TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

December 12, 2016
7:00 P.M.
Lincoln Center Hearing Room
494 Main Street

AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. WILLIAM FLEMMING (Continued from November 21, 2016) – For a resubdivision at 26 Wilfred Road (a.k.a. 26-28 Wilfred Road).
   - Resubdivision (2016-122)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. WILLIAM FLEMMING – For a resubdivision at 26 Wilfred Road (a.k.a. 26-28 Wilfred Road).
   - Resubdivision (2016-122)

2. ALEX PATEL AND ROSHAN PATEL – Pre-Application Review to discuss the possibility of a zoning regulation amendment to allow go-kart tracks in the General Business zone.

3. ANTHONY G. AND PAULA C. VISCOGLIOSI – Request a special exception under Art. II Sec. 18.03.08 to operate an inn at 50 Forest Street, Historic Zone.
   - Special Exception (2016-116) - Request for extension until January 4, 2017

4. ADOPTION OF 2017 MEETING SCHEDULE

5. APPOINTMENTS TO CAPITOL REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

6. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   - November 7, 2016 –Business Meeting, Aquifer Protection Agency Meeting

8. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS
December 2, 2016

Ms. Renata Bertotti
Senior Planner
Town of Manchester
494 Main Street
Manchester, CT 06040

Re: Pre-Application Review Meeting – Land Use

Ms. Bertotti:

Please be advised I represent Alex Patel and Roshan Patel who are looking to develop a parcel of property located at 145 Spencer Street. This site is located in a General Business zone.

My clients are interested in developing a seasonal outdoor go-kart track on the site, using either electric or gas go-karts, for rental by the public. Currently, the General Business zone allows for several recreational uses (e.g., carnivals and circuses (at the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals), tennis and badminton court, skating rink, health and recreation club, billiard or poolroom, bowling alley), but not this proposed use. While Manchester currently has no uses similar to the proposed use, the Commission may remember there was recently a gasoline go-kart track as part of Connecticut Golf Land near Vernon Circle. While closed, the track is still there to be seen.

I would like to discuss if, and under what conditions (e.g., permitted use or special exception use), the Commission would entertain an amendment to the zoning regulations to allow the proposed use. Attached please find a completed “Pre-Application Review Meeting – Land Use”. If possible, could this be heard at the December 12, 2016 meeting? Thank you.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Richard S. Conti
PRE-APPLICATION REVIEW MEETING – LAND USE

Applicant's Agreement to Pre-application Review Meeting under the Provision of Section 7-159b CGS

Sec. 7-159b – Connecticut General Statutes. Pre-application review of use of property. Notwithstanding any other provision of the general statutes, prior to the submission of an application for use of property under chapters 124, 126, 440 and 541 or any other provision of the general statutes authorizing an authority, commission, department or agency of a municipality to issue a permit or approval for use of such property, such authority, commission, department or agency or authorized agent thereof may separately, jointly, or in any combination, conduct a pre-application review of a proposed project with the applicant at the applicant's request. Such pre-application review and any results or information obtained from it may not be appealed under any provision of the general statutes, and shall not be binding on the applicant or any authority, commission, department, agency or other official having jurisdiction to review the proposed project.

I have read and understand the above provision of the Connecticut General Statutes and understand and agree that whatever discussion, comments and/or recommendations are made through this review are non-binding upon the parties.

Further, I acknowledge and agree that this pre-application review meeting is being conducted prior to and in anticipation of a formal application to the Manchester Planning and Zoning Commission to obtain feedback and response to the proposal or design, as it exists on this date, in the interest of preparing an application consistent with the Subdivision, Zoning or Wetlands regulations of the Town of Manchester as the case may be.

Location of Premises:
145 Spencer Street

Anticipated Type of Application:
Amendment to Zoning Regulations - Add Go-Kart Track to General Business Zone

Name Printed: Richard S. Conti
Signed: [Signature]
Date: 11/30/2016

Representing:
Alex Patel and Roshan Patel
Property Interest: Leasehold
TO:Joseph V. Camposeo, Town Clerk
FROM:Planning and Zoning Commission
DATE:December 6, 2016
RE: Scheduled Meetings for the Planning & Zoning Commission
February 2017 through January 2018

The following is a schedule of meetings to be held by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Meetings take place on Mondays unless otherwise noted, and will be held at 7:00 p.m. in the Lincoln Center Hearing Room, 494 Main Street, Manchester, Connecticut. At combined Public Hearing and Business meetings, the Public Hearing portion will begin at 7:00 p.m. and the Business Meeting will follow immediately after the hearings are closed.

MEETING DATES

February 1, 2017 (Wednesday)  July 17, 2017
February 13, 2017               August 14, 2017
March 6, 2017                   September 6, 2017 (Wednesday)
March 20, 2017                  September 18, 2017
April 3, 2017                   October 2, 2017
April 17, 2017                  October 16, 2017
May 1, 2017                     November 6, 2017
May 15, 2017                    November 20, 2017
June 5, 2017                    December 11, 2017
June 19, 2017                   January 3, 2018 (Wednesday)
July 5, 2017                    January 17, 2018 (Wednesday)

The Planning and Zoning Commission approved this schedule on ____________, 2016.

__________________________, Chair
Planning & Zoning Commission

cc: Planning and Zoning Commission
Customer Service

R:\Planning\Yearly Calendar - Board & Commission Schedules\2016 calendar memo - PZC.docx
TO: Municipal Planners and Planning Directors  
FROM: Mary Ellen Kowalewski, Director of Policy & Planning  
SUBJECT: Appointments to CRCOG Regional Planning Commission  
DATE: December 1, 2016

We are updating our Regional Planning Commission membership lists. Appointments are made on an annual basis for terms beginning in January and lasting through December of the upcoming year.

We request that your Planning Commission or Planning and Zoning Commission appoint a representative and alternate to serve on the RPC from the date of appointment through December 31, 2017. If your commission members are appointed by the Board of Selectmen or Town/City Council, the RPC appointments must also be approved by these bodies.

Your participation on the Regional Planning Commission ensures that the concerns of your municipality are reflected in regional plans and policies developed by the commission. Two of the main responsibilities of the RPC, as established under State Statutes, are to keep up-to-date a Plan of Conservation and Development for the Capitol Region, and to comment on zoning and subdivision proposals occurring along town lines.

Please make sure that the person appointed to the RPC is willing to attend our meetings on a regular basis, and if possible, please appoint an alternate who is willing to attend in the member’s absence. The 2017 RPC Meeting Schedule is attached. Meetings will be held on the second or third Thursday of meeting months, as noted on the schedule. Meetings are held at the West Hartford Town Hall.

RPC meetings are used to keep planning and zoning officials informed on CRCOG projects and programs related to regional and local planning. In addition, workshop sessions on current planning and zoning topics are periodically held, and members are given time to share information on municipal planning issues.

We look forward to working with your town’s RPC representative in the coming year. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 860-522-2217 ext. 222 or mkowalewski@crcog.org.

cc. Regional Planning Commission members and alternates.
REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

2017 MEETING SCHEDULE

Regular meetings of the Regional Planning Commission are held on the second or third Thursday of every other month.

7:00 PM at the
West Hartford Town Hall,
50 South Main Street,
West Hartford (unless noted to the contrary)

January 19, 2017
March 9, 2017
May 18, 2017
September 14, 2017
November 16, 2017
MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

NOVEMBER 7, 2016

ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Eric Prause, Chairman
Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Jessica Scorso

Alternate Members Sitting: Teresa Ike

Alternate Members: Patrick Kennedy

Absent: Timothy Bergin
Julian Stoppelman

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning
Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner
Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner
Karen Logan, Recording Secretary

Time Convened: 7:01 P.M.

Mr. Prause opened the meeting by introducing Commission members.
ST. JAMES CHURCH – Request a special exception modification under art. II Sec. 4.02.02 for renovations to the St. James Church at 896 Main Street. - Special Exception Modification (2016-113)

Mr. Charles Crocini of Manchester described the major renovations being planned for St. James Church. He cited the goals of the renovations, which were to build an addition to provide handicapped access and restrooms on the main level of the church; to build an addition on the south side of the church; to install a fence to enclose a relocated HVAC unit; and to modify and relocate an existing walkway near the proposed addition.

Mr. Crocini introduced Mr. Jeff Burkhart of FLB Architecture & Planning, 19 Silver Lane, East Hartford, Connecticut, who provided more detail regarding the proposed renovations to the church. He began by describing the building addition and associated floor plans, which were intended to provide a secure, sheltered and handicapped accessible entrance to the lower church hall. Plans for the building addition include a new double door entrance with a canopy with a stained glass window. The renovations also include rebuilding the existing basement stairway.

Mr. Burkhart continued by discussing the plans to rebuild the foundation walls by adding concrete to buttress the existing stone, which is allowing water to come in. He showed the current location of the HVAC condenser unit and noted that the plan calls for relocating the unit and constructing a fence to enclose it. The unit will need to be moved during the remedial work to be performed on the foundation.
Mr. Stebe asked Mr. Burkhart to review the proposed work on the walkway. Mr. Burkhart showed the location of the walkway on his plans and noted that the updated walkway would provide safer access for parishioners.

Mr. Stebe asked if the handicapped bathroom was on the second floor and how people would get to other levels in the church. Mr. Burkhart replied that there is an elevator available.

Mr. Prause asked Mr. Burkhart to show the exact location of the new addition and asked if the plan called for adding any rooms. Mr. Burkhart explained the location of the new addition and indicated that the plans did not call for adding rooms, but the intent was to cover an exposed stairway and to make the bathroom handicapped accessible.

Mr. Prause asked where the walkway would be expanded. Mr. Burkhart stated that the walkway was located on the south side of the building and it would be expanded to provide an apron or ramp area in front of the double doors of the church.

Mr. Prause asked if Mr. Burkhart was familiar with the special exception criteria relevant to this request, such as neighborhood compatibility, safety considerations, and traffic patterns. Mr. Burkhart responded that the only area he felt might change under the special exception criteria would be the expanded apron of pavement in front of the door and the covered stairway, which both serve to increase the safety factor.

Mr. Prause asked if the materials being used were comparable to the existing materials on the
building. Mr. Burkhart stated that was correct.

Mr. Prause called for staff comments. Ms. Bertotti stated that the applicant was aware of the outstanding comments, which were technical in nature and related to updating plans. She also pointed out that the church predated the zoning regulations. However, any building modifications have to be reviewed and approved by the Commission.

Mr. Prause asked if there was any landscaping planned as part of the renovations. Mr. Burkhart responded that a large oak tree will remain and some overgrown fir trees will be removed along the foundation in order to allow for that work to proceed.

Mr. Stebe offered that the application is fairly straightforward and the addition will be a benefit.

Mr. Prause commented that there would be no impact to environmental concerns or public safety and the changes were suitable for the location.

Special Exception Modification (2016-113)

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the special exception modification for renovations to the St. James Church at 896 Main Street with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Raymond Myette, Jr., Design Engineer, dated November 1, 2016; and
2. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated November 1, 2016.

Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.
The reasons for the approval are that the proposed activity meets the special exception criteria, that the materials fit the building, and that enclosing the stairways would benefit the neighborhood.

MICHAEL EVANS – For a building addition and a handicapped accessible ramp at 457 Center Street. – Design Overlay Review (2016-128)

Michael Evans of Michael Evans Home Improvement at 27 Roland Drive in East Hartford, Connecticut, presented his proposal to remove an addition from the front of 457 Center Street and construct a new 25’ x 24.5’ addition in the same place, and to add a handicapped accessible ramp and parking space. Mr. Evans stated that he would match the siding to the existing building to the best of his ability in order to preserve the look of the building.

Ms. Scorso asked if the decking would be changed during the renovations and Mr. Evans said that the plans called for adding on to that side of the building. Ms. Scorso continued by asking if the stairway to the second floor would be altered in any way and Mr. Evans responded that it would not.

Mr. Prause commented that the Commission would be reviewing the look of the building to compare its compatibility with the adjacent buildings. He asked Mr. Evans what the setback is for surrounding buildings. Burger King is about 75’ and the apartment building is about 15’, so the addition will not be any closer to the street than everyone else, he said.

Mr. Stebe asked where the sidewalk ends. Mr. Evans replied that it ends at the existing
pavement.

Mr. Stebe asked how close the addition would be to the maple tree in front of the property. Mr. Evans replied that the maple tree had been removed and there was just a stump there now.

Mr. Robert Muro of A & A Pest Control, 457 Center Street, Manchester, Connecticut, introduced himself as the owner of the property. He provided Commission members with the background and history of the property, indicating that he had worked hard to improve the property since he purchased it. He continued by saying that the addition was needed for additional office space. He hired Mr. Eddy, Architect, from Coventry, Connecticut to develop the plan for the addition and they worked hard to have the addition blend in with the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Kidd commented that he was not happy with the design of the addition. He stated that it looked like there was no front of the building and it did not fit in with the surrounding buildings.

Mr. Muro disagreed. The CHR building across the street has no doors and is just a square box. He added that he could not add a door in the front of the building, as it would cost him so much space, he would not be able to put a desk in the office.

Mr. Kidd suggested that the addition be made to look more like the front of a building. He noted that he would like to see enhanced architectural features to improve the look of the building. Mr. Muro replied that he was not willing or able to incur any additional expense. He pointed out that other buildings in the neighborhood did not blend with the neighborhood, such as Burger King.
Mr. Prause asked if there were any architectural features the applicant could add, such as dormers. Mr. Muro asked whether an additional window would help, and Mr. Evans offered that shutters could be added to the new addition.

Mr. Stebe asked if there would be any additional landscaping done in the front of the building. Mr. Muro responded that the plan called for removing a hedge and adding some plantings.

Ms. Scorso commented that she agreed with Mr. Kidd that it would be good to break up the look of the front of the addition.

Mr. Prause stated that in summary, the Commission was not thrilled with the look of the south elevation and asked if shutters could be added. Mr. Evans responded that he could add a couple of double hung windows and add shutters. Mr. Prause thought that would be better. He commented to the Commission that it would be possible to table this item and the applicant could come back with revised plans in two weeks.

Mr. Kidd suggested several ways to upgrade the look of the addition, including breaking up the look of the front by using different materials such as siding, new windows and shutters.

**Design Overlay Review (2016-128)**

**MOTION:** Ms. Ike moved to table the application to November 21, 2016. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.
PLAZA AT BUCKLAND HILLS, LLC. – Request a special exception modification for exterior building renovations at the Plaza at Buckland Hills at 1524 Pleasant Valley Road. – Special Exception Modification (2016-131)

Ms. Star Duvall represented the applicant and property owner, Washington Prime Group. Ms. Duvall began by citing the three main purposes for the renovations of the plaza, which were to raise the parapet height along the mansard roof; to add lighting along the façade and in the parking lot to increase visibility and safety in those areas; and to upgrade the exterior building materials to provide continuity throughout the plaza, including the new multi-tenant building constructed earlier in 2016.

Ms. Duvall introduced Mr. Todd Evans of Create Architecture who discussed the mansard roofs, which restrict the size of the signs that tenants can place over their businesses. The renovation plan calls for raising the roof line to allow for more display space. He added that the goal is to make the look of the shopping center much more cohesive, along the lines of the newly constructed multi-tenant building. Mr. Evans went on to state that the renovations plans called for upgrading the materials and adding entrance features to some of the tenants’ businesses. He noted that some of the businesses will be painted and some, such as Sally Beauty and Lane Bryant, will receive new rooflines. JoAnn’s Fabrics will have new square brick columns. There are plans for music, as well as Wi-Fi in the courtyard of the shopping center.

Mr. Prause asked for clarification regarding the two businesses in the shopping center that own their own buildings, Michaels and Toys R Us. He asked how that fact affects the plans for the
renovations to the center. Ms. Bertotti responded that the applicant has five years to complete the project and if some portion of the project is not completed, that portion will remain as it is today, but that portion could not be changed to anything other than what was in the proposed plans.

Mr. Prause asked about the color schemes being planned. Mr. Evans responded that the plans call for addressing each business individually, but the color schemes for the exterior facades would be along the lines of what was being proposed.

Mr. Anderson asked if the applicant had been in touch with the tenants regarding the renovation plans. Mr. Evans asserted that the applicant has been in touch with each of the businesses. Mr. Anderson asked if the applicant would be able to get an agreement from each of them and Mr. Evans responded that they were working on that.

Mr. Prause asked about the plans for lighting changes and whether the plan calls for changing the lighting throughout the shopping center or if it would just be in a few select locations. Ms. Duvall responded that the proposal calls for under cornice down-lighting for the stores with larger entrances, as well as new lighting in the parking lot.

Mr. Prause asked staff if a description of the plans for lighting changes had been received in the Planning Department and Ms. Bertotti said they had not. She continued by noting that if there were plans for changes to the lighting, she would like a detailed description filed with the Planning Department and if warranted, it would need Commission approval. Ms. Duvall replied that money had been budgeted for site lighting, but it was not necessarily part of the façade.
renovation package, so the applicant could come back at a later time to present detailed plans for site lighting.

Ms. Bertotti clarified that the issues before the Commission were the color scheme, materials being used, and changes to the parapet height.

Ms. Duvall noted that the color schemes being proposed were previously approved by the Commission earlier in 2016. The applicant is attempting to create a cohesive look in line with the color scheme and materials used in the newly constructed multi-tenant building.

Mr. Prause called for comments from staff and Ms. Bertotti responded that there were none.

Mr. Prause commented that the proposed renovations would modernize the roofline and standardize the look of the businesses in the shopping center.

Mr. Stebe asked if the awnings in front of Ulta and DXL would be changed or replaced. Ms. Duvall replied that the awning over Ulta would either be replaced or updated with the store’s prototype. The awning over DXL would be replaced with a more durable PVC trellis.

Mr. Prause asked if the landscaping would be changed. Ms. Duvall answered that the plan calls for minor modifications in the courtyard area at the center of the shopping center.

Mr. Prause asked if the façade changes would interrupt or affect the tenants’ businesses. Ms.
Duvall stated that they would not. Any changes affecting the entryways for the tenants businesses would be done after hours, either before the businesses opened or after they closed.

When the work requires removing the tenants’ signs, the applicant plans to provide the businesses with a banner to use when the signs come down.

Ms. Bertotti noted that the Town of Manchester has very specific signage regulations, so before the applicant invests in signs, they should contact the Planning Department for guidelines.

Mr. Prause asked what the applicant would do if there is tenant resistance to the proposed changes. Ms. Duvall replied that they would try to work with the tenants to achieve a satisfactory solution.

Mr. Prause clarified the procedures required for additional improvements and noted that the only improvements the Commission would be addressing at this meeting would be the plans that had been submitted to the Planning Department.

Ms. Ike asked where in the proposal the plan states “not in scope”. Mr. Sladek showed the elevations for Michael’s, Pet Smart and Toys R Us.

Mr. Kidd commented that even if no work is done on Michaels and Toys R Us, their look falls in line with the proposed look of the shopping center.

Mr. Prause added that the look of the renovations proposed for the shopping center was more
modern and fits in well with the new building added earlier this year.

**Special Exception Modification (2016-131)**

**MOTION:** Ms. Scorso moved to approve the special exception modification for exterior building renovations at the Plaza at Buckland Hills at 1524 Pleasant Valley Road. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity meets the special exception criteria.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS**

Mr. Anderson suggested a workshop preceding the next Commission Meeting to discuss potential rezoning issues on West Middle Turnpike near the Broad Street area. Mr. Stebe said he could make a brief workshop before the next meeting.

**Justin Weaver, 10 Trevor Court**

**Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-129) – Installation of a shed in 100’ Upland Review Area**

Mr. Bordeaux, the Wetlands Agent, approved this permit.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**September 29, 2016 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting**

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.
RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

MICHAEL EVANS – Design Overlay Review (2016-128) – For a building addition and a handicapped accessible ramp at 457 Center Street.

PLAZA AT BUCKLAND HILLS, LLC – Special Exception Modification (2016-131) - Request a special exception modification for exterior building renovations at the Plaza at Buckland Hills at 1524 Pleasant Valley Road.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

_________________________________________  ______________________________
Date                                      Eric Prause, Chairman

NOTICE:  A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THIS BUSINESS MEETING CAN BE HEARD IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT.
ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Eric Prause, Chairman
                 Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman
                 Michael Stebe, Secretary
                 Jessica Scorso

Alternate Members Sitting: Teresa Ike
Alternate Members: Patrick Kennedy
Absent: Timothy Bergin
         Julian Stoppelman

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning
             Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner
             Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner
             Karen Logan, Recording Secretary

Jonathan Larabee – 81 Adams Street - Request for Aquifer Protection Area Registration

Attorney Leonard Jacobs, of Jacobs, Walker, Rice & Barry, LLC, 146 Main Street, Manchester, Connecticut, presented for the applicant. He explained that when the applicant initially completed the form to register the property at 81 Adams Street with the Aquifer Protection Agency, he misunderstood the form and inadvertently excluded registration. Moving forward, the applicant
believed he was registered appropriately and only recently discovered that the registration had been excluded. The applicant is appearing before the Agency to request approval of a late registration. The applicant intends the property to be used for auto detailing and oil changes.

Mr. Bordeaux provided more detail and background on the state-mandated registration process which is intended to identify and maintain records of potential threats to aquifers and protected wetlands. Mr. Bordeaux concluded by noting that Town staff recommended approval of the late registration request and certified that the regulated activity was eligible for registration.

Mr. Kidd commented that it was understandable how such a mistake could have been made. He asked if there was a specific timeline for allowing late registration under the State’s regulations. Mr. Bordeaux responded that there was no end date for late registration, according to the town’s attorney and the State Department of Energy and Environmental Protection.

Mr. Stebe noted that the crux of the matter was that the applicant intended to fully comply and register. He continued by saying that since there was no definitive guide on late registration, he felt it would be best to recognize the intent and approve the request.

Mr. Prause asked if there was a separate form for the exclusion and Mr. Bordeaux explained the form that was used and how the applicant became confused.

Mr. Prause asked if the exclusion clause included a list of regulated activities. Mr. Bordeaux said that it did and read the list of activities.
Mr. Prause asked what kind of hazardous materials would be stored on the property. The applicant, Mr. Jonathan Larabee, stated that there were three tanks containing waste oil on the site and that all three were above ground.

Mr. Prause commented that the property was only used for storage of vehicles, not for repair of internal combustion engines. Mr. Larabee responded that the site is used primarily for storage, but is also used for internal work in support of the main repair facility.

Mr. Prause asked Mr. Larabee if he completed the form himself and if he remembered doing so. Mr. Larabee said that he did remember. Mr. Prause then asked Mr. Larabee to explain how he misunderstood the form. Mr. Larabee responded that his interpretation of the form was that the property was excluded from having to register because of the low volume of work performed. The error was discovered when the Town realized it and as soon as he was made aware of the error, he acted to try to correct it.

Mr. Prause asked Mr. Larabee if his company had been following best practices consistently and Mr. Larabee said that they followed best practices at the main facility and operated under the same rules at this facility.

Mr. Kidd added that he agreed with Mr. Stebe that Mr. Larabee had intended to register the property appropriately and he approved of accepting the late registration.
Request for Aquifer Protection Area Registration

**MOTION:** Mr. Kidd moved to accept the registration of regulated activities (B), (C), and (D) as defined in Section 2(a)(35) of the Aquifer Protection Area Regulations. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the registration is complete and the registrant has certified the subject facility is in compliance with all the best management practices set forth in Section 12 of the Aquifer Protection Area Regulations.

The Chairman closed the Aquifer Protection Agency meeting at 9:26 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

_________________________  _______________________
Date  Eric Prause, Chairman

**NOTICE:** A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THIS MEETING CAN BE HEARD IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT.