

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
MAY 21, 2018**

**ROLL CALL:**

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

Alternates: Julian Stoppelman  
Patrick Kennedy  
Teresa Ike

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning and Economic Development  
Matthew Bordeaux, Acting Senior Planner – Current Planning/  
Environmental Planner/Wetlands Agent  
Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary

**REVISED AGENDA**

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to revise the agenda to remove application 2018-036 for the Association of Muslim Community (AMC). Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The Chairman opened the Business Meeting at 7:04 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

AMANDILY, LLC - For construction of a warehouse building at 111 Hilliard Street. – Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-033)

Mr. Frank Borawski, P.E., of PDS Engineering & Construction, introduced himself. Mr. Borawski explained that the proposed warehouse building is for the expansion of the applicant's business, which is necessary for warehousing and storage of equipment. He reported that they have been working with Town Staff to address comments, though there are still a couple of minor issues being worked on, and revisions were submitted to Staff recently.

Mr. Borawski explained that the building will be an 11,000 sq. ft. warehouse, strictly for storage of equipment and raw materials. The parking lot will be accessed off Electric Street, he explained, and there will be a dock and one drive-in door into the warehouse building. In the rear of the building, there is what appears as a concrete bunker, which is a dead storage area for raw materials, he stated. Mr. Borawski explained that the drainage of the lot will go into a detention basin across the front. The site is very flat and will be surrounded by a silt fence for erosion and sediment control, he said. He reported that the site presently drains across the land and then across the road, and the drainage will be improved by catching and sending it into the detention basin.

The building itself, he explained, is strictly storage. Off Electric Street, there will a dock door and a drive-in door, according to Mr. Borawski. There will be one other overhead door opposite the concrete bunker building to enable transfer of materials back and forth. The building will include a small bathroom for warehouse employees, he noted.

Mr. Borawski reported that the parking area in the rear meets the regulation criteria. The only minor exception discussed with Staff is the requirement of a landscaped berm, though the slope of the property will only accommodate landscaping in the area.

Mr. Stebe requested clarification about the west side embankment between the applicant's property and 123 Hilliard Street, because the rectangle at the northwest corner is essentially the same height as the current concrete structure and slopes down perhaps 10 ft.

Mr. Borawski stated that is correct, about 10 ft.

Mr. Stebe said he assumed there will be a sizeable cut in order to establish the footprint for the warehouse on the northwest corner.

Mr. Borawski agreed.

Mr. Stebe sought clarification that the berm is completely on the applicant's property, with which Mr. Borawski concurred. Mr. Stebe noted that it appears to have been clear cut and questioned what the cover will be to maintain the slope.

Mr. Borawski informed Mr. Stebe that the slope will be flattened somewhat. He explained that there is a 4 ft. concrete kicker wall along the side which is higher than the finished floor elevation. Therefore, there will be 3 ft. more taken from the slope, he stated; it will be flatter and planted, according to Mr. Borawski.

Mr. Stebe sought confirmation that there will be a space between the planned building and the retainer kick wall.

Mr. Borawski verified the area Mr. Stebe referenced.

Mr. Stebe expressed his concern over the area that was clear cut.

Mr. Borawski assured Mr. Stebe that the area has not been stumped or cleared at this time.

Mr. Stebe asked if the area will be seeded and grassed.

Mr. Borawski explained that all the disturbed areas will be seeded and grassed, with the trees surrounding, and displayed the area between the building and the property line, which will be landscaped. Mr. Stebe noted that the retaining basin is fairly shallow and questioned whether there is an expectation of standing water.

Mr. Borawski replied there may be some water for a few hours after a heavy storm. He noted that there is a very slow perc rate in the area, which prohibited the use of dry wells. There will not be any water in the location for longer than 10-12 hours, he stated.

Mr. Kidd requested clarification from Staff about why there is only an erosion and sedimentation control plan before the Commission.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that the use is permitted in the zone, the site is less than four acres, and there are fewer than 60 parking spaces, which would be the threshold for a special exception and a more intense level of review. Because the site disturbance exceeds one-half acre, they were required to come before the Commission, he stated.

Mr. Kidd stated that he had pondered the neighborhood compatibility, noting that there are single family homes on the street and the proposal would be out of character. He commented that the building, in his opinion, is an unattractive 28+ ft. tall sheet metal sided building, though the Commission has no purview over that.

Mr. Prause questioned whether there are existing catch basins on the property.

Mr. Borawski pointed to the plan and noted one catch basin on the street.

Mr. Prause surmised that the catch basins depicted on the plan are new and Mr. Borawski concurred.

Mr. Prause referred to the proposed detention basin at the lower corner of the land, noting that there is no catch basin currently, with which Mr. Borawski agreed. Mr. Prause questioned where the construction stockpile will be located.

Mr. Borawski pointed to the plan for the location of the stockpile.

Mr. Prause questioned whether that will be close to the new dumpster pad, with which Mr. Borawski agreed. Mr. Prause clarified that it will be next to the existing bunker. He assumed that construction vehicles will enter and exit off Electric Street, and Mr. Borawski agreed.

Mr. Bordeaux distributed a letter from Mr. Borawski requesting that the Commission accept the modification of what would be a strict interpretation of the residential zone screening requirements, per Art. II, Sec. 16. The regulations read that there should be an “8 ft. fully bermed evergreen buffer,” Mr. Bordeaux said. However, the applicant’s request is, rather than waive the entire requirement, that the Commission modify the interpretation of the regulations, given the combination of existing vegetation, the row of arborvitae and the fact that the grade change there is not conducive to additional filling. Mr. Bordeaux noted that there is also another modification from the Assistant Town Engineer, Michelle Handfield, related to the stormwater, sizing and layout of the detention basin and the ability for the detention basin to drain. Mr. Borawski has responded to all prior comments, and Ms. Handfield has communicated that this minor comment can be satisfied, Mr. Bordeaux said.

Mr. Prause noted that, in a memo from PDS, the building is located within the 15 ft. buffer.

Mr. Bordeaux responded that the memo states that the building is located just outside the 15 ft. setback; therefore, there is the 15 ft. side yard building setback line and the building should be outside or into the site from there.

Mr. Prause clarified that the memo states “inside the yard setback,” which means it is 17 ft.

Mr. Borawski reported that it is.

Mr. Bergin asked Mr. Bordeaux to illuminate the differences between the screening height under the regulations and the final berm height plus the arborvitae height.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that the berm would typically be 4 ft. and the planted height of an evergreen shrub would be 5-6 ft. The location of the arborvitae on the embankment, he explained, is very close to an overall height of 10 ft. The building exceeds that height, so this will not eliminate the view altogether, but with the combination of the embankment and the arborvitae, the fully bermed screen would be 8 ft. wide. Typically, it would be best to stagger trees so they fill out when grown, but there is existing vegetation here as well, he said.

Mr. Prause questioned the history of the existing berm. He pondered whether that was earlier construction.

Mr. Borawski stated that he did not know.

Mr. Vinny Savino, Owner of Action Air Systems, introduced himself and reported that he was told it was a water holding tank from the Bon Ami factory. He explained that it is at grade level; it is not a basement and it will have a customized overhead door in front. The building will be for storage with a heater, he said.

Mr. Prause speculated that the lot has been at a lower grade than the lot to the west for a long time.

Mr. Savino responded that, when walking on grade level, it is possible to walk in as there is a very slight depression from grade level.

Mr. Stebe requested clarification from Mr. Bordeaux that the buffering request is related to abutting residential property. He stated that 123 Hilliard Street is half the length of the subject property and the property to the west appears to be a large property running the entire length. Therefore, he explained, there is residential property running the entire length of the western edge of 111 Hilliard Street. Mr. Stebe inquired whether there is any buffering requirement to the northern end of the property as well, or if that would be part of the waiver, stating that if the arborvitae is placed halfway up the embankment on the southern half of the west edge that would suffice, and the northern half of the western edge does not need anything at this point.

Mr. Bordeaux commented that the thought was that there is a mostly-wooded lot, but it is difficult to ascertain from the picture. He stated that, from the picture, he could not tell whether the rear portion of the lot has been cleared. In Staff review, the focus was on the front half of the lot because that is where the new building will be constructed, Mr. Bordeaux explained. He surmised that if there is a need to improve the rear portion with a screen, because it is at that elevated grade, a more formal screen could be installed. With an Erosion and Sedimentation Control permit, some of the zoning issues not directly involved in the disturbance of the site most likely would not be reviewed, according to Mr. Bordeaux. If there is a situation where the Zoning Enforcement Officer needs to provide a certificate of occupancy for the site, he explained, a strict application of the regulations would apply.

Mr. Stebe noted that there is another industrial site following Loomis Street back, which hits that edge and may actually be encroaching within the residential space. He said he was unsure how far back the house on Hilliard Street has developed, though he speculated that may be the apartments.

Mr. Borawski reported that Loomis Street is mostly commercial. He noted that Mr. Savino left most of the area uncut when clearing the area for the building.

Mr. Savino clarified that the tree line is still there.

Mr. Borawski stated that, when the building construction is complete, if the Zoning Enforcement Officer thinks there should be more trees for screening, it would not be a problem.

Mr. Savino noted that the barrier of the property line is along the whole side where the commercial area abuts; it is untouched and the trees are quite high.

Mr. Stebe reiterated that there is still a row of current vegetation along that edge, with which Mr. Savino agreed. He noted that there is an existing row of vegetation on the northwest edge that is quite heavy. In addition, Mr. Stebe noted, the existing 8-10 ft. berm from grade plus the arborvitae would make a sizeable indentation of a buffer between the properties. He said he was leaning toward working with the exemption for the buffering requirements.

Mr. Prause speculated whether there was a motion.

Mr. Stebe questioned whether Mr. Prause was referring to the waiver on the zoning screening or the entire application.

Mr. Prause clarified that he meant the residential zone screening requirements, referencing the memo.

#### Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-033)

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to certify the erosion and sedimentation control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated May 18, 2018 to Matthew Bordeaux, Acting Senior Planner; and with the modification of the Residential Zone Screening requirements of Art. II, Sec. 16.06 as outlined in the letter from Frank Borawski, P.E. of PDS Engineering & Construction, dated May 17, 2018. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

#### THE REDEEMED CHRISTIAN CHURCH OF GOD - Pre-Application review to discuss a special exception use at 73 Summit Street.

Attorney Steven Penny introduced himself as representing The Redeemed Christian Church of God. He explained that the church intends to file an application affording it a special exception use for a place of worship in the Residence B zone. The site is known as 73 Summit Street, at the location where Bigelow Brook crosses Summit Street, according to Attorney Penny. He explained that the site is a rectangle of approximately 170 ft. of frontage and 320 ft. of depth, 1.22 acres in size. The existing building has 6,922 sq. ft. of usable space on the first floor as well as a basement of the same size, though it is only usable for storage as it is in the floodway, he noted. The current site layout, Attorney Penny reported, was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission in 1973. The location has been devoted to various commercial uses including, among others, an electrical contracting firm and an oxygen supplier. Attorney Penny noted that the church owns the site.

Attorney Penny commented that the site is zoned Residence B (RB) and places of worship are special exception uses in the RB zone, per Art. II, Sec. 5.02.02 of the zoning regulations, subject to the provisions of Art. II, Sec. 1.00.02, which deals with special exception uses in residential zones; Art. IV, Sec. 20, regarding special exception uses generally; and Art. IV, Sec. 9 of the regulations, regarding parking. He further pointed out that Art. II, Sec. 1.00.02 requires, for places of worship in a residential zone, that the site be located on an arterial or collector street (Summit Street is a collector roadway), that vehicle parking be available per the regulations (there is adequate onsite parking), and suitable

landscaping plantings and screening of residential properties, and the applicant is seeking the Commission's input.

Attorney Penny explained that Andrew Bushnell, the Project Engineer, will speak to the existing topography, mature vegetation and other conditions on the site with emphasis on those that impact the regulatory requirement for landscape buffering including, in part, a conflict between the floodway regulations and the zoning regulations. In addition, according to Attorney Penny, Mr. Bushnell will describe the applicant's intended use of the property in light of another existing and to be continued use of an adult day care center on the property, particularly as it relates to parking and access to parking. Pastor Augustine Uwaya, Attorney Penny reported, will assist with any questions the Commission may have.

Mr. Andrew Bushnell, Project Engineer, Bushnell Associates, introduced himself. He displayed the plan and described the abutters. He projected an aerial picture taken in 2016 and pointed to the surrounding area. He explained the topography of the site, i.e., Summit Street drops down toward the back, it is flat in the parking area, and there will be a 6 ft. to 8 ft. rise in grade at the condominiums from the brook in the parking lot area. He explained that the rise is approximately the same from the parking area in the rear to the house located to the north. On the high school side, there is an embankment of 25-30 ft. up to the high school, he said. He displayed and explained the path of Bigelow Brook from the high school to Center Springs Park.

Mr. Bushnell displayed the FEMA flood map of the area depicting the floodway, which encompasses a portion of the rear parking lot and land down the side of the building. It may encompass a part of the building, though he stated that there must be a more detailed study to extract the exact boundaries, but it definitely encroaches on the rear of the property, i.e., the parking lot and wooded area. Mr. Bushnell displayed pictures of the front of the site looking east from Summit Street that portrayed existing parking spaces in the front of the building and two handicapped spaces. He noted that the intent is not to change anything in terms of impervious surface layout or do any construction outside the building, though parking in the rear might be rearranged to make it more compliant with present-day regulations and add a space or two. Mr. Bushnell presented a view of the front parking lot to the north showing the existing single-family residential house to the north. At this time of year there is dense vegetation, he explained. In addition, he showed a view of the front parking looking south, depicting the condominiums and an existing stockade fence. Mr. Bushnell presented a picture looking from the rear toward Summit Street, which includes the driveway installed as part of the 1973 approval. He further pointed to two dumpsters, one of which will be shielded from view. There is a 6-10 ft. high embankment which provides a grade change from the parking lot to the existing house above. He noted that there is the constraint of only 13 ft. from the edge of a wall to the edge of the parking and there is not much room to extend the parking, definitely not the 24 ft. required under current parking regulations.

Mr. Bushnell went on to display several views from the property. He noted that the proposal does not include anything new from what is existing. He explained that an issue with buffering is the floodway; a fence would be considered an obstruction of the floodway, as would a planting of evergreen trees. A parking demand study that Mr. Bushnell completed showed 33 standard spaces – 23 in the rear, 6 on the side, 4 in the front, plus 2 handicapped in the front. As Attorney Penny mentioned, there is an adult day care center occupying a portion of the building, Mr. Bushnell stated. The day care's hours of operation are a first shift from 7 A.M. to 3 P.M. Monday through Friday and a second shift Monday through Friday from 3 P.M. to 8 P.M., with 15 employees on the first shift and one employee on the second shift. Six transportation vehicles remain onsite after hours and their greatest parking demand is 21 spaces.

The demands for the church property are that during the week there is only a requirement for the pastor; there is Thursday evening bible study from 7 to 9 P.M., requiring 6 spaces; the Sunday services are from 10 A.M. to 12:30 P.M. on Sundays, encompassing the one pastor and 50 church members, requiring a total of 18 spaces. He referred to the restriction of the driveway width and the current parking spaces, which become a V-shape in the corner and which do not meet today's requirements for dimensional standards, but the applicant would like to count them and is interested in input regarding a waiver.

Mr. Prause sought clarification about the buffering questions.

Attorney Penny inquired about the landscape buffering requirement as it applies on the south side of the property between the parking lot and the stream. He noted that Mr. Bordeaux took the position in Staff discussions that the floodway requirements trump the zoning requirements because obstructions in the floodway cannot be established. This would seem to suggest that, physically absent the stream, a fence could be erected inside the parking lot to provide buffering, he said. However, that is not an option in this situation, he noted. The elevation distances between the condos and the subject parking lot are such that there will not be headlights shining into residences. In Attorney Penny's estimation, the issue surrounds places of worship and screening. He noted that the regulation states, "Places of worship shall screen adjoining residential properties with a landscaped border not less than 8 ft. wide. The landscaped border shall provide a year-round effect through which the developed site is obscured from view from abutting residential property." It then goes on to say, "If a landscaped berm (and Attorney Penny suggested the natural grade becomes a berm), masonry wall, or a combination thereof at least 4 ft. high (in this case it is 6 ft., he noted) is installed to provide the visual screen, the requirement for planting evergreen species may be waived by the Commission." Therefore, he stated, the Commission could interpret the regulation as being met, given the set of circumstances that have met the regulation by the natural change in grade and the existing mature vegetation.

Another issue, Attorney Penny described, is the fact that on a previously-approved site plan from 1973 there are only 13 ft. between the edge of the retaining wall and the edge of pavement and property. There is not 24 ft. of normal two-way traffic aisle width, he explained. However, he stated, there are two uses for the site which are not in conflict with each other. The adult day care center does not have a lot of traffic coming and going because the clients arrive by the six vehicles and they have been operating at the site for a period of years, and the site has worked for 45 years without any adverse consequences. The church, meanwhile, will be there only on Sundays, and presumably the congregation will arrive for the service and will not leave until it has concluded, enabling the traffic to go in one way or the other without conflict.

Mr. Prause referred to the parking spots that are smaller than required by regulation.

Mr. Bushnell explained that the width is fine except for the area of the parking lot coming to a point that does not meet the 24 ft. required in present-day regulations.

Mr. Stoppelman inquired which part of the building the church would occupy.

Attorney Penny replied that the church will be on the first floor.

Mr. Bushnell noted that the applicant would be on the southerly side of the building.

Mr. Stoppelman inquired whether the entrance will only be around the front of the church.

Mr. Bushnell explained that there are some entrances from the basement that could be used for emergency purposes, but the main entrance is in the front for both the tenant and the church.

Mr. Stoppelman surmised that the only problem would be people walking up the drive and coming to the front of the church.

Mr. Bushnell reported that people could walk inside as there are entrances in the back, as well as a side entrance for the tenant next door.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he recalled an issue of waiving a buffer requirement arose when the Commission approved a church in the basement of Cosmic Omelet. He questioned whether the Commission granted a waiver of a buffer.

Mr. Anderson agreed that there was an issue with the buffer but did not recall the resolution except that the Commission determined the abutting property was actually commercial.

Mr. Kennedy stated that, whatever latitude the Commission has, the site is an operating site that operates most of the week and there has not been any necessity of a buffer for the current use. He said he did not see a practical need for a buffer for an operation on Sunday on a site that is used five days a week on a regular basis. If the location was new construction, he commented, that would be different, but to whatever extent the Commission has the ability to be flexible or to waive requirements, he would lean toward that, given the limited use. Mr. Kennedy asked if, under the Town's standards, the parking is adequate for the size of the congregation. They said the congregation is 50 people and they have enough spaces, he noted.

Mr. Anderson explained that Staff has not reviewed the topic, as there is no application.

Mr. Kennedy interjected that the standard they are using is one parking space for every three people and there are 50 people. Mr. Anderson said he believed one space for every three seats was correct. Mr. Kennedy said the site does not appear to have enough parking, he noted, but that is probably due to the configuration. He stated that if the Commission is allowed to have flexibility on the size of the parking spaces, he would not object to using the older standard for the size of the parking spaces because it is an existing lot.

Mr. Stebe commented that he frequents that end of Summit Street and has never had an issue in the area, though he always contemplated the ease of exiting the parking lots that front on Summit Street. He has not seen any issues surrounding the area and said he felt as though the Commission could make this issue work. Referring to Mr. Kennedy's comment, he said he believed there is enough room for compromise on rules and regulations and obtaining a waiver for the waterway and the buffer.

Mr. Kidd stated that he was inclined to agree, considering the minimal impact with the hours of operation, i.e., a couple of hours during the week and a couple of hours on Sunday. He noted that there is a pre-existing condition as the building has worked for 40-50 years with that narrow driveway. His only concern would be the fact that the entrance is in the front and the parking is in the back through that area that is narrow, and that may be a safety issue, he said. The parking does not appear to be an issue as it has worked for many years and he would not be averse to a waiver for a couple of parking spaces, he said.

Mr. Bushnell reported that the applicant can work with the architect to alleviate the pedestrian issue.

Mr. Stoppelman reiterated that his only concern is pedestrian safety.

Attorney Penny noted that the church cannot occupy the basement, though he would assume that the building code would not preclude people entering and using the stairway to the first floor.

Mr. Stebe commented that seven spaces could be opened in the front of the building by moving the transportation vans to the lower level for the weekend.

Mr. Bergin questioned whether the church will have any use outside of the building, anything that abuts the southerly border by the brook.

Pastor Augustine Uwaya introduced himself and stated that the church would not have any activity outside of the building. The congregation utilizes Center Springs Park for a picnic every year.

Mr. Bergin commented about the handicapped parking, noting that there is only a small overlap in the hours of operation on Thursday nights with the other tenant, but he would presume they would be utilizing that parking and the site is limited for location of other handicapped parking.

Mr. Bushnell said he was not certain that the tenant utilizes the handicapped parking, but the applicant would need to communicate with the tenant about the utilization.

Mr. Kidd contemplated that the Commission did not address the issue of a special exception for use. He stated that he did not feel that granting a special exception in the location was an issue at all.

Mr. Kennedy commented on the issue of churches being put into plazas and other buildings where they are a secondary use. He suggested adding something to the regulations allowing the Commission to relax provisions for houses of worship being put into existing buildings or plazas.

Mr. Anderson asked what types of requirements Mr. Kennedy was referring to.

Mr. Kennedy replied that he was referring to parking and buffering.

Attorney Penny offered that, in the PRD zone, there is a direct waiver provision for landscape buffering, though there is not one in this case. In the parking regulations for places of worship, he noted, there is a waiver provision, but there is not one for the landscape buffering other than the interpretive approach.

Mr. Prause inquired about the existing stockade fence shown in the southwest corner. He said he assumed that is in the flood plain zone as well.

Mr. Bushnell replied that the flood plain zone is determined by elevation. He noted that is much higher than the elevation in the rear.

Mr. Prause added that that area is not on the map as being in the flood zone.

Mr. Bushnell noted that if there was a detailed study, it is an elevated flood zone.

Mr. Prause stated that, in his opinion, regarding the special exception, the site is already a Residential B zone. The applicant would be moving into an existing building, which would remove a lot of the restrictions on the special exception requirements, he reported, and the Commission would only be dealing with neighborhood compatibility. He commented that he is concerned that there are not as many parking spots for a church that may be interested in growing.

HILLIARD MILLS, LLC - For parking area expansion and renovation of Building 4 into a banquet hall at 640 and 642 Hilliard Street and 370 Adams Street. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2018 -015) – Request for a 65-Day Extension; Special Exception (2018-016) – Request for a 65-Day Extension; Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-017) – Request for a 65-Day Extension; Special Exception Modification (2018-018) – Request for a 65-Day Extension; Flood Plain Permit (2018-019) – Request for a 65-Day Extension

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2018 -015) – Request for a 65-Day Extension

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 65-day extension of time. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Special Exception (2018-016) – Request for a 65-Day Extension

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 65-day extension of time. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-017) – Request for a 65-Day Extension

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 65-day extension of time. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Special Exception Modification (2018-018) – Request for a 65-Day Extension

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 65-day extension of time. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Flood Plain Permit (2018-019) – Request for a 65-Day Extension

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 65-day extension of time. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:**

Mr. Anderson reported that there are no administrative reports.

**RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:**

PLAZA AT BUCKLAND HILLS, LLC – Resubdivision (2018-047) – Resubdivision to create two parcels for outbuildings out of the Plaza at Buckland Hills shopping center at 1524 Pleasant Valley Road (a.k.a. 1448 Pleasant Valley Road), resulting in three lots.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:25 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

June 4, 2018

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

\_\_\_\_\_ Eric Prause, Chairman

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