

SHELTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

FEBRUARY 9, 2016

The Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 9, 2016, Shelton City Hall, Auditorium at 7:00 p.m., 54 Hill Street, Shelton, CT 06403. The Chairperson reserved the right to take items out of sequence.

Commissioners Present: Chairperson Ruth Parkins
 Commissioner Virginia Harger
 Commissioner Elaine Matto
 Commissioner Frank Osak (alternate for T. McGorty)
 Commissioner Anthony Pogoda (via teleconference)
 Commissioner Jim Tickey (arrived 7:10 p.m.)

Staff Present: Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator
 Anthony Panico, P&Z Consultant (via teleconference)
 Patricia Gargiulo, Court Stenographer
 Karin Tuke, P&Z 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 February 9th Regular P&Z Meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and a roll call of members present. She indicated that Comm. Pogoda (referred to as "Tony") and P&Z Consultant Tony Panico (referred to as "A.J.") would be in attendance via conference phone. Additionally, Comm. Osak is acting as alternate for Comm. Tickey.

PUBLIC HEARING

PROPOSAL OF THE SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION TO AMEND THE FOLLOWING ZONING REGULATIONS: SECTION 36 (CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT) – CONTINUED FROM 1/12/16 MEETING

Chair Parkins indicated that the first item on the agenda would be the continuation of a public hearing from January 12th regarding Central Business District Zoning Amendments. There were just a few minor modifications made since that point. They were briefly mentioned last time and Mr. Schultz will provide some more detail.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and added that there is one piece of correspondence for the Secretary to read.

P&Z Secretary, Comm. Harger read correspondence from the Greater Bridgeport Regional Council regarding the zoning text amendments.

***See attached correspondence dated 2/1/16 to Chair Parkins, Shelton Planning & Zoning Commission from the Greater Bridgeport Regional Council, Brian Bidolli, Executive Director.**

Mr. Schultz indicated that Staff has provided the latest revised copies of the text amendments and the Commissioners have it before them. Public members who would like to participate can obtain copies that are available next to the stenographer.

Comm. Tickey arrives 7:12 p.m.; Comm. Osak acting as Alternate for Comm. McGorty.

Comm. Pogoda asked Staff to state the page of the document when reading the revisions because he just got it and is reading it off of the computer.

Mr. Schultz referenced the 15 page document and stated that on Page 1 there are no changes. On Page 2, under Subsection 33.12.5 Parking, the first sentence will end with the word “City.” On the bottom of Page 2, the 2nd to last sentence will read “provided that a Statement is obtained from the *City’s Designated Agent*.” These items are highlighted on the printed text.

On Page 3, the fifth sentence will read “determined by the Commission and the *City’s Designated Agent*.” The same change will be seen at the end of the same paragraph regarding the *City’s Designated Agent*.

He referenced Page 5 under Subsection 36.14.2, the third to the last sentence will read “the Shelton Economic Development Corporation and the *City’s Designated Parking Agent*.”

On Page 9, Subsection 36.8.2 Access and Circulation, second sentence in “b.” will read “and shall comply with *the City’s Sidewalk Ordinance #520*.”

On Page 13, Subsection 36.10 Parking, the “City” will be added to the first sentence reading “The *City* has established municipal, off-street parking facilities...” In the same paragraph, fourth sentence shall read “that a statement is obtained from the *City’s Designated Agent*...”

Mr. Schultz referenced Section 36.11 Lighting on the same page with the addition of Subsection 36.11.1 Lamps – “*All lighting shall utilize LED standards*.” Lastly, on Page 15, he noted the addition of the words “*City’s Designated Parking Agent*.” On the third to the last line of Subsection 36.14.2 Procedure.

Mr. Schultz indicated that concludes all of the text changes that the Commission instructed Staff to incorporate. As of tonight, they have completed the Amendments to Section 33 Procedure for Special Exception Applications, 33.12 Mixed Use Developments and Section 36 for Central Business Districts and the creation of PDD #82 along with the Statement of Uses and Standards and the map that is a part of the exhibits showing the shaded location for PDD #82.

Chair Parkins asked if there was a new paragraph where he referenced the Ordinance. She asked if it wasn’t a new paragraph as well.

Mr. Schultz responded no they always had that wording in there with the Portland-cement.

After reviewing the document, Chair Parkins commented that the changes were pretty minor.

Mr. Schultz responded pretty minor in scope but nevertheless important.

Chair Parkins commented OK, she wanted to make sure that they included the Sidewalk Ordinance because they weren’t aware of that ordinance when they started making amendments to this as well as the LED lights which was just obsolete – an oversight. She asked if the Commissioners had any comments or questions.

Comm. Pogoda commented that he had no comments at this time.

With no further comments from the Commission, Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak regarding the Amendments to these Zoning Sections. With no response from the audience, she asked for a motion to close the public hearing.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to close the public hearing the Proposal of the Shelton Planning & Zoning Commission for Proposed Zone Change for Section 36 (Central Business District)

AGENDA ADD-ONS

Chair Parkins stated that they had three items to add to the Agenda under Old Business, New Business and Other Business

SEPARATE #0581: DON DELUCA, 8 COUNTRY RIDGE DRIVE, HOME OFFICE (GUN SALES)

Chair Parkins commented that this had been erroneously listed as a Staff Approved Separate but needs to be addressed with Commission discussion for Separate #0581.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to add Separate #0581 to the Agenda under Old Business/Applications for Certificate of Zoning Compliance for a home business.

APPLICATION #16-4: RESUBDIVISION APPLICATION (LOT 3: PEARMAIN ESTATES), 43 PEARMAIN ROAD (MAP 143, LOT 4), R-1A DISTRICT: ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to add an item to the Agenda under New Business for Application #16-4.

INFORMAL DISCUSSION: PROPOSED PRD/PDD DEVELOPMENT FOR THE REMAINING PORTION OF SOUNDVIEW CROSSING, PARCEL B: ATTY. THOMAS

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to add an item to the agenda under Other Business for an Informal PRD/PDD Development Discussion for a portion of Soundview Crossing Parcel B.

OLD BUSINESS

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATE OF ZONING COMPLIANCE

SEPARATE #0532: LEWIS MERRITT, 223 CANAL STREET, OPEN HOUSE EXPO

Mr. Schultz stated that the Applicant has asked the Commission to table this again tonight because the Shelton Police Department has just now finalized its letter. He anticipates it will be on the March Agenda.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #0532.

SEPARATE #0582: KATHLEEN SNINSKY, 49 MOHEGAN ROAD, DAYCARE

Mr. Schultz stated that this is the Hideout at the former Nike Site under Mohegan's new ownership. Everything is the same with eight employees and hours of operation 6:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. for before and after daycare. As the Commission is aware this has been provided for many years. Staff recommends approval.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0582.

SEPARATE #0578: NATIONAL SIGN: 90 HUNTINGTON STREET, SIGN

Mr. Schultz stated that this is for the Quest Diagnostic facility and there should be a representative here.

Comm. Harger asked if this was moving in.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, the Commission approved occupancy already. This is for the signage. There are a couple different aspects of the signage – the traditional sign on the wall which is straightforward, and they are looking for identification on the window.

Chair Parkins asked if they had both sides.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Chair Parkins asked if one side wasn't the Massage place.

Mr. Schultz commented that the Applicant was supposed to be here.

Chair Parkins asked if the Applicant was present.

Comm. Pogoda commented in regard to the drawing that he saw and added that he was OK with the wall, the parapet and the door but he thinks it is getting ridiculous on the window for a small place like that. He added that he did not think it was needed.

Comm. Harger agreed. Comm. Tickey agreed.

Mr. Schultz commented OK, wall and door sign only.

Chair Parkins responded that until they do something with the Café at the end, it is a little bit hard to tell...

Comm. Tickey commented that the Café was an issue.

Chair Parkins added that it was a big issue.

Comm. Harger agreed and added that it may be hard for right now but (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins stated that they can't deny one and let others do it so...

Comm. Harger asked if they were pursuing something with the Café.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and he'll be reporting on that tonight because they're ready to take action.

Chair Parkins commented that the window sign really didn't bother her.

Mr. Schultz asked if that was the consensus.

Chair Parkins stated that she wanted to make sure that the Massage place isn't next to that because if so, then the Quest sign has to be centered over the other window.

Mr. Schultz agreed.

Comm. Tickey commented that he thinks it is next to it. Chair Parkins agreed adding that there is a doorway there and another doorway there.

Mr. Schultz stated that all of the brackets are there from the previous occupants. He'll check it out or do whatever they want him to do.

Chair Parkins commented that if she does come in for a sign, she'll have to put it up there which means that they'll need a smaller sign. She commented that they have to table this. It is going to have to be smaller to fit over the two windows not wide to fit over the entire space.

Mr. Schultz indicated that he will get some more info on that.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #0578.

SEPARATE #0576: CAROLYN PARKER, 464 RIVER ROAD, SIGN
SEPARATE #0577: CAROLYN PARKER, 827 RIVER ROAD, SIGN

Chair Parkins asked what the lit signage in the audience was for.

Mr. Schultz responded that it was for the Cumberland Farms which is next.

Chair Parkins commented OK and asked if it could be laid down or something because it is really bright and glaring at them.

Comm. Harger added yes, they get the idea.

Mr. Schultz commented that Separate #0576 is for the 464 River Road Cumberland Farms and Separate #0577 is for the other Cumberland Farms facility at 827 River Road.

Carolyn Parker, representing Cumberland Farms, addressed the Commission. Ms. Parker indicated that Cumberland Farms has started a Smart Pay Program which allows customers to get 10¢ off a gallon of gas. The two ways that Cumberland Farms is incorporating the Smart Pay Plan into their property is by putting in a Smart Pay Alternator within the existing LED price sign. They have two locations and one has a 4x6 LED price sign and the other one has a 2x6x6 price sign and within that same square footage, they would like to put an alternator strip that would allow the prices to alternate between the Smart Pay member price and the Non-member price.

Chair Parkins asked if it would be flashing.

Ms. Parker responded no, alternating.

Chair Parkins asked if she could define that a little bit more.

Ms. Parker showed how flashing would go quickly and added that this sign could alternate between 0 – 60 seconds so it would depend upon what this town would consider to be flashing. She commented that 8 seconds is the standard that Cumberland Farms likes to set it at; she has had towns doing 30 seconds, 15 seconds, etc. She added that she has a list of other towns that have allowed the signs.

Comm. Harger asked if she was talking about a message change from one message to another.

Ms. Parker responded that it wasn't a message, just a price. So if the price was \$1.70, it would go from \$1.70 to \$1.80 with just one digit changing. She commented that she has a video on her phone if they would like to look at it. She provided a listing of the sites where they have signs. She stated that this program has been around for 2 ½ years but the reason that they are finally just getting around to Connecticut is because Cumberland Farms went to the State of Connecticut to allow them to have LED Pump Toppers.

LED Pump Toppers are the prices on the dispenser. Currently people have to shut down the lanes and go out there and change the magnets manually every day so Cumberland Farms is looking to change out the magnetic pump toppers to put in the LED pump topper. The LED pump topper also has the Smart Pay incorporated into it so the Pump Toppers are for the people at the pump and are not meant to be seen from the roadway.

Ms. Parker added that at one of the properties the pumps are 72 feet away and at another site they are roughly 40 feet away.

Chair Parkins asked if she had any visuals.

Ms. Parker responded that she had one but they asked her to turn it off.

Chair Parkins stated that was representative of how bright it may be but isn't representative of the sign itself and where it will be positioned.

Ms. Parker commented that there was a whole package of information that she submitted.

Mr. Schultz showed the Commissioners the renderings provided.

Chair Parkins commented OK that was what she was looking for.

Ms. Parker pointed out the rendering of the sign, existing signs, the pylon area, and the depiction of the Pump Topper. They would take out the manual and install these - they are roughly 2.16 square feet which is roughly the same size of the one that is currently there.

Comm. Harger stated that she could see having one on the pump but asked what one on the road would really do. If you are going to go to Cumberland Farms, then you are going to go to Cumberland Farms, she didn't think you would do a 360° to turn around because they have a sign like this.

Ms. Parker responded that you may wonder why the price changed and then go in and find out about the Smart Pay Program and become a member.

Comm. Matto asked about seeing (inaudible)...

Mr. Schultz commented that this is a whole new advertising (inaudible)...

Comm. Tickey asked if any other gas stations had these.

Chair Parkins commented that it didn't bother her over the pump but their Regulations state clearly that "no sign shall be animated or flashing except for barber poles and time temperature devices..." She asked Ms. Parker had read their Regulations so she doesn't have to go through them all.

Ms. Parker responded yes, she has them. She reiterated that everyone's interpretation of flashing is very different; therefore Rick asked her to come in front of the Commission to discuss it. The other option on the main pylon sign would be to add a second LED price sign that would remain static so you would have both prices out on the main pylon sign but their Regulations only allow for 40 square feet so she would need to go in front of the Zoning Board.

Ms. Parker would take the LED Smart Toppers with Smart Pay and pull the sign card out.

Comm. Tickey commented that he was fine with that above the pump. Chair Parkins agreed that she didn't mind it above the pump either.

Comm. Tickey added that people are already there and if they are member they will be able to see what price they'll be paying.

Ms. Parker added that also they won't have to go out and change it in bad weather.

Mr. Schultz asked the Applicant how the reaction has been with other communities in Connecticut and Mass, and R.I.

Ms. Parker responded that she has probably done about 500 sites and about 95% maybe 98% have allowed it. No one has a problem with the LED Pump Topper but some towns don't want it on the signs so they put a second sign and got a variance for that. She has been doing this for 2 ½ years. She stated that on the Pump Topper they show that they can dim the light or put a coating on the sign to reduce glare.

Chair Parkins stated that she just thinks it is distracting and River Road is busy enough as it is. People drive very fast on that road and that is a distraction that is not needed. If people are going to stop in Cumberland Farms to get gas, if they are a member or not a member, they can see it when they get up to the pump. She added that was just her opinion.

Comm. Matto agreed and didn't see how...

Comm. Pogoda concurred that he didn't mind them at the pump designating the prices but any movement is a safety hazard as far as he's concerned. They have enough problems with distracted drivers and don't need anything more with flashing or moving signs.

Chair Parkins asked if that was the actual size of the Pump Topper sign.

Ms. Parker responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked to see it closer.

Chair Parkins stated that it was half the size of the pump.

Mr. Schultz commented that he was glad that she brought it as an example.

Ms. Parker indicated that she was going to show them that on the back they can put a film and a coating to reduce the glare and to dim it. She put the bad side on first.

Chair Parkins stated that Comm. Harger commented that it was reflecting off her glasses and that's why she asked to have it shut off earlier.

Ms. Parker commented that it was basically two square feet. They would like the Smart Pay at least at the pump. She added that she couldn't understand what the speaker on the phone was saying and if he didn't want the Smart Pay on the pump or just didn't want it on the street.

Chair Parkins responded that he was just concurring about the signage. She asked if it was still her intention, even if that is approved to go for a variance for the signs.

Ms. Parker stated that she would go back to Cumberland Farms and ask them what they'd like to do. They are allowed 40 square feet – with one they already have at 48 square feet and the other they're at 39 square feet so there is a reason why the signs are the size that they are. She added that they could take the 4x6 out and put two 2 ½ x 6 so that they are only adding six square feet so there are different things that they could do. Right now, they would at least like to have the Smart Pay at the pump and that may be all that they want to do.

Chair Parkins commented that her concern is that if they allow this, they are allowing a flashing component to a sign and then they will go to ZBA and say that the Commission allowed the flashing so they obviously allow flashing signs.

Comm. Matto asked if the one on the pump was going to flash too.

Ms. Parker responded that some towns say it is not even a sign because it is a part of the gas station requirement – a requirement by the State – to have the sign there. It is two square feet and some Regulations state anything under three square feet isn't considered a sign. She has had some towns tell her that they don't even want to regulate them.

Chair Parkins commented that they are Shelton and they really aren't going to go by what everybody else does. The question is if they want to allow signage that is quite large for a pump that is going to be flashing.

Comm. Harger stated that she didn't see the need for it to be flashing, she doesn't think it is going to make people buy (inaudible)...

Ms. Parker responded that they could have it alternate at 30 seconds.

Comm. Tickey asked if they would be able to determine the length of it before it changes – how long the price would stay there before it changes.

Mr. Schultz responded yes she said that would be an option.

Ms. Parker indicated that eight seconds is the standard that they like.

Comm. Tickey responded that is probably a little bit too quick.

Ms. Parker stated that this one, if they want to watch it...

Mr. Schultz asked how many seconds it could go up to.

Ms. Parker responded that it goes up to 60 seconds. In some of the Town Halls, this video doesn't work...

Chair Parkins commented that the coverage inside the building is pretty spotty.

Ms. Parker showed what it looks like on the pump and if it worked and you counted 1..2..3..4 – 15 seconds is a long time when you are waiting so it is by no means flashing. It is not scrolling but it just changes.

Comm. Matto asked if the Pump Toppers were about the same size as what they currently have except it is electronic.

Ms. Parker responded yes and right now it is magnetic and they go out every day and change it but it is the same size.

Comm. Matto asked if they had room on there to put those two prices on there...Ms. Parker showed her the rendering on her phone of the sign over the pump.

Comm. Harger stated that she did not mind a digital sign but did not see any need for it to be flashing. If you are going to buy gas at a gas station it is because you need to buy gas and you're not going to be pulled in ...

Chair Parkins responded that it has to change and that is the thing.

Comm. Harger asked why it had to be flashing.

Chair Parkins commented that it doesn't have to be flashing.

Comm. Matto stated it was because there is a 10¢ difference in price.

Chair Parkins added that they can control the time.

Comm. Tickey stated that they should set a limit as to how often the prices will change. He thinks 8 seconds would be too quick but...

Comm. Harger stated that the pumps at Stop & Shop just show the difference – if you buy it with this...

Comm. Matto asked how they show it.

Comm. Harger responded that it was digital and it shows when you scan your card – it shows the price with your points.

Mr. Schultz added that you scan your card, it shows the price and asks if you accept the price.

Chair Parkins commented that they should go with 15 seconds.

Comm. Tickey agreed.

Chair Parkins added at just over the pump. She added that they will send a letter to ZBA.

Mr. Schultz responded that would be for Separate #0576 and #0577.

Chair Parkins stated yes, for both locations. She asked Comm. Pogoda if he was OK with that.

Comm. Pogoda asked if this was for the sign above the pump and how long.

Chair Parkins responded yes above the pump for 15 seconds.

Comm. Pogoda commented OK, he understands. He requested that she take the vote.

Chair Parkins asked what he would recommend.

Comm. Pogoda stated that he doesn't feel that it is really necessary for it to be moving. Although he can't see it...but in listening to the discussion...he thinks it would be a detriment.

Ms. Parker stated that they just did one in Ansonia and she mentioned it to Rick in case the Commission wanted to see it before the meeting.

Mr. Schultz responded that her presentation is sufficient.

Ms. Parker commented OK but she wanted them to know it is being used in towns right near them; although it is not in Shelton.

Chair Parkins asked if it could be dimmed a little bit too. If you are already there and right on top of it, standing there at the pump looking at it...she asked what the options were for dimming it.

Ms. Parker used the actual electrical sign that she brought to show the regular brightness, one coat of film over the light and then two coats of film over the light. She explained that each coat of film dulls the light. She showed the prices at brightness #6 and reduced to #3 brightness and added that with two coats of film, the glare would be further reduced. She added that is what they have come up with in the last couple of years. They aren't trying to have it be seen from...

Chair Parkins commented ...from Mars.

Comm. Tickey commented that he preferred the two coats.

Chair Parkins stated OK, two coats of film on the light at 15 second intervals and over the pumps.

Comm. Matto commented that it only had to be readable at the pump – not bright enough to be seen from the road.

Ms. Parker stated that at one of these sites, as she mentioned, it is 72 feet away from the road.

Chair Parkins asked for a motion to approve with the noted stipulations.

Comm. Matto asked about the dimness option – and the sheeting

Ms. Parker stated that was for two coats of film. Anything less just burns the bulbs out.

Chair Parkins asked if they could dim it to three coats.

Ms. Parker stated that the bulb would get tinier but anything below three causes them to burn out all the time.

Chair Parkins asked if that was for the three coat or the two coat.

Ms. Parker recommended the two coats with a brightness of three and they can control it at the location by just setting it and leaving it.

On a motion made by Elaine Matto seconded by Jim Tickey, it was voted (4-2) to approve Separate #0576 and Separate #0577 for Smart Pay Pump Toppers with the noted stipulations (Two coats of light dimming film with a Brightness of 3, over the gas pumps only with 15 second intervals for price alterations). Comm. Pogoda and Comm. Harger voted in opposition.

SEPARATE #0586: CHILI'S GRILL AND BAR, 828 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, SIGN

J. J. Jamadar, Director of Development for Chili's Restaurants, addressed the Commission. Mr. Jamadar stated that the planned remodel of this restaurant is part of a national reimage program that they have. They've already reimaged about 800 restaurants across the country and this is in the last batch of about 50 restaurants that are left.

Mr. Jamadar stated that the plans are to – one shows the colors of the exterior of the building and the other plan is replacing all of the signs.

Mr. Schultz provided renderings of the plans for the Commission and asked Mr. Jamadar to present the diagrams that he showed him earlier. He added that the Applicant has alternatives to proposed plan as well.

Comm. Tickey asked for a current photo of what it looks like.

Mr. Jamadar showed the actual color of the brick on the building and the front and back views.

Chair Parkins asked if the windows would really be all these different colors.

Mr. Jamadar responded no that they were architectural renderings but the windows, the awnings are new. There are striped awnings on the existing building so the game plan is to paint the parapet the color that they see. He asked what color they are referring to.

Mr. Schultz responded the red one.

Mr. Jamadar responded OK, the upper part of the building would be painted that color. The current awnings would change out to these – because this is a part of their national reimagining program that is happening across the country – so it will change from the existing signage to what is shown. The building parapet color will change and the awnings will get changed out. All of stone on the building that they see is existing.

Comm. Tickey asked to see what it looks like right now.

Mr. Jamadar present renderings of the current restaurant.

Mr. Schultz commented that more of the Commissioners want to see the alternate B.

Mr. Jamadar stated that he understands that there is some concern about the red color on the parapet; what they would like to propose then is to not paint any of the brick at all – so the current brick on the building does not get touched. The only part that would change – and he provided an alternate rendering ...

Chair Parkins commented about being slightly confused.

Comm. Pogoda stated that he knows that the Applicant is passing out alternate colors but asked if she could point out to him what (inaudible) they are.

Chair Parkins stated that she would as soon as she figured it out.

Comm. Tickey commented that the alternative without painting the brick (inaudible, multiple conversations)

Mr. Jamadar commented that they would not change the brick at all. The only thing on the alternate rendering that is getting painted is the parapet cap going from a beige color to a brown. The current building is a light green color and it would get painted a beige with a brown trim top and bottom. In terms of the painting of the building that is all that happens. The awnings will get replaced (inaudible)...they will stay in character with the adjacent restaurants. (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins asked what color the awning would be.

Mr. Jamadar responded that the awnings would stay red and green – that is there national change across the country. In lieu of this alternate, this would have been painted red all the way from here to here but they won't do that. All they will do is paint the individual band, the parapet here and the parapet there.

Chair Parkins commented OK so you will not paint the brick at all but paint the parapet cap which is now beige and make it dark brown. The trim in the middle above the awning which was beige will made dark brown. The awnings will be changed from striped to rectangular red and green.

Mr. Jamadar responded yes and the individual band color goes from the sea foam/light green color to the beige.

Comm. Tickey responded that he was OK with that.

Chair Parkins stated that they like Option B.

Mr. Jamadar stated that the Chili signage was going to be replaced...

Comm. Harger asked what the thought was behind changing and putting the name above the entrance and putting the big trademark.

Mr. Jamadar responded that was the national – they just changed out the national logo a few years ago and they are rolling it out across the country.

Chair Parkins asked Comm. Pogoda if he was able to follow that.

Comm. Pogoda responded yes but he wants to make sure that the awnings above the windows would be staying red and green.

Chair Parkins responded yes.

Comm. Pogoda responded OK.

Comm. Harger commented that her concern was that this is a very heavy dark look (inaudible) and she isn't particularly mad about the awnings.

Chair Parkins stated that she just didn't like the red painted brick. One of the things that they did with that PDD is to have it uniform with the rest of the buildings in that complex. She asked if the gooseneck lights were staying.

Mr. Jamadar stated that they are staying and painted a dark brown.

Atty. Dominick Thomas, representing the landlord, addressed the Committee. Atty. Thomas stated that according to the lease provision for the Applicant to file for the signage, according to the lease, they are in no way endorsing what they are presenting but it is up to the Commission because it is a PDD.

Chair Parkins asked if they gave them permission though.

Atty. Thomas responded yes, they were given permission to file but he wants to make clear that it wasn't an endorsement of the red brick or anything like that.

Mr. Jamadar indicated that they aren't going to be able to paint the brick anyway.

Chair Parkins asked the Commission if they were OK with the awning colors.

Comm. Harger responded well, no...

Mr. Jamadar stated that they are trying to keep a national image across the country. They have about 800 restaurants.

Comm. Harger responded yes she understand because she used to work in trademarks for (inaudible)...it is a very southwestern look. She doesn't think it is a New England kind of look.

Comm. Matto added that it wasn't a New England kind of food.

Comm. Harger agreed and added that it was a heavy appearance over the windows. She stated that she worked in Trademarks for a corporation for many years and you have a standard and expect it to be something that is agreeable to everyone nationwide without taking regional differences into account. Things that may be appropriate in California or Texas are not the same things that people appreciate or look at as attractive in other parts of the country. She stated that she wants to voice this as something – for someone at Corporate to do - OK this is what we are going to do nationwide...she understands it about corporate identity but those awnings leave a lot to be desired.

Chair Parkins asked what type of green that was and asked if he had a sample of the awning color.

Mr. Jamadar responded that he did not have fabric samples with him today but he can mail them to the Commission.

Chair Parkins asked if it was a forest green, bright green or a ...

Comm. Pogoda stated that he wouldn't be able to see it but would like him to bring in a sample of that red and green and asked if that was the actual depiction of what they would be. He asked if it would be a different color when they bring it in.

Comm. Harger commented about the Pantone color system that all printers and industry people use to identify specific colors.

Chair Parkins responded yes but that doesn't mean that is what this is.

Mr. Jamadar responded that he can provide the Pantone colors of all the paints that they are proposing.

Chair Parkins stated that it wasn't so much the paint but the fabric of the awnings.

Mr. Jamadar responded that he can give them a Pantone color of that too.

Comm. Harger asked if they had taken fading into consideration – fading from the sun because this isn't a shaded area.

Mr. Jamadar agreed and indicated that every awning and every bright color anywhere will fade over time to a certain extent. These are Sunbrella®, one of the best awning fabrics made and they already have some that have been there for several years and haven't significantly faded. If anything, they see the fading more on the paint rather than these fabrics.

Chair Parkins asked if they printed on the fabrics.

Mr. Jamadar responded no that is the color of the actual fabric.

Chair Parkins stated there was design on them such as "Chili's to go..."

Mr. Jamadar responded that for the revised drawings that he submitted they took all of the logos off.

Chair Parkins stated OK, no design or wording on it.

Mr. Jamadar commented that there was some objection about it being considered signage so they took it off.

Comm. Pogoda stated that a point was brought up about the fading and he asked if they intend on changing them when they start looking irregular from sun damage.

Chair Parkins responded that they are a chain restaurant and she imagines that they are going to keep the place looking nice. It doesn't look shabby now.

Comm. Pogoda responded that he agreed but the sun will fade them. He asked if they could withstand the weight of snow or ice.

Chair Parkins stated that there are awnings on all of the windows right now; they are striped. –It isn't like they are adding awnings.

Mr. Jamadar commented that all they are doing is changing out the fabric.

Comm. Tickey responded yes and added that he believes there are awnings on Longhorn and other restaurants up and down Bridgeport Avenue as well.

Mr. Jamadar commented that pretty much every major restaurant chain has some type of awning on the building; it's not like something they recently do. They have had awnings on these buildings – some of the buildings are 30 and 40 years old.

Chair Parkins asked for a consensus – whether they wanted to approve it or wait to see the colors.

Comm. Tickey indicated that he would approve it with less painting as they discussed.

Comm. Matto commented that she would approve it.

Chair Parkins responded OK with no painting of the brick.

Comm. Harger stated that she would like to see the color swatches on file at City Hall so if there are ever a questions of fading or whatever...

On a motion made by Elaine Matto seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0586 for exterior painting and signage Option B.

SEPARATE#0588: THREE BRIDGES COFFEE HOUSE, 410 HOWE AVENUE, SIGN
SEPARATE#0587: WRITTEN WORDS BOOKS & GIFT, 410 HOWE AVENUE, SIGN

Mr. Schultz indicated that both of the new tenants – Three Bridges and the Written Words are proposing projected signs.

Comm. Harger asked if they were blade signs.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, over the sidewalk. They have to submit liability insurance to the Building Department. The dimensions are 40" x 30" and added that was not a bad size. It will be located eight feet from the sidewalk height. The Three Bridges will be located between their door and first window to the right. The Written Words goes into the end entrance and that one will be located between the two windows located closest to the entrance door and closest to the parking lot.

Chair Parkins asked if it would be on Howe Avenue.

Mr. Schultz responded yes and both of them will have a uniform height of eight feet. They have uniformity here as to quality, dimensions and location.

Chair Parkins asked if they were going to have the same hangers and everything.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, using the same fabrication.

Comm. Harger asked to see the renderings of both signs.

Mr. Schultz indicated that they are starting to see uniformity.

Chair Parkins asked if they were wood.

Mr. Schultz responded that they were fabricated but not wood material; it just looks like wood.

Comm. Harger asked Mr. Schultz to ask the Coffee House applicant if “coffee house” was one or two words because the sign company won’t necessarily know and sometimes they just throw things down.

Comm. Tickey added that it might be edited to reflect a space between coffee and house, if the owner would like to they can adjust.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0588 and Separate #0587 for signage.

SEPARATE #0579: KIM BENSEN, 17 HUNTINGTON PLAZA, BUSINESS

Kim Benson, 17 Huntington Plaza, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Benson indicated that should would wait on the signage and just do the occupancy.

Mr. Schultz stated that this is the old Hallmark Store in the back, 1200 square feet and this is for Kim’s Lite Food Inc. with three employees, hours of operation 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday and Saturday, 9 a.m. to 12 p.m. She has found a permanent location after two other locations.

Ms. Benson stated that they do have one meeting a week on Monday nights.

Chair Parkins stated that parking is not an issue there.

Comm. Pogoda asked if the sign was forthcoming.

Chair Parkins responded yes.

Comm. Harger added that there are issues with continuity on that building too.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0579 for business occupancy.

SEPARATE #0589: BRR ARCHITECTURE, 465 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE, EXT. SIGN & PAINTING

Mr. Schultz indicated that this was for Wal-Mart on Bridgeport Avenue so they have another Corporation changing the appearance of their exterior.

Brendan Kemmer, Representing BRR Architecture for Wal-Mart, addressed the Commission. Mr. Kemmer commented that he did not know if they had copies of the changes in front of them but they would be changing the color tones from browns to grays. He stated that there were some variations in the gray and he had some colors to show them.

Mr. Kemmer stated that the only color that will be on the store is located in front of the main entrance. It will be the blue right behind the badge sign and the signage on the building will be new but it won’t be any larger in square footage. It will actually be less square footage than the existing signage. He provided paint samples.

Chair Parkins asked if they were just painting the top part – the Wal-Mart – or were they painting the whole building.

Mr. Kemmer responded that the whole building will be painted. Currently, it is variations of browns around the perimeter and everything, as they can see in the elevations, the side, rear and side will pretty much be the same gray tone. In the front elevation, there will be some variations of the gray tones.

Chair Parkins asked if this was like the gray tone of the building.

Mr. Kemmer responded yes. The top part will be the lighter color.

Chair Parkins commented that there were three colors there.

Mr. Kemmer responded correct, the lighter color is around the whole perimeter of the building and the top band. The darker color is in the middle and the slightly darker tone will be on the bottom.

Chair Parkins commented that she didn't know who was responsible for that color scheme but it seemed pretty drab in her opinion.

Comm. Harger agreed that it was basic.

Mr. Kemmer responded that they were toning down everything – inside and out.

Chair Parkins asked if they were doing anything with the sign.

Mr. Kemmer responded that the signage will be new but the replacement sign will be what is currently there and actually reducing the square footage of the wall signage.

Mr. Schultz asked about the monument sign.

Mr. Kemmer responded that the monument sign would be the same and they would be putting a fresh sign face in there – a new Wal-Mart sign in there but the size will not increase.

Chair Parkins asked if they were illuminating it.

Mr. Kemmer responded no, it will be in the same location. They will just take the existing plastic and put something new in so that it looks nice.

Chair Parkins asked if it was internally illuminated right now.

Mr. Schultz responded it is but it is hidden from all of the vegetation and no one sees it.

Mr. Kemmer added that they will be painting the sign so that it looks nice but it will not change in any way.

Mr. Schultz asked if the logo had changed in any way.

Mr. Kemmer responded no the logo is not going to change at all – the same sign going right back on there.

With no issues, Chair Parkins asked for a motion.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0589 for exterior sign and painting.

SEPARATE #0518: DON DELUCA, 8 COUNTRY RIDGE DRIVE, HOME OFFICE

Chair Parkins commented that this was the add-on separate for home office sales of firearms, e-commerce firearms.

Mr. Schultz stated that this was for the sale of new and used firearms. The license that they hold is Federal Firearms License and they will be occupying 200 square feet of the home. The owner is the only employee and hours of operation would be as needed. The Applicant will provide details. Mr. Schultz stated that the last time that they had a similar application, the Commission directed the Applicant to notify the neighbors. They are here tonight to advise the Commission as to what they've done.

Chair Parkins asked if the neighbors were here.

Mr. Schultz responded no. He asked the Applicant if the neighbors were contacted.

Mr. DeLuca submitted the letter to the Commission that he sent to his neighbors and a copy of the Federal Firearms License.

Mr. Schultz asked if most of the business was internet sales.

Mr. Don DeLuca, 8 Country Ridge Drive, Shelton addressed the Commission. Mr. DeLuca responded yes basically all the antique and collectible firearms.

Comm. Harger asked if there were any deliveries to the residence.

Mr. DeLuca responded that anything that would be delivered to Connecticut would be delivered to a gun store, an existing gun store. Connecticut Gun Exchange is actually the store.

Chair Parkins commented on the letter submitted and stated that it did not tell the neighbors what type of e-commerce sales he would be doing.

Mr. Michael DeLuca addressed the Commission. He responded that they did not.

Chair Parkins commented that they have to tell them what it is.

Mr. DeLuca responded that he didn't want everyone in the neighborhood to know about it.

Mr. Michael DeLuca stated that they were advised by the ATF not to tell neighbors about it.

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commission has never done that in the past.

Mr. DeLuca stated that two of the neighbors, Mr. Sarni across the street and Mr. Hubbell have both bought firearms from them at their store so they know what business they have.

Chair Parkins asked if they had a regular retail store.

Mr. DeLuca responded that they did have a store in Monroe and Mr. Sarni knows the business that they are in.

Chair Parkins asked if any of the neighbors asked them about it.

Mr. DeLuca responded no.

Comm. Harger asked about a couple of the neighbor's names on the list.

Mr. DeLuca responded that one is a father and the son both living in the same residence.

Chair Parkins stated that she found it strange that no one asked them what they were selling.

Mr. Michael DeLuca responded that he thinks that they are aware of the store that they had in Monroe and that they were turning it into an e-commerce business versus a store-front business.

Comm. Tickey stated that he wanted to see a copy of the letter.

Comm. Harger asked if they would be maintaining a stock in their house.

Mr. DeLuca responded no – nothing like what they had available at the store.

Comm. Harger commented (inaudible) like a retail operation.

Mr. DeLuca commented right, that would be hundreds of guns.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that they would have traditional guns that would be stored at the house in secured safes and lockboxes.

Chair Parkins commented that this license in for Roosevelt Drive in Monroe.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that they need to change the address on the license. The ATF requires them to have a letter from the P&Z Commission approving this new location first.

Mr. Schultz added correct – local approval first because they do call Staff.

Mr. M. DeLuca indicated that they also need approval from the Police Department that says that they acknowledge they'll be conducting firearms business.

Chair Parkins stated that the license is issued to Michel DeLuca and she asked who that was.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that is Michael and he is Michael.

Chair Parkins responded OK, and asked about the spelling.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that was an Italian spelling of Michael.

Mr. Tickey commented stated that the letter states deliveries/pick-ups may occur up to three times a week.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded right, from regulated carriers. If they order something from any of the firearms dealers, they would be delivered through FedEx, UPS or the Post Office.

Chair Parkins asked if they had to be signed for.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded yes, absolutely, they have to be signed for. Nothing is ever just left outside.

Comm. Harger asked if they intended to have any displays for potential customers.

Mr. DeLuca responded that there would be no foot traffic into the house at all.

Mr. M. DeLuca clarified that if they could take out the fact that it is guns, it is really just shipping and receiving. They advertise an Internet site and if people decide that they want to purchase a gun then they ship it to a licensed Federal Firearms dealer in their town. All of their business is basically FFL to FFL with very little business that would happen FFL to local people. The Connecticut business will be addressed through an arrangement that they made with Connecticut Gun Exchange that for any Connecticut business, they would bring the guns and transfer the guns to the Connecticut Gun Exchange and they would deliver – do the retail side of it – and deliver it to the Conn. residents.

Comm. Harger asked what Connecticut Gun Exchange was.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that it was a retail gun store in Monroe.

Mr. DeLuca stated that the gun would go from their FFL License to his FFL License.

Chair Parkins commented that they didn't sell directly – she asked if they were sort of like the middleman.

Mr. DeLuca responded no – you would buy it from me but he would deliver it to Conn. Gun Exchange and you would go to Conn. Gun Exchange, do the legal paperwork to take possession.

Chair Parkins asked if they were verifying permits or anything like that.

Mr. DeLuca responded no they are just a broker.

Mr. M. DeLuca added that always happens with the delivering FFL. The sending FFL assumes that the FFL on the other side, which they get copies of – that dealer is responsible for making sure it is a valid transaction in State. It has happened to them too – someone actually shipped them a gun that is not legal in the State of Connecticut so as an FFL, he made the decision,

turned around and shipped it back to the FFL who shipped it to them and told them they couldn't deliver it.

Comm. Matto asked if it was just a financial decision to do this at their own home rather than rent a retail space.

Mr. DeLuca responded yes.

Mr. M. DeLuca added that in Connecticut it is almost to the point now where it doesn't make any sense to have a gun store because of the increased regulations so they are taking that part of it out. They can still do the e-commerce that they were doing state to state and they aren't really looking at Connecticut as being a part of their (inaudible)...

Mr. DeLuca stated that 85% of their business when they had the store was FFL transfers to other states so they did very little business in Connecticut; most of it was out of state anyway.

Comm. Matto asked if they were dealing primarily in antique guns.

Mr. DeLuca responded collectible firearms more than newer guns. They could get newer guns in stores locally. They are more into collectible rifles or a collectible handguns.

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that it is hard to compete with some of the large box stores and they really want to take their business more into collectibles and military-type weapons.

Comm. Harger asked if the collectibles had been modified so that they cannot be fired.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded no.

Comm. Harger asked if they could still be used.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked how they would handle ammunition.

Mr. DeLuca responded none, nothing.

Chair Parkins stated that she hopes this doesn't appear on the front page of their newspaper.

Comm. Matto commented about notifying the neighbors and indicated that she would think that they would want to know to consider the effect on their property values and any disclosure that they might have to make to a potential buyer of their own property because this is going on in the neighborhood.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that they had discussions with the neighbors when they went to get them to sign (inaudible)...

Mr. DeLuca stated that both of his neighbors, Danny Annunziado who lives across the street and Kenny Hubble who lives next to him have been in their store so they aren't blind to what they are doing.

Comm. Harger commented that those are the people across the street but she asked about people living on their side of the street.

Mr. DeLuca stated that they are all up on Capitol Drive which is a whole different street.

Mr. M. DeLuca indicated that if you were facing their house, this is the neighbor on the right hand side and two that are diagonally across the street from the house.

Comm. Harger asked if they had an abutter on either side of them.

Mr. DeLuca responded that was on Capitol Drive so the fronts of their houses face Capitol Drive so they aren't ...

Chair Parkins commented that she wondered if it wouldn't make sense for them to know for their own security too – if they see something strange going on (inaudible)...

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that there is a security system in the house and none of guns will ever be out on display; they will all be locked in construction lock boxes or safes.

Comm. Harger asked if they were referring to guns that have been delivered that they are going to turn over to the Conn. Gun Exchange or ship out.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that if it needed to be delivered in Connecticut, it would go to the Conn. Gun Exchange.

Comm. Harger commented that when they say that they will be locked in safes – she asked if these are guns that have come to their home and haven't been turned over yet.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded yes, they either they have purchased for resale or that they bought from other dealers that will now be delivered in CT – they will do an FFL transfer to Conn. Gun Exchange and they will deliver the gun as a retail sale so all of the Conn. paperwork requirements will be taken care of by the delivering FFL.

Comm. Harger asked if they plan to buy stock to keep on hand just in case...

Mr. DeLuca responded no. If you bought an antique firearm and they put it in online, it may stay in the house for a week or so until it is sold but it would be locked up. If you can carry a 900 lb. safe out of the house – it would be difficult. They are fire-proof and explosion proof safes so you would have to destroy the house before you could get into the safe and after 30 seconds an alarm goes off.

Comm. Harger asked if he has had to take out extra insurance.

Mr. DeLuca responded that his house is already insured with it.

Chair Parkins asked the consensus about the neighbors not knowing.

Comm. Tickey stated that he would not be able to vote in good conscience if he doesn't know that all the neighbors within a radius had been notified as to the type of e-commerce business that it is. When other applicants come to the Commission, they go within a certain amount of feet in regard to who is on the street and he thinks that the neighbors deserve to know what kind of a business it is. It seems as though they have a solid process and he doesn't doubt that but he thinks that the neighbors should know more than what was in that letter. He added that he read the letter and the neighbors should know more than what was articulated in that letter before they go forward with this.

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that the neighbors were – he explained.

Mr. DeLuca asked how far around them were they considering as neighbors. He asked if they wanted the whole street to know.

Chair Parkins responded no, just the abutters.

Mr. DeLuca stated that he already told them who was across the street.

Chair Parkins commented that they picked and chose who they notified. She asked if that was correct.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded no the P&Z advised them that it was the adjoining properties so that is why they went there.

Mr. DeLuca added that P&Z said adjoining properties around them – so Sarni adjoins his property and Manny and Jimmy Hubble are across the street.

Comm. Harger asked if they were on Country Place.

Mr. DeLuca responded yes the others are on Capitol Drive which is a whole other area.

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that the other issue that he wants to raise is that they don't want people knowing that there are guns stored in this house - in respect to his brother's safety...

Chair Parkins commented that it was a little late for that because they have the press is here.

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that in respect to his brother's safety in the house, they don't want to advertise that there are guns in the house because it would become more of an opportunity for people to try and break into the house even though they have gone to exemplary steps to keep the guns safe. They have an alarm system on the house but they still don't want to let people know in case they talk to someone, and they talk to someone else and some else, etc. and then pretty soon everyone knows about the guns in the house because then there may be a criminal element that wants to break in.

Comm. Harger stated that they have had other home-based gun operations.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, they have approved two.

Chair Parkins stated that the fact that this meeting tonight is public, the meeting minutes are public, so anybody could find out what they are selling by the fact of them being here. She thinks that the Commission is saying...

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that he understands what they are saying but he doesn't want to advertise a gun store in a residential house in Huntington.

Chair Parkins commented that what that is saying to them is that the neighbors are going to have an issue with it.

Mr. DeLuca asked how many neighbors they want him to notify. He asked if they wanted him to notify 10 houses down each side of the street.

Mr. Schultz responded just the neighbors that immediately about their home.

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that all of them have already signed off on it.

Chair Parkins clarified that the Commission does not know that they have explained to them that it was a gun store. There is nothing in that letter that says that they know what you are going to be selling.

Comm. Matto agreed that it was not well documented.

Mr. Schultz indicated that in all fairness, the Commission required that from the last two applicants so there is a precedent.

Mr. M. DeLuca asked if they had to specifically state that it is for gun sales.

Comm. Harger responded yes.

Chair Parkins commented that they can't require it for them and not you. She added that she understands their concerns but on the other hand they have to understand theirs as well. If they say they have talked to these folks and they have no issue with it then she doesn't understand why it couldn't be put in writing.

Mr. M. DeLuca stated that he doesn't want people to know, other than the people that they do business with, that there are guns there. There is no public traffic or retail sales of guns from this

house so whether there are guns in this house does not affect the neighbors. If you take the guns out of it, all they are is shipping and receiving.

Comm. Matto stated that you are contradicting yourself because you are saying that the neighbors know and don't mind and yet you don't want to document it so that is a problem.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that he doesn't understand why that is a problem.

Chair Parkins stated it was because they don't know; unless the neighbors are here in front of the Commission, saying that they don't have any issue with the gun sales.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that they signed the letter.

Chair Parkins indicated that there is nothing in that letter that says what they are selling – you could be selling e-cigarettes for all they know because it just says e-commerce. The Commission has no idea if the neighbors know what you are selling.

Mr. DeLuca responded OK, they will get all three of them to sign it again where it says guns.

Chair Parkins stated that if they want to have them just come here and say it because you don't want it in writing. It puts them in a very...(inaudible)

Mr. M. DeLuca responded no, they'll put it in writing. He stated that he just disagrees with notifying everyone that there is a gun store in a residential neighborhood.

Comm. Matto stated that they told the Commission that they did notify them and they don't mind.

Mr. DeLuca stated that they had been in their store before and that is exactly what they explained...

Comm. Matto commented that you are saying that you don't want them to know what it is but you are also saying that they do know what it is and they don't mind. You can't have it both ways.

Mr. M. DeLuca indicated that what he is saying is that these people have been customers of their retail store. When they decided to make this an e-commerce store, they were asked to go to the three neighbors. They told the three neighbors that they were moving their gun store into the house. He called it an e-commerce but he doesn't see where that makes much of a difference.

Comm. Harger stated that if they know it is going to be an e-commerce business then the neighbors need to know that there are guns on site. If you said it verbally to them and they didn't mind then they should mind it when it is in writing.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded OK.

Comm. Tickey clarified that this is a public meeting and the minutes of this are posted on the website so the fact of coming through this process and applying for any business is already made public. It will be available on the website and minutes anyway.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that he wasn't arguing about that. He just doesn't want it to propagate a large group of people that there is a gun store in the house. He understands that it is in the minutes of this meeting.

Comm. Harger asked what happens if the property changes hands with the neighbors – somebody moves out and somebody else moves in- she asked if they were not going to tell them because they weren't there from the beginning. They have to be notified that this is what exists in their neighborhood.

Comm. Matto added that the neighbors might be required to notify others when they sell.

Mr. M. DeLuca commented that he didn't agree with that.

Chair Parkins stated that she was a little bit concerned that they are saying that the neighbors know and are aware of what they are doing there but won't put it in writing.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that he didn't say he wouldn't put it in writing. He drafted the letter and everything he has been taught and in every conversation with the ATF is that you minimize the amount of knowledge going out about it being a gun store. So instead of putting it into a letter that could end up who knows where, they went and had discussions with each of these neighbors. He added that they didn't just put these letters in the mailboxes. They went and talked to them about the fact that they were going to have an Internet gun store and there would be firearms in the house and they all signed off. He added that was how they protected it for themselves.

Comm. Tickey stated that it would not hurt to add that language so that the Commission feels more comfortable.

Chair Parkins stated that she is having a hard time trying to figure out what this is such an issue.

Mr. DeLuca responded that he doesn't have the business in his house right now so should he notify all the people living around him about the guns that he does have there – his personal guns.

Chair Parkins responded no because you aren't going to have UPS and FedEx coming in delivering guns

Mr. M. DeLuca asked if anybody else had UPS delivering (inaudible)...

Mr. DeLuca stated that they are all aware of it and they've all been in their store before. He doesn't see the issue with it. He asked if he had to notify everyone in the surrounding block that they have this store. He did the adjacent properties.

Chair Parkins responded that is fine – just add the little caveat as to what kind of e-commerce you are selling. She reiterated that was all that they were asking for. You have already stated it on the record and these letters will be a part of the record visible for anyone to see.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded OK but with all due respect, the minutes of this meeting are read by maybe 20% of the people in Shelton. He doesn't want it to become common knowledge. Their business has nothing to do with the public – it has to do with dealings between Federal Firearm Licensed Dealers and that is all. By advertising the fact that they are interpreting it as a traditional gun store...

Chair Parkins stated that they were not.

Mr. M. DeLuca commented that they are opening the residence to more scrutiny of those who might take advantage of that.

Chair Parkins stated that they will have to agree to disagree with this matter. The Commission sees it one way and they are seeing it another way. The Commission will not vote favorably unless they get the letters that acknowledgement that the abutters are aware of what this is.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded OK, he will rewrite the letter and specifically say that it is an e-commerce firearms business and there will be no public sales.

Comm. Matto asked if they could store these guns out of their home somewhere else.

Mr. M. DeLuca responded that the FFL requires the guns to be where the transactions take place so he can't rent a locker at a public storage and put them there and then run the business out of his home. The FFL requires that the premise location be the same place as the place where the guns are sold from so if the ATF decided to come in and inspect then everything would be there.

Chair Parkins indicated that they would table this until they receive the letters.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to table Separate #0581.

Chair Parkins stated that they would be going back to Separate #0578 that they tabled.

SEPARATE #0578: NATIONAL SIGN, 90 HUNTINGTON STREET, SIGN

Darcy Roy, National Sign Company representing Quest Diagnostics, 90 Huntington Street, Shelton addressed the Commission. Ms. Roy apologized for arriving late and indicated that Quest Diagnostics would like to replace the existing Clinical Laboratories Partners sign. The sign will be the same size, non-illuminated and they do take up that entire space with frontage of about 33 feet, 6 inches there.

Chair Parkins responded OK, they weren't sure if there was the massage therapist there.

Ms. Roy stated that she just verified it with (inaudible) and they (inaudible) that they do take up the entire area.

Chair Parkins asked if it was all four windows.

Ms. Roy responded yes that is what she said and she gave her a frontage of 33' 6".

Comm. Harger asked if that was the Quest Diagnostics corporate identity way of using all upper case, initial caps because everything else is all upper case.

Ms. Roy responded yes.

Mr. Schultz indicated that the Commission's consensus was that the wall sign was fine and the door sign was fine but not on the main window. He asked if that was something the client would find acceptable.

Ms. Roy responded that she was sure that they would. Someone went out and said that there are other window signs.

Chair Parkins stated yes there are.

Mr. Schultz added that it was an ongoing enforcement issue.

Ms. Roy responded OK and she will pass that along.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve Separate #0578 for wall sign and door sign.

APPLICATION #15-25: VIADE DEVELOPMENT, LLC FOR FINAL SUBDIVISION APPROVAL (9 LOTS), 185 EAST VILLAGE ROAD (MAP 163, LOT 15), R-1 DISTRICT

Mr. Schultz stated that they have a letter authorizing the 65 day extension on the review. Staff received the revised plans for a permanent cul-de-sac which was the consensus of all parties. Staff has referred to the Police Dept., Fire Chief and the City Engineer. The City Engineer is concentrating on drainage related concerns. All the lots that immediately abut it had existing issues. The Fire Chief is going to be looking at the sight line issues and response as well as the Police Department. It is a work in progress with the revised plans with emphasis on drainage. The Commission needs to accept the 65 days extension tonight.

Comm. Harger asked if the entrance would still be from East Village Road.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Comm. Harger stated that she was not a part of that consensus to have a permanent cul-de-sac entrance...

Chair Parkins indicated that they weren't forming a consensus yet because they haven't gotten the reports back.

Comm. Matto commented that Rick just said something about it being a consensus.

Mr. Schultz clarified that it was a consensus of the Staff direction but the Commission makes the final decision. They submitted revised plans with a permanent cul-de-sac but it is the Commission's call if it is a thru road or not.

Comm. Harger asked how different the revised plans were from what they were given.

Mr. Schultz responded more detailed and he'll be going over that with them.

Chair Parkins added that they didn't get reports yet from the City Engineer, Police, etc.

Mr. Schultz responded correct, they are a work in progress so they should get (inaudible)...they want all of the emergency responders.

Chair Parkins asked for a motion to accept the extension.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to accept the 65-day extension letter for Application #15-25.

APPLICATION #16-1: TOLL CT, LP FOR MINOR MODIFICATION OF DETAILED DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PDD #75 (BUILDING ORIENTATION CHANGE FOR UNITS 4, 5, 6: SHELTON COVE), 550 RIVER ROAD (MAP 53, LOT 55).

Mr. Schultz stated that the Commission received an email of the narrative on the request of the Applicant and indicated that he had the original plans here. The Applicant is in attendance and this is for the reorientation of those three units.

On the plans, Mr. Schultz showed the location of the three units - #4, #5 and #6 that are orientated to face the dead end driveway.

Chair Parkins asked if they received any correspondence from Inland Wetlands.

Mr. Schultz responded no the Applicant met with Staff and Mr. Cooke indicated that he felt satisfied with the reorientation but did not take it to his Commission.

Comm. Harger asked if there was any consideration besides the reorientation about eliminating one of the three units.

Mr. Schultz responded that was conveyed to the Applicant and the Applicant requests to preserve all three units.

Comm. Harger stated that she brought that up because she was at the site and felt that there were space constraints.

Jeff Minke, representing Toll Brothers CT, addressed the Commission. Mr. Minke stated that he believes that they are still 20 feet apart and that is what the original approval was based on.

Comm. Harger commented about the two on the other side of that entrance – these are all two units.

Chair Parkins asked if there was not a wall there.

Mr. Minke responded that there will be a wall to the rear – a retaining wall between the building and the highway side of the road.

Chair Parkins asked if there was fencing or anything like that alongside Unit #3.

Mr. Minke responded no there is no significant change in grade there. There would have been but there will not be as currently...

Chair Parkins commented that according to these plans it says “safety fence to be installed as per Building Code requirements” and that is right alongside Building #3.

Mr. Minke responded that if they construct Units #4, #5 and #6 per the original plan, the orientation would be such that there would be an extreme drop in grade and there would be a retaining wall and a fence. If they are able to change the orientation, that retaining wall and fence will not be required because the grade will not change significantly.

Chair Parkins stated that she recalled there being something mentioned from the Inland Wetlands about keeping a row of vegetation, in keeping adequate space along the Ivy Brook corridor.

Comm. Matto stated about 50 feet or so.

Mr. Minke responded that he did not recall any required plantings on that side of Ivy Brook between #4, #5, #6 and the Brook. They have done almost all of the required plantings.

Chair Parkins asked if there was a Landscape Plan here. She reviewed the Landscape Plan and commented that it looks like pretty substantial plantings indicated on this plan between Unit #6 and Ivy Brook.

Mr. Minke commented that the area was below the retaining wall and you can still do plantings between the units and (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins asked if you could still do plantings between the wall there.

Mr. Minke responded yes because the wall – that wall – has not changed. It is still in the same place so the side of Unit #6 is probably as close to the wall as the rear of the units will be if they change them.

Chair Parkins stated that this unit was originally wide and short.

Mr. Minke responded yes this unit, #4 originally was wider and shorter. The reorientation would make it another unit like #6, longer and narrower. There is approximately 40 square feet difference in the coverage of the two different size units.

Comm. Harger asked if that was a reduction.

Mr. Minke responded that he believes it is a 40 square foot increase.

Comm. Tickey asked if there was anything from Inland Wetlands.

Chair Parkins agreed that she wanted something from Inland Wetlands because she knows that there was controversy about those units and that is why they are oriented that way. It wasn't just by happenstance that they were put this way. This project was reviewed intensely.

Mr. Schultz stated that Inland Wetlands meets this Thursday.

Chair Parkins stated that she didn't want to sign off on something and overlook something that they required because this was quite some time ago.

Mr. Minke stated that Mr. Cooke did address...they went to Mr. Cooke at the office...

Mr. Schultz commented that the role as Staff is so far as the Commission wants to take it (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins asked Mr. Panico if he could recall anything about this.

Mr. Panico responded that he did not recall. He remembers the area but didn't recall the particulars of what the wetlands impacts might be. He commented that John Cooke was satisfied with the Wetland impacts but asked if she was concerned about the greenbelt along the stream.

Chair Parkins stated that she just knows that there is a reason that these buildings were positioned the way that they were. She did not think it was by chance.

Mr. Schultz stated that some of the Commissioners want it to go before the full Wetlands Commission.

Chair Parkins stated that she wants to make sure that the Wetlands Commission, who oversaw this project and had a lot of issues with it as well as the Conservation Commission, and she wants to make sure that they don't go approve something and have it come back to them.

Mr. Panico agreed and added that requesting the letter from them that there is no significant change in Wetland impacts that leaves the final plan decision up to them then.

Chair Parkins responded right.

Comm. Tickey agreed that they should do that.

Chair Parkins asked if they could put it on their agenda for Thursday.

Mr. Schultz responded yes, absolutely.

Mr. Minke asked if he needed to do anything for that meeting.

Mr. Schultz responded that he can contact John Cooke tomorrow; it is the regular meeting and he can make his presentation.

Chair Parkins asked Mr. Minke to let Wetlands know the P&Z Commission is not comfortable without a sign off from the Inland Wetlands Commission.

Mr. Minke responded OK, he understands. He'll bring that same layout and narrative.

Comm. Osak asked if it had to come back to P&Z, if Inland Wetlands approves it.

Mr. Schultz responded yes.

Chair Parkins indicated that they really reviewed and had a lot of scrutiny on this project so she wants to make sure that there isn't something in their files that says that this shouldn't be done.

Comm. Osak commented that he just thought they might be able to close it out rather than continuing it here.

Chair Parkins responded that it was a Site Plan Modification. She asked the Applicant to get a letter from the Inland Wetland Commission. Mr. Minke responded yes.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to table Application #15-25 pending further information from the Inland Wetlands Commission.

Chair Parkins repositioned Agenda items to address issues with audience members.

NEW BUSINESS

APPLICATION #16-2: PETITION OF JOHN WATTS FOR MODIFICATION OF PDD #60 INCLUDING BASIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS (CONCEPTUAL), DETAILED DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND STATEMENT OF USES AND STANDARDS (SITE D: 23 MULTI-FAMILY UNIT DEVELOPMENT), 235 CANAL STREET (MAP 129C, LOT 17): ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING.

Mr. Schultz suggested the fourth Wednesday in February, 2/24 or fourth Wednesday in March, 3/23.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Elaine Matto, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #16-2 and schedule a public hearing for Wednesday, February 24, 2016.

APPLICATION #16-3: 714, LLC FOR MINOR MODIFICATION OF PDD #70 (BIG Y GAS STATION ATTENDANT BLDG), 405 BRIDGEPORT AVENUE (MAP 77, LOTS 26, 27, 28, 29 AND 30): ACCEPT, DISCUSSION, AND POSSIBLE ACTION

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #16-3 for review and discussion.

Atty. Steven Bellis, representing 714 LLC, Shelton addressed the Commission. Atty. Bellis provided hand-outs for the Commission.

Chair Parkins commented that the hand-out was a little bit confusing and asked if there were three little kiosks here and the original location of it.

Atty. Bellis showed the plans for the Crabtree property for 714, LLC and added that they are about to enter into their lease with the biggest tenant which is Big Y. The lease will be signed tomorrow, 2/10/16. While reading through the very thick lease, he noticed that there was an “attendant” in an “attendant building;” their plans were approved will a little kiosk. He told the attorneys that he would need to go back to the P&Z Commission and run this by them.

Atty. Bellis commented that he asked them why they needed this and they explained that they have this program where you can save on gasoline, similar to Stop & Shop, but they use the coins. The program has gold coins and silver coins to get 20¢ or 10¢cents off your gasoline. He added that he has never shopped there and doesn’t know much about the program.

Chair Parkins commented that they should really go to a card scanning system because those coins are (inaudible)...

Atty. Bellis responded that they are trying to make that conversion and some places allow you actually put the coins in the gas ...(inaudible) like a slot machine...So, they have an attendant who takes the coins right now because they can’t use those kinds of things in Connecticut.

Chair Parkins commented that she thought there was always going to be an attendant here.

Atty. Bellis stated that the attendant will take the coins, give the gas credit and then what they will have, according to the lease, they will have certain items in the attendant building like water, cigarettes or gum or whatever. They don’t want customers to go from the gas station for a bottle of water with their coin to wait in line at the Big Y. He pointed out the attendant building, a small building for the soda, water, etc. It is not selling coffee, beer or anything like that just small things that go along with the car (inaudible)...

Chair Parkins commented about associated accessories to automotive uses such as oil, windshield fluid...

Atty. Bellis responded yes, they already did that and he is not asking to change that.

Chair Parkins stated yes, that is fine and that is it.

Atty. Bellis responded that then they have a big problem.

Mr. Panico asked if it was going to be juice, snacks and candy.

Atty. Bellis responded yes, that's it – things that you would normally get like grabbing a can of soda and they use these coins to get them.

Mr. Panico stated that the problem is how you define "snack."

Atty. Bellis responded that he can work with Rick on that.

Mr. Panico commented that they might be able to buy donuts and if there are donuts, there may be canisters of coffee.

Atty. Bellis responded no, none of that Tony and he doesn't mind prohibiting that.

Mr. Panico stated that they have to just put it down.

Mr. Schultz asked if it was a controlled entrance like in Stop & Shop or can they go inside.

Atty. Bellis responded that he does not think that you can even go in – you give the attendant the coin and get the soda. He knows...it is weird...but they have them. They are laughing but it is problematic with the lease.

Chair Parkins commented that she was not laughing.

Comm. Tickey stated that it is problematic because they heard very loud and clear from the residents about what they did and didn't want in that area with the gas station.

Atty. Bellis responded that they approved the gas station. He asked if Stop & Shop didn't do something similar.

Mr. Schultz responded yes they have a kiosk there.

Chair Parkins added they don't sell cigarettes. Mr. Schultz added that you can't go inside.

Mr. Panico stated that kiosks are normally, 60 to 80 square feet not 800 square feet.

Atty. Bellis responded yes this is bigger.

Chair Parkins indicated that this is not supposed to be a convenience store. It is supposed to be a gas station accessory to the grocery store.

Atty. Bellis indicated that it was not a convenience store.

Chair Parkins responded that it is getting there with (inaudible) products and drinks. She asked what you go into a convenience store for.

Comm. Pogoda commented that they need to put some limits on this now.

Atty. Bellis responded that if it wasn't a big deal he wouldn't have come before them. They do this whole thing with cap rates and it gets complicated with how much income gets brought into the lease and they have these in their leases that they have these little buildings in their leases.

Chair Parkins commented that they can have the little building and sell windshield wipers, fluid and oil and things that people find at a gas station. If you want cigarettes then you park your car and go over to the store.

Atty. Bellis commented that he understands about the cigarettes but asked about the water and the things where you would normally get one item – so you don't have to go into the store for like a bottle of water or candy.

Comm. Matto commented that they are trying to sell more stuff there...

Atty. Bellis responded that it is more for convenience if someone is there getting gas and wants a bottle of water, they don't have to go across the shopping center for it and if they have the coin that they can redeem.

Comm. Matto commented that there is no end to the things that people could want.

Chair Parkins added exactly, they can go to Starbucks and (inaudible)...

Comm. Pogoda stated that they can go to the other establishment there and get the water and help them out. He asked where it ends – they want water, they want cigarettes and before you know there are going to be other things there.

Atty. Bellis responded that he would be willing to sit down with Tony & Rick or Ruth and limit it to very specific items in the Statement of Use. He is not trying to make it into a convenience store. It will not have lottery tickets or any of that stuff – just coin related because that is the program that they have. He has a list here...

Chair Parkins commented that she was fine with soda and water but not cigarettes.

Atty. Bellis OK, no cigarettes is fine.

Comm. Tickey asked about the candy, gum and snacks.

Mr. Panico commented that (inaudible) ...they need to get a floor plan, they need some elevations so that they know what it will look like. All they know is the square on a map (inaudible)...

Atty. Bellis pointed out the location on that plan and added that it meets all of the setbacks. There are no changes to the...

Mr. Panico responded that there was no question about that. If they built this thing on other facilities and have some pictures of what they built at the other facilities, what their floor plan looks like and bring that in as well.

Atty. Bellis responded that he can do that for them.

Chair Parkins asked if people could walk into this store.

Mr. Panico asked him to make sure if you go inside the building or get served from an attendant window.

Atty. Bellis responded that he will find that out.

Chair Parkins commented that 800 square feet is pretty large.

Atty. Bellis responded that is mostly for the coolers for the water and the soda – that is what he was told. He will bring Tony the plans. He reiterated that these tenants are difficult to get.

Chair Parkins stated that they are pushing the envelope. She asked if they were going to say that they would not sign if they don't get this.

Comm. Harger commented that there are nine parking spaces allotted here.

Atty. Bellis responded that it was not for that building.

Chair Parkins asked what it was for then – she reiterated that is a convenience store. They have a little convenience store at their gas station. She commented about a site in Lee, MA before getting on the Mass. Turnpike like this one - it is a convenience store.

Atty. Bellis responded that he has never been to Lee, MA. He will come back to the next meeting...he commented that the location is a good location.

Comm. Harger stated that they would be better served to have more pumps and have a small kiosk in the middle because people do not like to walk.

Chair Parkins commented OK something in the middle if they need help with gas or something They need something in the middle but not a convenience store.

Comm. Harger agreed.

Comm. Tickey stated that with those parking spots on the side, they are going to go in with their coins and get whatever they are selling so it would be better to have it in the center.

Comm. Harger stated that if they are dispensing water and soda, she's sure that there are vending machines in the market that can accept those coins.

Atty. Bellis responded he really didn't know but thinks that they are definitely going to get away from this coin thing but right now that is where they are at.

Chair Parkins restated that they do not want a convenience store on that site.

Atty. Bellis responded that he was not proposing a convenience store.

Comm. Matto commented that 800 square feet is almost as big as her first house.

Atty. Bellis asked if she thought it was too big. He commented that he wasn't quite sure how you get the coins...

Chair Parkins asked if they had figured out how the trucks were getting in there and turning around.

Atty. Bellis responded yes they met with the Fire Marshal and that has been addressed as well as the curb cuts. He asked to be put on the agenda for next time and he'll come back with more details. It is important and it's a huge part of this lease and they are giving them a hard time about signing the lease. They say that they have it in their leases.

Comm. Pogoda asked to send them (inaudible)...

Atty. Bellis responded that he would send them the lease.

Comm. Harger asked for visuals.

Atty. Bellis responded that he's heard fair comments and he will get visuals, elevations and find out whether it is a walk-in and why they need that much room.

Chair Parkins mentioned the large gas station/convenience store in Lee, MA and added that they don't want to see anything like that. There is no sense in having a grocery store there if there is a big convenience store on the side of it.

Comm. Harger added that it had nine parking spaces.

Atty. Bellis responded that Lee, MA may be a big one, he doesn't know. They aren't try to put all those items in it but just want to entice people with the coin program.

Comm. Harger asked if this was a new generation of stores or a new concept store.

Atty. Bellis responded no.

Comm. Pogoda stated that they should move into 21st century and use something besides the coins.

Atty. Bellis responded well, he's not running the Big Y.

Chair Parkins added that they do have a Big Y Card even though they use coins for the reward program. She commented that the neighbors weren't happy with the gas station facility going in to begin with. They were concerned about noise, extra activity, lights and now they have a situation where people are not only fueling up but running in to buy stuff with coins in a store.

Atty. Bellis stated that he thinks eventually they will have more technology but at this point this is what they have.

Comm. Harger commented that Atty. Bellis should remind them what the Big Y Card is – it is a savings club and they should be able to use that.

Atty. Bellis asked to come back with more info in a couple of weeks.

Chair Parkins responded OK, the next meeting is Feb. 24th.

Atty. Bellis recalled another issue and added that some of the tenants are excited to come to Shelton and they want to put a "Coming Soon..." banner on the fence while they are doing the construction.

Chair Parkins commented that they already know that there's a Center coming.

Comm. Pogoda asked who wants to do that.

Atty. Bellis responded the Urgent Care, Big Y...just temporary signs.

Comm. Pogoda asked if they are going to put banners on every single thing that wants to come into Shelton.

Atty. Bellis responded no, just temporarily while they are building so that people know what will be coming.

Comm. Harger stated that she didn't mind that because a lot of times she will drive by a project and wonder what is going in there.

Atty. Bellis clarified it would not be a permanent sign but a well-done temporary sign.

Chair Parkins (inaudible)...it was huge, humongous.

Comm. Pogoda added yes it has been there.

Atty. Bellis commented that maybe it was taken down. Maybe they could they could give him an idea of the size it should be. He added that they know what he means – "Coming Soon, Big Y..."

Chair Parkins commented that Rick can issue temporary signs.

Mr. Schultz responded yes but he wanted the Commission to know what was going on.

Chair Parkins asked who else was coming.

Atty. Bellis responded Urgent Care (walk-in medical), the Liquor Store, Great Clips (Haircut Plus)...

Chair Parkins stated that the sign shouldn't take up $\frac{3}{4}$ of the fence.

Comm. Harger asked if it would be something vinyl with grommets.

Atty. Bellis responded yes.

Comm. Pogoda indicated that there should be no moving lights on it.

Atty. Bellis asked if the sign was OK then.

Comm. Harger asked if he would be submitting a drawing.

Atty. Bellis responded no.

Mr. Schultz indicated that Staff can issue that internally. He stated that no other motion was necessary, Application 16-3 was already accepted for review.

PUBLIC PORTION

Chair Parkins asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any item not on tonight's agenda. With no response, she asked for a motion to close the public portion.

On a motion made Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to close the public portion of the meeting.

APPLICATION #16-4: RESUBDIVISION APPLICATION (LOT 5: PEARMAIN ESTATES), 43 PERMAIN ROAD (MAP 143, LOT 4), R-1A DISTRICT: ACCEPT AND SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously voted to accept Application #16-4 and schedule a public hearing for February 24th.

Chair Parkins indicated that they will do the Informal discussion with Atty. Thomas next followed by the P&Z Zone Change.

OTHER BUSINESS

INFORMAL DISCUSSION: PROPOSED PRD/PDD DEVELOPMENT FOR THE REMAINING PORTION OF SOUNDVIEW CROSSING PARCEL B: DOMINICK THOMAS

Atty. Dominick Thomas, Cohen & Thomas, 315 Main Street, Derby, CT addressed the Commission. Atty. Thomas stated that he was representing Mark Darby of Darby Builders who owns property located at Soundview Avenue. It was a previously approved subdivision for this property. Mr. Darby has now obtained a sewer easement through the property of Summerfield Condos which will allow this property to have both sewer and water. He has looked at the PRD Regulations and the PDD Regulations. He is attempting to meet the market here. He provided a site plan of the area.

Atty. Thomas commented that he didn't know how much the Commission has recognized it that one of the things that hasn't been going before Commissions lately are any sizeable one acre subdivisions because there really hasn't been that much of a demand for one acre subdivision. So in order to meet the market, Mr. Darby has looked at the property now that it has sewers coming into it and the first proposal is to utilize the PRD.

With respect to this site, it allows him to apply for a PRD under the grounds that it is adjacent – even though it doesn't meet the 20 acre parcel – that it is adjacent to a large acre of open space of the City of Shelton that stretches out...He added that he wasn't sure if it was the Wycek or the other open space on the other side of Constitution Boulevard.

The proposal for this is 3-unit attached buildings that meet the increased standard allowed in the PRD with sewer and water. These are very uniquely designed units that actually appear to look like they are a single family home. The PRD ones look like they are single family homes that are

actually three family homes that he believes are marked 2000 square feet roughly. They have a garage and a very unique look and would fit the market very well. It abuts Summerfield to the rear which is a high density condominium project. He showed the Summerfield Condo and Soundview Avenue areas on the site plan.

Comm. Osak asked for clarification as to the Soundview Avenue area.

Comm. Harger responded that it was Mildred Davies' property.

Comm. Osak commented OK.

Atty. Thomas indicated that they were trying to get a feel from the Commission – and this is a relatively unique proposal - utilizing their PRD Regulations to try something which is different. He uses the term, which is often misinterpreted, alternative types of housing rather than using a term like affordable.

One of the things that Mr. Darby explained to him was that on a house he built at 2800 or 3000 square foot colonial, a couple with two children who lived in a nice apartment in Stamford decided that they wanted to move up to Shelton. If they recall, 2800 to 3000 square feet is not considered very big because the McMansions were about 3800 square feet to 4000 but when the people came to see the house they asked what they would do with all of that room. He commented that was the best example that he could provide of the market right now.

Atty. Thomas stated that the market was not in homes that were big and a lot of people are not interested in big lots. This is an attached unit type of density, meets the requirements of the PRD and with the unique design that has basically the look of a single family but it is three units that are together in the neighborhood of 2000 or 2200 square feet.

Another option, because it can be considered a transitional zone in that it is next to a very high density condominium project, is to go with the PDD which would allow lots that allow from 10,000 square feet for the smallest up to almost 20,000 square feet with single family homes. The term they used is adult-oriented in that there would be restrictions within the PDD of no swing sets, pools or anything of that nature. He asked Mr. Darby the square footage of the homes there...

Mr. Darby responded about 2500 square feet, single-family homes.

Atty. Thomas stated that attached to the smaller versions that they are giving them, there is the design that he is proposing with respect to those properties. He stated that the purpose of coming before the Commission informally is to get some feedback from the Commission and the Staff as to whether or not it would be receptive to some alternative form of housing within this area that abuts...

Comm. Osak asked what the existing zone was.

Atty. Thomas responded R-1.

Comm. Osak asked how big the project area was.

Mr. Darby responded that it was 10 acres.

Atty. Thomas commented that in the PRD Regulation allows you to go into a PRD where it abuts a substantial amount of Open Space and the original approval which did not have a road, did not have sewers had lots backing up onto Constitution Boulevard with the requirement that if Constitution Boulevard were ever built, the lot driveways would have to go out. For instance, the PRD Proposal now extends the Open Space and increases the amount of Open Space, extends it all the way down along the Constitution Boulevard line which is not just Open Space. There is a gas line that runs through it but it extends it and adds a much larger buffer to the Open Space which then goes to a large piece of Open Space that he thinks runs behind the High School.

Comm. Osak asked if the perimeter of this property touched Constitution Boulevard.

Atty. Thomas showed the location of the future Constitution Boulevard is located.

Comm. Osak stated that it touches Constitution Boulevard.

Atty. Thomas responded that Constitution Boulevard isn't built here.

Comm. Osak responded that he knows it is not built.

Atty. Thomas stated it touches it and he showed the location of the end of Constitution Boulevard below the edge of the Site Map, just past the edge of Summerfield.

Comm. Osak asked about the right-of-way for Constitution Boulevard and who owns the title to it now.

Chair Parkins responded the City.

Comm. Harger asked the size of the lots in the second proposal.

Mr. Darby responded between 10,000 and 20,000 square feet.

Comm. Harger asked if that was a third of it (inaudible)...

Mr. Darby responded $\frac{1}{4}$ of an acre to $\frac{1}{2}$ acre.

Atty. Thomas stated that there are a couple of lots just north of 20,000 square feet.

Mr. Schultz stated for the benefit of the new Commissioners, the first PRD was Aspetuck and the last PRD they used was Cranberry Estates on Armstrong Road.

Atty. Thomas commented that one of the issues, and he believes he brought it up at a Staff session unsuccessfully, is that when you are looking at single-family and with the a PRD, your multiplier at the lower end does not create much of an incentive for a private developer to do it. In other words, it is 1.2 and in some circumstances you are only getting one extra house whereas ...he reiterated that market, and the PRD does address the issue by shrinking the lot sizes, and people are not looking for the big lots. There are specific buyers that want the big lots and a big house but they are few and far between.

In other towns right now where he has some clients doing some building and they have lots that were approved in the one acre size, they are difficult lots. They are getting people to buy 2200 square foot colonials basically tucked on the front end of the lot. In these towns did nothing to put Conservation Easements on them or anything like that but with the back of the lots people don't really care and don't want them cleared; they just want a smaller area of yard.

Comm. Harger commented that Comm. Osak had asked what the overall size was. But 10 acres isn't buildable because they have the wetlands over there. She asked what the actual buildable area would be. It looks like about a third.

Atty. Thomas responded that was an engineering question but he'll guess.

Mr. Schultz stated that Conservation is 42,600 so just under a full acre.

Atty. Thomas responded that on that proposal that was the Conservation Easement area but the Open Space area on the attached units is 123,000 square feet so it is roughly 4 acres .

Comm. Osak clarified that no, it was just under three acres.

Comm. Harger commented that on the second proposal it says 117,000.

Chair Parkins asked what his rationale was for saying that this is adult-oriented because four bedrooms are not adult-oriented; it is family-oriented.

Atty. Thomas responded that in a PRD they could limit it and they have limited those types of proposals.

Chair Parkins stated that was in the PDD.

Atty. Thomas clarified yes, in a PDD that have limited those and he explained that to Mr. Darby and required that the Association have those restrictions on it so whether he chooses three bedrooms with a large office or whatever there will be some restrictions. When he says adult-oriented it is going to have that appeal to it. The bottom line is if they put a restriction on it, a PDD is a zone change, so they would have to live with it. One of the things that are being discussed a lot is that many people stand before them and there is always the issue of kids and the enrollment is going down. No one is talking about the enrollment going up. The numbers that people throw around regarding “X” number of students – he thinks he heard Partnerships for Strong Communities - he thinks that number contains infrastructure numbers in there too.

Comm. Osak asked if he was talking about the cost per pupil number.

Atty. Thomas responded yes.

Comm. Osak asked if he meant bricks and mortar.

Atty. Thomas responded bricks and mortar – it’s factored into it but the bottom line is the capacity in the town but enrollments are going down, Shelton included. The school capacity is there and he supposes that you could say that if you keep kids from coming into town...

Comm. Osak commented that the population is ageing but new people coming into town bringing kids so one won’t balance the other.

Atty. Thomas stated that the enrollment is going down everywhere. The enrollment is going down across the board and a lot of towns are faced with this situation and many are starting to close schools and consolidate more. It is happening...neighborhoods rotate; neighborhoods will become older and other neighborhoods will become younger and kids flow in. With the kids flowing in, the enrollment is still going down. The rollover is different. You can argue sociologically whether it is the Millennials having kids later or whether they are going to have as many kids.

Comm. Osak stated that the national fertility rate which is the amount of births per 1000 females aged 44 to 45 is going up since 2012 so now it is up to 63 per 1000 females. That is growing.

Chair Parkins asked if he said that 63 out of every thousand women are having a child between the ages of 40 and 45.

Comm. Osak responded that the fertility rate is the number of births per thousand females between the ages of 15 and 44.

Comm. Matto stated OK because you said between 44 and 45 before.

Comm. Osak apologized for the error.

Comm. Matto stated that it is the end of the Baby Boom. There were two peaks – her generation and ...

Chair Parkins added that people are realizing that they can’t afford to have more than two kids. She realized it when she had two kids and stopped.

Comm. Harger asked for clarification as to the location of Mildred Davies’ old house, the new house that was built...

Comm. Osak stated that it is appearing that units with more than one bedroom attract more children and there are statistics on that.

Atty. Thomas agreed that there was no question about that.

Comm. Osak added that he was depending upon him to get that.

Atty. Thomas stated that one of the interesting concepts that are going on right now is that a lot of the Millennials are living with kids in apartments. It is an unusual concept because usually it is 0 -5 but some of them, when you have three-bedroom apartments, they are actually bringing their kids up in apartments. He added that it wasn't so strange; he grew up in a 900 square foot apartment with a sister and the whole family, aunt and uncle downstairs, etc. Everyone has a different approach and a lot of it has to do with how you grew up.

Mr. Darby commented that when he did East Village Road and did 13 homes over there, there were only six kids in 13 houses that they sold.

Comm. Harger asked about the first proposal and if they were all two bedrooms.

Mr. Darby responded yes.

Comm. Harger asked why you would have a Jack-and-Jill bath attached where one entrance comes from the bedroom and the other goes into a studio.

Chair Parkins added that the studio has a window and a closet.

Mr. Darby responded that the studio would be a home office. They are going to be building permitted as a two-bedroom condominium.

Comm. Harger commented that this very easily overlooked by a homeowner who wants to put a bed in there.

Chair Parkins agreed it was easily convertible into a bedroom.

Mr. Darby asked if they wanted him to eliminate the closet to stop someone from doing that. It was the more for the aesthetics in the front of the building to have a dormer coming out on top of the garage.

Atty. Thomas stated that was also the building in the middle.

Mr. Darby added that it was giving a little bonus, a little more square footage extra because the middle unit is always a little more difficult to sell.

Atty. Thomas agreed that it was giving it somewhat of a bump over losing one side of windows. It is an issue of alternative means of housing. There are a lot of things that his client needs to address but they wanted some feedback from the Commission. Their PRD concept – doing a straight math on single family just doesn't seem very economical like what he is doing here with bringing in the sewer. It is a benefit rather than having septic systems (inaudible)...there is a cost associated with putting a sewer not only for the easement but to run the sewer line. The complexity that they are dealing with on WPCA is that there would be a private sewer so these proposals would be private roads. WPCA was scratching their heads...

Comm. Harger asked if they were all two-stories on the second proposal.

Mr. Darby responded yes.

Comm. Matto asked about the second version and if the land, such as lawns, surrounding the buildings would be maintained by ...the owners.

Atty. Thomas responded that individual lot owners would maintain it.

Mr. Darby commented that they would be fee simple lots but the road will be an Association because it will be a private road.

Chair Parkins asked if it would be private road pick-up for trash, recycling, etc.

Mr. Darby responded most likely public pick-up for trash, recycling and mail delivery.

Chair Parkins asked if the City picked up on private property.

Mr. Schultz responded that they usually pick it up at the intersection like Monty Blakeman's...

Chair Parkins asked if these people would have to bring their recycle and garbage all the way down to the edge of that road.

Atty. Thomas asked if they pick up inside at Heritage Point.

Mr. Darby responded that he thinks that they pick-up inside of Summerfield.

Comm. Harger commented that they could just ask Tony Pogoda.

Atty. Thomas asked Comm. Pogoda who picks up the garbage and recycling at Heritage Point.

Comm. Pogoda responded the City.

Comm. Harger asked if he puts his containers at the end of his driveway.

Comm. Pogoda responded yes.

Mr. Schultz stated OK, it changed then; now it's 100%.

Chair Parkins commented that she thinks the Applicant is just looking for some feedback as to what the Commission thinks is palatable.

Comm. Harger stated that she would be concerned about the density of it.

Comm. Matto agreed that it looked like a lot of density in the area.

Comm. Harger stated that she thinks that it is a unique approach when you look at the elevations for the first version. It looks as if you have elegant Tudor homes and (inaudible)...

Mr. Darby responded that is exactly what it is supposed to be. They are transforming an R-1 zone into a multi-family but if they keep the R-1 look of the McMansion with the styling of each building...

Comm. Harger asked where he was going to put extra parking.

Mr. Darby responded that there was adequate space on either the ends of the driveways or extended out into the grading in the front so they would be able to come in and have back to back styled parking.

Comm. Harger stated that it is quite a change from what is there now. She goes up and down Soundview Avenue a couple of times a week and it is all single-family homes so it is a different look all together.

Mr. Darby stated that in the interior – in the back there would only be this private road about 20 - 25 feet wide.

Comm. Harger stated that the elevation just slopes down.

Mr. Darby responded yes it slopes down and then flattens out.

Atty. Thomas commented that on one side you have a high-density condominium and the other side there is single-family.

Mr. Darby stated that as far as a PRD, Old Dairy was a PRD.

Atty. Thomas indicated that was relatively close to it. With respect to density, there was density versus R-1 or density versus – this is dense but it might be acceptable if it were the same thing but less dense. He asked if that made sense.

Chair Parkins responded yes if he's trying to confuse them.

Comm. Harger clarified that if it wasn't as populated.

Atty. Thomas stated that there were two things. One answer would be no, they would really like this to stay R-1 or second answer would be these concepts are good but make it a little less dense. They have raised the issue of density...

Chair Parkins responded that she would be more apt to consider this if two of these buildings were gone – for the PRD – (inaudible) take two of those buildings out and spread it out a little bit more because she thinks it is way too dense. She added that she definitely thinks he'll need additional parking in there and they aren't going to have it.

Mr. Darby asked if they moved one of the buildings and made a green-space, park type of area.

Comm. Harger responded that she knows that you need to get bang-for-your-buck (inaudible) but she thinks that Chair Parkins' comments are well-based.

Atty. Thomas indicated that he had forgotten to e-mail these plans to Comm. Pogoda.

Chair Parkins stated that she would like to see this taken out and the others moved for more space and then take this other one out.

Comm. Harger agreed commented that she is looking at it as someone who would be looking to move and with this she wouldn't even want to get out of the car because it is too crowded.

Chair Parkins agreed and added that especially because of the massive size of them – they look like single family houses but they will look massive because they're three units and to have so many of those so close together.

Comm. Matto commented that was how they build them in Florida with giant buildings but nobody wants any land to bother with but...

Atty. Thomas asked if they had any comments about the PDD version.

Comm. Harger stated that she didn't like the rear lots.

Comm. Tickey stated that he didn't mind the PDD but did not like the rear lots.

Comm. Harger commented that it was really busy-looking though. They know the market but...

Mr. Darby stated that in other PDD's that were approved there were 6000 -7000 square foot lots but he doesn't want to be there. He doesn't want to go down to postage stamp so he would rather go ¼ acre to ½ acre so it is a blend between R-1 and...something in between.

Comm. Harger stated that she thought the concept was interesting.

Comm. Matto stated that if this were R-3 these would be small.

Atty. Thomas responded that R-2 is 20,000 square feet and R-3 is 12,000 square feet – again they have such a variety of sizes, they could probably get it into the R-3 type size.

Comm. Osak stated that the first decision is to go to R-1 to something else. He indicated that the question is what the something else is. Unfortunately, he is just an alternate and it probably

won't come to him for decision because it will be a future meeting but he is encumbered by his own experience converting R-1 to multiple unit development which kind of gives him a negative twinge but he understands that he's living in a new era right now.

Comm. Osak stated that he is still driven by the economic benefit or economic penalty to the City between the taxes collected and the cost of supplying services to the people there. He added that he just didn't know that. The whole issue of children and \$13,200 it is now contains principal payments, bricks and mortar, interest payments but he thinks that is a small part of it. He has to kind of get some number in his head of what these proposals are and what they might look like in dollars and cents – such as penalty to the City, benefit to the City, benefit to the developer and penalty to the developer – he has to get that balance through his head a little bit.

Atty. Thomas agreed that they had to present more evidence on it and more than likely, and he has heard him get up before them and redefine what economic development is, it is simply a project that creates more money than it spends in services. He added that he thought it was safe to say that the attached units would be a positive cash flow.

Comm. Osak responded that he has to see that and they're going to come up with this rather hard thing to put their hand on with children per household or better yet children per bedroom or children per extra bedroom. Mom and Dad occupy one bedroom but asked who would occupy the other two bedrooms.

Atty. Thomas stated that it would really be impossible to really pinpoint that in today's market.

Comm. Osak disagreed and indicated that they have to dig a little deeper.

Chair Parkins stated that she thinks that a three-bedroom would appeal to an older adult so that they could have one guest room for a visitor and maybe one child. She stated that people have a right to have kids. She stated that she thinks four bedrooms is pushing the envelope...and encouraging (inaudible)...

Comm. Osak responded that one child in each of these 24 units would economically sink this thing with \$13,200 plus they have other services that they have to provide for - which is the total number of people – 41,000 people in this community divided into that part of the budget that is not education which is about \$40M. If you make that division you come up with about \$900 per occupant plus the children cost on top of that.

Chair Parkins stated that you cannot just look at children as an economic factor. They are an ageing population – she asked who would live in Shelton if everybody is old. If nobody has kids anymore or if they don't encourage any children to move in then they won't need any schools, there will be a whole bunch of vacant buildings, there will be nobody to take any jobs over – they have to allow some children in.

Atty. Thomas commented that the Chair just hit something on the head – there are two things of interest lately and he's been talking about Shelton at seminars because – there has been a study done that towns in Western Long Island called the Young Brain Drain which are towns with big lots, big houses, rich towns - they mentioned some of the Fairfield County towns and the young people who get educated in their great schools go to college and get good jobs. A lot of them are working in urban or other areas and they look at the town that they grew up in and can't afford to move back there nor do they want a big lot or big house.

Atty. Thomas discussed a seminar he attended by a young lawyer from the Department on Ageing and the push to “age in place,” redefining zone and getting rid of restrictive in-law apartment regulations and getting rid of zoning that made all of the two and three family homes non-conforming so people can't come in and expand them. All of these different things so that families could go back to living together in smaller spaces. All of these things are relevant but the point is that young people have to go somewhere.

Chair Parkins reiterated that they want some to stay here.

Comm. Tickey commented that he would like to not be the only one here.

Chair Parkins stated that people aren't having as many children and sometimes you wonder where these statistics are coming from. The projection for Shelton is a 19% decrease in school-age children.

Comm. Osak stated yes, he lived in this town when there were 7400 kids in the public schools – there are 4800 now. He has seen it happen over the years.

Comm. Harger stated that they opened the present high school in 1974. She was a first year teacher and there were 2200 students in that school.

Chair Parkins commented that times have changed.

Atty. Thomas agreed with Comm. Osak that step one is finding out the reception, no commitments of going off of R-1. Secondly, he would ask where they go off of R-1. They have seen the two concepts but in both situations the density appears to be an issue for the Commission; however, there does not seem to be an aversion to going off of R-1.

Comm. Osak stated that density shouldn't be as heavy a weight as it was back in the 1970's. It is not that important for a lot of the reasons that you just said.

Comm. Matto stated that she wouldn't mind the density if there were more compensatory open space. She asked what would be the reasonable number of dwellings if it were built the old-fashioned way where you put things tighter. (inaudible) when you mentioned a park (inaudible)...open space included in a project like this.

Mr. Darby asked if she would rather see single family. Again, that is a question of how many units you had on that piece of land.

Comm. Matto commented that she doesn't personally like the giant mansion look but she knows people may like that and it would be fine.

Chair Parkins stated that two things (inaudible) – she asked what he thinks the market is going to demand.

Mr. Darby responded that the market is going to absorb either one of these.

Comm. Harger asked if there was a reason why he kept all the bedrooms up on the second level because they see so many plans where the master bedroom is downstairs.

Mr. Darby responded that there was no particular reason. If it became something of interest, maybe they could incorporate an elevator into the units.

Comm. Tickey stated that he didn't know if he loved the concept on the PRD. A case would have to be made for him because he doesn't know.

Comm. Harger stated that it looks like less of an impact visually – the PRD.

Chair Parkins responded that they are huge buildings.

Comm. Harger commented yes but they are talking about eliminating some.

Comm. Matto stated that they were huge buildings and close together.

Comm. Harger commented that they have to keep in mind the elevation of that lot.

Chair Parkins asked which one Comm. Osak didn't like.

Comm. Osak responded that he didn't like the PDD.

Chair Parkins commented that it was too many.

Comm. Osak indicated that he was imposing his living standards on that.

Comm. Harger asked if these were walk-out basements.

Mr. Darby responded maybe...the units on the Summerfield side.

Chair Parkins commented that they could take something like this, take three units away and do some sort of walking path or dog park. People love dog parks but she is finding that a lot of people don't like the Shelton Dog Park because they don't know the dogs, there are too many dogs, some dogs are getting attacked but people like to have their dogs socialize with other dogs.

Mr. Darby commented that they could have a green space area and they can do whatever they want with it.

Comm. Tickey commented that the PDD (inaudible) he agreed if they could make that less.

Chair Parkins stated three less units or maybe not as many bedrooms – they worked with Ben Perry on Perry Hill Estates.

Comm. Tickey commented about 10, 13 and 14 because there is space in there to do something that people could enjoy.

Atty. Thomas responded that was good, a fair statement – thank you.

Comm. Osak asked about the body of water shown on the plan.

Atty. Thomas responded that it was a wetland. The open space doesn't have to be Open Space to the City, the open space could be Conservation Easement and Open Space doesn't mean you can't walk through it. He commented about Oxford Greens – until Stage 4 they did not have one bit of Upland Review Area or wetlands filled but there is a Declaration of Easements that they are allowed to place wetland friendly paths that are wood slats or some form of process. He reiterated that just because it is a wetland, it doesn't mean you can't walk through it, especially in confined neighborhoods like that.

Chair Parkins asked how many houses you could get on that as a regular subdivision.

Atty. Thomas responded seven in the back area not counting the front lots.

Mr. Darby added that there wouldn't be any open space.

Chair Parkins responded except for the wetlands.

Atty. Thomas indicated that the wetlands would be a part of a lot but not built on.

Comm. Harger asked Mr. Darby if there was anything close to this that he's built.

Mr. Darby responded that the closest thing to this PRD would be on Racebrook Road in Orange where they have triplexes and behind on the field (inaudible)...

Comm. Osak asked about the eight units – three living units per structure – he asked if they would be on lots fee simple.

Atty. Thomas responded no, they would be a common ownership.

Comm. Osak stated that this would be one project with one landlord collecting rents.

Atty. Thomas responded no, it would be a common ownership, condominium. You would have ownership of your unit. He thanked the Commission for the time the Commission has extended. He added that he is a Smart Pay member at Cumberland Farms.

**PROPOSAL OF THE SHELTON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION:
PROPOSED ZONE CHANGE FROM CA-3 TO PLANNED DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
#82 (TWO BLOCK AREA: HOWE AVENUE TO CORAM AVENUE AND WHITE
STREET TO CENTER STREET) (PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED ON 1/12/16).**

Chair Parkins stated that they directed Staff to prepare a favorable resolution on this after the public hearing closed. She read the P&Z Draft Resolution dated February 9, 2016.

***See attached P&Z Resolution dated February 9, 2016 Proposal of the Shelton Planning and Zoning Commission: Proposed Zone Change from CA-3 to PDD #82 (Two Block Area: Howe Avenue to Coram Avenue and White Street to Center Street).**

Chair Parkins asked for a motion and second for discussion. Comm. Tickey motioned and Comm. Harger seconded.

With no further discussion, Chair Parkins conducted a roll call vote.

On a motion made by Jim Tickey seconded by Virginia Harger, it was unanimously roll call voted (6-0) to approve the Proposal of the Shelton Planning & Zoning Commission: Proposed Zone Change from CA-3 to PDD #82.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: 1/12/16

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to approve the minutes of January 12, 2016.

PAYMENT OF BILLS

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

STAFF REPORT

***See attached P&Z Report dated February 9, 2016 from Richard Schultz, P&Z Administrator.**

Mr. Schultz reviewed Staff Report items including upcoming ZBA Agenda Items, Downtown Subcommittee agenda items, Zoning Subcommittee and Sign Enforcement Issues.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, Chair Parkins asked for a motion to adjourn.

On a motion made by Virginia Harger seconded by Jim Tickey, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karin C. Tuke
P&Z Recording Secretary