

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
DECEMBER 11, 2017**

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Timothy Bergin
Jessica Scorso

Alternates: Teresa Ike (Sitting)
Julian Stoppelman
Patrick Kennedy

Absent: Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman

Also Present: Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner
Gary Anderson, Director of Planning &
Economic Development
Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental
Planner/Wetlands Agent
Katie Williford, Administrative Secretary

Time Convened: 8:43 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:

OM FOUNDATION, INC – To allow a place of worship at 15 Burnham Street Extension. –
Special Exception (2017-086); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-087)

Ms. Scorso said she felt the plan was very detailed and gave enough information, and that fencing along the side of the parking lot and the proposed landscaping should be a sufficient buffer. She said she was in favor of plan.

Mr. Stebe said the proposed building is beautiful. He said he did not see any reason to add any restrictions, other than a follow up on the traffic study, as the Commission has done on other items in the past where there were concerns about traffic. He added that he didn't see the temple as a large issue for traffic, but it would be nice to see an update. Mr. Stebe said the temple would be a nice addition to Manchester and it would serve both Manchester and South Windsor. The four-foot fence along with the arborvitaes will be a very nice buffer, he said.

Mr. Prause agreed with the previous comments and said the use seems to fit with the area. He was not worried about noncompliance with any special exception criteria, he said. The scale of the building is a little imposing, Mr. Prause said, but it is set back from the main road. The applicant has done a lot of mitigations that will negate concerns from light pollution. He noted that the property does not have frontage or access onto an arterial or collector street and asked if that is a violation. Ms. Bertotti explained that the applicant received variance for that about a year ago.

Special Exception (2017-086)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the special exception under Art. II Sec. 1.00.02 to allow a place of worship at 15 Burnham Street Extension, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Shawn Morris, Deputy Fire Marshal, 8th District Fire, dated November 27, 2017;
2. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated December 1, 2017;
3. Raymond Myette, Jr., Design Engineer, dated December 4, 2017; and
4. Jim Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer, dated December 4, 2017 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

and with the condition that the applicant will provide traffic counts post development (6 months after opening) to verify the assumptions and data contained within the application material.

Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

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

Regarding the erosion and sedimentation control plan, Mr. Prause said it is good that the applicant took a lot of care to make sure the detention swale and everything else will be protected during construction and there will be silt fence around the property.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-087)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to certify the erosion and sedimentation control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated December 1, 2017 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

EL REINO UN MINISTERIO NUEVO – For a place of worship in the lower level of an existing commercial building at 485 Hartford Road. – Special Exception (2017-101)

Mr. Stebe asked if a condition needed to be included requiring review of a landscaping plan for approval by town staff. Ms. Bertotti confirmed.

Mr. Prause said he thought the location and use are fine and the church seems to work well in that building. He said he was concerned that there is not a lot of room before the lot line. Mr. Anderson said he thought staff could find a way to figure it out.

Special Exception (2017-101)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the special exception under Art. II Sec. 11.02.10 (Business II zone) and Sec. 5.02.02 (Residence B zone) to allow a place of worship at 485 Hartford Road, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated November 22, 2017;
2. Kim Dubanoski, Chief Sanitarian, dated November 20, 2017; and
3. Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner, dated December 5, 2017.

and with the condition that the applicant will provide a final landscaping

screening plan to Town Staff for approval.

Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

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

SURENDAR SEERANGAN – For a portion of the residence, a portion of the driveway, installation of gas, water, and sewer services, proposed drywell and regrading at 149 Tufts Drive. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-104); Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-104)

Surendar Seerangan, 21 Westwood Street, Manchester, said he bought 149 Tufts Drive last March and plans to build a two-story single-family house. The property is part of an existing subdivision from 2004, and the wetlands permit has expired, so he is reapplying, Mr. Seerangan said. The lot is 0.7 acres lot and there is an existing driveway cut, he said. Mr. Seerangan indicated the proposed location for the driveway and house on the map, as well as the location of the wetland and regulated area. Part of the house would be in the regulated area, he said, and pipelines for water and sewer and gas are in the regulated area. This is the low point from a grading perspective, he said, so the pipelines would be outside of the ground, so he plans to fill this area with soil to increase the grading level of property and to cover the pipelines. There is an easement for CL&P for the neighboring houses so that will be left as it is, he said, and there will be an L shaped low point left with the existing grading because the house will have a walkout basement in back with a deck on top of it. The trees will be left as-is in the regulated area except for two that will be removed for the foundation of the building. There will be about 300 yards of volume of fill, he said.

Mr. Prause asked why the fill is being added and Mr. Seerangan said the fill is to prevent problems with the foundation and to cover the pipelines. Mr. Prause asked about the previous wetlands permit and Mr. Seerangan said there was a wetlands permit when the subdivision was created in 2004.

Mr. Bordeaux said the applicant has worked with staff and the Assistant Town Engineer has reviewed what she would typically review for a plot plan review at the same time that she is doing the review for the wetlands permit, because if there are changes it could potentially require the applicant to go back before the Commission. One of her comments was to provide adequate depth for underground utilities, requiring fill in the front yard. The majority of the activity will be that fill and installation of driveway and the portion of the home there, he said. Otherwise, there would have been a low point in the front yard, and the applicant had originally proposed a drywell in the middle of the front yard, which is undesirable as a homeowner. At this time, they are proposing infiltration units to the side and more to the rear to capture runoff from the grade behind the property, Mr. Bordeaux said. At the time of the subdivision approval when the other lots were built, the original wetland area has been significantly altered, he said. Mr. Bordeaux noted that, at the bottom of the plan, there is a bituminous driveway that goes right through the wetland area that ties it to Tufts Drive, which goes right through a former wetland area. This is significantly made land at this point, he said. Mr. Bordeaux said the applicant noted it was unfortunate there was not a pipe left underneath that driveway so drainage from his site could get under the driveway and drain toward the wetlands to the south, so instead he is forced to accommodate some of the storm water onsite. Mr. Bordeaux said this was an approved lot in 2004 and the wetlands permit expired. He said he did not expect significant problems with this. There will be standard erosion control measures during construction and the fill will be

stabilized. Mr. Bordeaux said he expected that the applicant's goal will be grass turf over the front yard. As long as there are no significant changes during the plot plan review, then there should not be any major alterations going forward, he said, and Mr. Bordeaux should be able to administratively approve anything minor.

Mr. Prause asked if there was an application for this property before the PZC several years ago. Mr. Bordeaux said there was an application for a property to the south. Mr. Prause said it was a lot they wanted to subdivide and he was wondering if this was the same lot. Mr. Bordeaux said it was not the same lot, but it was on the same road.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-104)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the inland wetlands permit application 2017-104 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing.

Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-104)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the inland wetlands permit to allow construction of a single family home, driveway and installation of residential utilities, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Jim Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer, dated November 30, 2017;
2. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated November 30, 2017; and
3. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated November 30, 2017.

Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity does not disturb the natural or indigenous character of the land by significant impact or major effect.

The approval is valid for 5 years. The work in the regulated area must be completed within one year of commencement.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER – For dredging of Center Springs Pond at 99 Edgerton Street. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-092); Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-092)

Mel Higgins, Weston and Samspon, presented the application, and Jeff LaMalva, Assistant Town Engineer, was also present. Mr. Higgins distributed plans that were revised in response to staff comments, noting that the updates are nothing relating to the impact area or limits of work; staff only wanted minor details revised.

Mr. Higgins stated that Center Springs Pond is about 6 acres on a 55 acre park area and it was dredged in 1995. Sediment had built up and the water quality had become poor. Over the years, sedimentation from Bigelow Brook has filled up the pond, warming the water and decreasing dissolved oxygen levels, increasing weeds and decreasing water quality and aesthetics, Mr. Higgins said. The goal of this project is to improve water quality and natural habitat and to improve the aesthetics for park visitors, he said. 12,000 cubic yards of soft sediment is proposed to be removed from the pond. The hydraulic dredging method will be used and this method does

not require lowering of the pond. A boat with a dredge on it, essentially a large vacuum with a 10" diameter nozzle, will suck up soft sediment, which will go through a pipe to a discharge area where the sediment will dewater. The piping will put the sediment into geotubes, which are large pillows with holes so water can seep out while sediment stays inside, Mr. Higgins said. Then sediment is taken offsite, and the landfill has agreed they could take on this sediment, he said.

The project will impact some wetland areas, Mr. Higgins said. The entire pond will be dredged, 240,000 sq. ft., removing 12,000 cubic yards of material. The other impact area is to the west where the sediment will dewater; the geotubes will be placed in this area, which is inland wetlands and 100 year flood zone. The grass underneath will be impacted. It is currently manicured lawn where people can walk and play Frisbee golf, so even though it is classified as wetland, it isn't the typical vegetated wetland resource area. Once the geotubes are removed, it will be returned to the previous condition. A silt curtain will be provided so sediment will not filter down into Bigelow Brook, he said. The dewatering area will have straw wattles or compost filter tubes around the eastern and northern portion of where the filter tubes will be. They are not needed on the southern part, the sledding hill, because the water won't go uphill, Mr. Higgins said. Connecticut Fisheries commented that they want improved fish habitat after the dredging, and they suggested four underwater rock piles, he said. The project will increase water quality, increase habitat, and improve aesthetics, Mr. Higgins said. He added that the pond used to be used for ice skating but now the depths are so shallow it has not been used for skating in recent years. This project would provide that service as well, he said.

Mr. Stebe asked if there would be 600 or 700 truck runs in and out and Mr. Higgins confirmed that was correct. Mr. Stebe noted that it is a tight neighborhood run to the north of the pond, and asked if Edgerton Street is open all the way through on the opposite side coming back out in the other direction. Mr. Bordeaux said that Edgerton Street toward Center Street will be open. Mr. Stebe asked where the trucks would exit and Mr. LaMalva said Edgerton Street, most likely; it did open a week or two ago. Trucks would not be going out through the neighborhood up by Hemlock Street, he said. They would be coming down to Center Street, and the trucks would come in and out in that direction, Mr. LaMalva said.

Mr. Prause asked if there would be a significant impact on the wetlands. Mr. Higgins said there would not. With the pond as a wetland resource area, nothing will change hydraulically during or after; the water will reach its level to where the outlet is and the population will not be changed; fish, etc. will stay in pond. The other option was mechanical dredging, which required draining the pond, but that would have been more impactful for the local population. As proposed, Bigelow Brook will still flow in and out, and downstream will be protected so sediment will not enter it. The water levels will not change, he said. Regarding the 100 year flood zone, there would be temporary impact only, Mr. Higgins said. 12,000 cubic yards of volume would be added in the flood zone, as it dewater that volume will decrease, and it might only be there a month. By the end of the project, it will be gone. The same is the case with the wetland, he said. There will be temporary impacts only and it will be returned to the current condition of manicured lawn afterward.

Mr. Prause asked where the wetland delineation is. Mr. Higgins replied that the updated C-1 plan shows it, and he indicated it on the plan. Mr. Prause asked if dredging of the watercourse was a significant impact and Mr. Higgins replied that neither the use, habitat, or capture area will be altered.

Mr. Prause asked if other alternatives were considered. Mr. Higgins replied that the other major option is mechanical dredging, in which the pond is dewatered, then bulldozers and excavators are brought in. There are two downsides to mechanical dredging, he explained. First, it is detrimental to the fish population; last time they did that in Center Springs Pond and they flushed all the fish down the pipe. The second downside is that it is very messy, and once the pond is refilled there are more sediment issues than if the hydraulic method had been used, because that method has less sediment disturbance. He added that a design was started with mechanical dredging and they had to build a haul road with crushed stone, which is a lot of material to put into a pond. That material would be removed, but he questioned whether 100% of it would be removed.

Mr. Prause asked if the 100 year flood plain would be changed after this work is done since some of the soil underneath will be removed. Mr. Higgins replied that soil will not be removed within the 100 year flood zone. If the grass is dead after the geotubes are removed, the grading will be kept the same but will be loamed and seeded. The dredging of the pond does not add capacity to the flood plain except for a month maximum while the sediment is dewatering, Mr. Higgins said. Mr. Prause asked if any natural benefit would be removed and Mr. Higgins replied not at all; weeds and high nutrient sediment that are causing water quality issues will be removed.

Mr. Bordeaux said that staff had some comments that Mr. Higgins responded to today; staff has not reviewed those response or revised plans yet. The comments were from Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, and from Mr. Bordeaux. The engineering comments were mostly technical, he said, and his comments were about the storage of materials during construction and making sure no hazardous materials are stored in the regulated area overnight, in advance of storms, etc. Mr. Higgins said that comment was addressed; a note was added on one of the plans that mimics exactly what Mr. Bordeaux said. Mr. Bordeaux said that Mr. Higgins and Mr. LaMalva came to the November Conservation Commission meeting.

Mr. Prause asked about the timeline for the project and Mr. Higgins said it would hopefully be in July.

Mr. Prause noted that he did not see anti tracking pad for the trucks. Mr. Higgins said none were proposed but they could be added. It would only be a risk in the dewatering area he said, and it is a low risk because they estimated three truckloads a day. Mr. Prause asked for Mr. Bordeaux's opinion and Mr. Bordeaux replied that it would be applicable for the trucks moving the dewatered sediment from the opened grass field, and the proposed route would be up an asphalt drive, the interior walking path at the park, that will function somewhat like an anti-tracking pad, but there is that distance to that area. With the focus on Center Springs Park recently it is going to be maintained, he said, but the risk of placing a tracking pad in an open field is it becomes a bit of an issue with removal; it compresses material into the lawn. Mr. LaMalva said there is really no excavation or grading proposed as part of this project; it really is just the traveling of the trucks over the grass area. It could be monitored and a tracking pad could be added if needed, he said.

Mr. Bergin asked for clarification of the start date of the project. Mr. Higgins said he originally thought 2019, but the hope is to get it done faster than that, and the goal is July 2018. The project would then end in the fall of 2018, he said. Mr. LaMalva said, from a Town perspective, this is a high priority project, with support from the Friends of Center Springs Park and the Board of Directors. Timing also depends upon when final permits are received from the State, he said, noting that applications were submitted to the State two months ago. Mr. Stebe said the

memo refers to April to October, six months, and six months from July would be into December. Mr. LaMalva replied that the actual time that the barge would be sucking up material would be about a month, and it is the dewatering process that is variable and could be two to four weeks. The six month timeframe is a conservative estimate, he said. Mr. LaMalva said if we know we won't be able to get it done this year, we will not put the project out to bid.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-092)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the inland wetlands permit application 2017-092 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Mr. Prause said the work is significant but the actual impact at the end of the work does not really modify the impact of the wetlands themselves.

All members voted in favor.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-092)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the inland wetlands permit to dredge Center Springs Pond, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated November 14, 2017; and
2. Matthew R. Bordeaux, Wetlands Agent, dated November 20, 2017.

Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity to enhance the water quality of Center Springs Pond will be conducted in a manner that will minimize turbidity and maintain the existing functions of the waterbody during the hydraulic dredging process.

The approval is valid for 5 years. The work in the regulated area must be completed within one year of commencement.

ADOPTION OF 2018 MEETING SCHEDULE

Mr. Stoppelman said the first proposed November meeting is the day before Election Day and suggested possibly moving that meeting to Wednesday. Mr. Bergin said he would be in favor of moving that meeting. Mr. Anderson replied that staff would need to make sure the Hearing Room is available on that date. Mr. Kennedy said the meeting has been held on the day before Election Day in the past. Mr. Stebe said Mondays are much easier for him.

Ms. Ike noted that the proposed January 28, 2019 meeting date is the fourth Monday of the month. She asked if there is a reason that Wednesday the 23rd was not considered. Ms. Bertotti said staff tries to schedule meetings on Mondays if possible and January 28 was probably chosen because that Monday was open. She said staff could look into Wednesday if the Commission would prefer that. Mr. Prause agreed, because then the next meeting would be the following week, the first week in February. He suggested moving the meeting to the previous Wednesday.

Ms. Bertotti said staff would change the schedule and resubmit it for adoption with regards to the second January 2019 meeting. She asked if staff should we leave November 5th as-is. Mr.

Bergin replied that it has been on the schedule in the past. Mr. Prause said he supported changing the January 28, 2019 meeting to January 23, 2019.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 2018 meeting schedule with the modification that the proposed January 28, 2019 meeting date will be changed to January 23, 2019. Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

APPOINTMENTS TO CAPITOL REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Ms. Bertotti said the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) requests a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission attend five of their meetings and that an alternate is assigned. The purpose is to allow a voice to a community that is part of the capitol region. Members are also charged with reviewing certain applications for subdivisions for other communities. The schedule is included in packet, she said, and meetings are the second or third Thursday of every other month. This year, Mr. Stoppelman and Mr. Bergin were on the Capitol Regional Planning Commission, she said. Mr. Stoppelman said he would continue if the Commission wanted him to. Mr. Bergin offered the position of alternate to anyone who was interested, but said he would keep serving if no one else was interested. Mr. Prause asked if Mr. Kennedy was interested and Mr. Kennedy said he has served before for other commissions and has busy evenings, so he would defer. Mr. Bergin said he would serve again.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to nominate Mr. Stoppelman as a regular member and Mr. Bergin as an alternate member to the Capitol Regional Planning Commission. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Ms. Bertotti reported on a lot line revision that was approved at 811 and 819 Middle Turnpike East.

Ms. Bertotti said she recently emailed the Commission an updated spreadsheet following up on the previous workshop discussion about posting public hearing signs. Many towns responded, most of which required posting signs, she said. The requirements correlated with also not mailing abutter notices, she said. A number of towns had eliminated their requirements for mailing abutter notices and replaced it with posting signage because it was simpler and less expensive, Ms. Bertotti said.

Ms. Bertotti said there are concerns about what could happen if a sign is not posted properly, but it seems that has actually happened in very few instances. Many planners replied they felt the policy of posting signs was appropriate. Some towns had signs just for Planning and Zoning Commission items and some had them for all public hearing items. A few required posting of signs for any application, she said.

Ms. Bertotti said it is up to the Commission to tell staff what they would like to do. Mr. Bergin asked about the cost savings of using signs vs. mailing, and if Ms. Bertotti could anticipate some safeguards if a sign is improperly put up. Ms. Bertotti said she did not have cost information but it seemed that signs could be homemade with instructions from Planning, made by a sign maker, or template signs given out by the Town. Costs of the signs can range from free to \$100-\$200 depending on the frontage. In most scenarios the applicant would cover some kind of cost of the sign unless it is homemade, she said. As far as precautions for improper posting, she said, staff

would need to look into the legal ramifications. Planners tend to be too scared about these things, she said. If someone has put an affidavit that a sign has been posted and a zoning officer is checking, then it has been testified that the sign is posted properly. If the applicant fails to do that and there is an appeal, it is a risk the applicant is taking on themselves; the risk is more on the applicant than the town, Ms. Bertotti said. She said she did not know if it would be necessary to defer a hearing or deny an application.

Mr. Stoppelman said the Commission had discussed enlarging the area notified of public hearings to 500 feet from the site, and he thought the reason for this was that people were thinking they were not getting enough notice. He said 500 feet would be better notice than signs because the signs do not say what the issues are. Mr. Stoppelman said he would like to experiment with 500 feet and not add signs at the moment.

Ms. Scorso agreed with Mr. Stoppelman's comment and said she was concerned about maintenance of signs. She said she would like to see the response to 500 feet and then go from there. Mr. Kennedy agreed, saying that South Windsor had signs that people would take when needed, but Manchester is not used to dealing with this. Sometime there would be an issue with a sign and the Commission would have to deny a public hearing, and it would be with a major application and there could be litigation. He suggested taking the first step of expanding the number of letters sent, and if people still feel they are not getting enough notice then the Commission can reevaluate.

Mr. Prause said he works in South Windsor and he sees the signs all the time. There is boilerplate information that could be put on the sign, and if cost is a concern, there could be a deposit that is returned when the applicant brings back the sign, he said. Mr. Kennedy said the concern is more about the possibility of a procedural defect at exactly the wrong time. Mr. Prause replied that not all towns require affidavits, and you could just have a requirement that the sign is posted, and if someone steals your sign it is not your fault. Mr. Kennedy said it would be most likely to come up with something that is really worth litigating. He asked, if expanding the letter notice makes everyone happy, why the Commission would need to take the next step. Ms. Bertotti said she worked in Coventry and there was one problem with the posting of signs, and it was with a controversial application for a Walgreens or CVS that involved a dispute with a neighbor. Cost is not a big issue with signs, she said; sending abutter notices is more costly.

Mr. Prause said there must be some kind of case law because this must have come up before. He asked staff to check with the Assistant Town Attorney. He agreed that expanding the boundary for letters would reach more people, but signs would reach a different group of people. Someone who is driving past, even if they don't live within 500 feet of the property, may be impacted, Mr. Prause said.

Mr. Anderson said that the Commission needs to decide whether to put this in the regulations. He said staff has been waiting to make the change on the boundaries until this is figured out, but if it takes much longer staff can make the change. He said he was hesitant to do both and recommended the Commission pick one. The thing people like most about the signs is that they don't do the notification mailing, he said, but it would be difficult to take that away because people are used to getting those notices. Mr. Prause said it seems that the legal repercussions are a big sticking point and an answer about that would help guide the Commission's decision.

Ms. Bertotti said that the planners listserv recently had more discussion about temporary health care structures and a number of towns that had initially said they would not opt out actually

ended up opting out. As of today, she said, about 21 towns have opted out. She said she contacted John Guskowski, who works for the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association on the legal end, and talked about the letter the Commission had asked staff to submit. Mr. Guskowski said the Commission should submit something in February. There is a list of complaints from planners throughout state that Mr. Guskowski and Amanda Kennedy, who is also in that group, are compiling, Ms. Bertotti said.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 16, 2017 –Public Hearing/Business Meeting
November 6, 2017 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting
November 20, 2017 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:

Ms. Bertotti said there are no new applications to be received tonight. On January 3rd, the Commission will hear a resubdivision and wetlands permit application for the Trustees of North Methodist Church, and they also have one lot that is a rear lot and requires special exception approval. The applicant submitted paperwork tonight but under the Planning and Zoning Commission rules the special exception application cannot be accepted by the Commission tonight. There will be hearing on it together with the resubdivision, she said.

The application for Church of Pentecost, Inc. was on the agenda tonight, Ms. Bertotti said, but she heard from the applicant this morning and they were out of country and were not aware of her attempts to contact them. They will submit revised plans and responses to staff comments and hopefully be ready for January 3rd, she said.

There are two Town applications for zoning regulation amendments for solar energy systems and referral of design plans in the Central Business District to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The latter amendment applies to things that were approved by the PZC Chairman and Planning Director, for which there was no specific language in the regulations stating what the next step is if the Chairman and Director do not agree.

There is a pre-application review for 40 Forest Street, Ms. Bertotti said, where they would like to use this property for outdoor events. The draft future agenda describes it as a banquet hall use, which is not exactly correct but it is the most similar to that.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 10:25 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

January 3, 2018
Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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