

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
JANUARY 23, 2019**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Patrick Kennedy, Acting Chairman  
Timothy Bergin, Acting Secretary  
Jessica Scorso

Alternate Members Sitting: Charles Sabia  
Julian Stoppelman

Alternates: Teresa Ike

Absent: Eric Prause, Chairman  
Michael Stebe, Secretary

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning  
Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner  
Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary

The Acting Chairman opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. The Acting Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

LA IGLESIA DE DIOS, INC. – Request a special exception under Art. II, Sec. 6.02.04 for a place of worship use at 69 North Street and 65 North Street (a.k.a. 65-67 North Street). – Special Exception (2018-129)

Attorney Stephen Penny introduced himself. Attorney Penny explained the request for a special exception use approval to permit a place of worship in a Residence C zone, along with a parking easement to serve the church use. He reported the property boundaries, noting that all surrounding properties are zoned Residence C, and stated that the property is served by public water and sewer. Attorney Penny described the prior use of the buildings, explaining that the site has fallen on hard times. He reported that the pub structure is in poor condition externally and will require work internally to meet current codes. The two-family residence sustained a fire, has been condemned by the Town, and would be removed by the applicant, though the church would like to replace it at some point in the future. Attorney Penny stated that the surrounding area consists almost exclusively of one- and two-family homes, though there are two churches and a fraternal meeting hall within in the zone.

On July 25, 2018, the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) granted the applicant a variance of Art. II, Sec. 1.00.02(e)1 of the regulations, which requires that new places of worship be located only on streets designated arterial or collector roadways, according to Attorney Penny, who noted that North Street is a local street. The applicant has the property under contract for purchase, he explained, and the record-owner of the property has signed a consent letter that is in the Planning Department's file.

Attorney Penny described the proposed use as well as aspects of the particular site. He explained that the applicant would own and use the former 4,800 sq. ft. restaurant and banquet facility as a place of worship, with no proposed changes to the footprint, though several outbuildings would be removed. He went on to describe the parking plan. Attorney Penny described the specific church use, as well as the planned yearly special anniversary service, which would attract 100-125 people.

The Plan of Conservation and Development, remarked Attorney Penny, characterizes the area as a “core neighborhood,” which in this instance extends from North School Street on the east to the Hockanum River on the west, and from North Main Street on the south to Union Pond on the north. He reported it is clear the Plan of Conservation and Development, as well as the Zoning Regulations themselves, contemplate the proposed place of worship use as a one- or two-story structure in this mixed use, though predominantly residential, neighborhood. Attorney Penny described the permitted uses and criteria in the Residence C zone as well as special exception and parking uses.

Mr. Andrew Bushnell, Professional Engineer and Licensed Land Surveyor with Bushnell Associates, introduced himself. Mr. Bushnell further described the site and the planned demolition of the home and outbuildings on the site. He displayed and explained the changes to the driveway, parking and landscaping. He reported that the building is served by city water, city sewer, natural gas and overhead utilities and the demand is not anticipated to increase. Mr. Bushnell noted other nearby sites that use on-street parking on North Street for overflow parking.

Mr. Bushnell reported that the proposed landscaped areas will be more than the 20 sq. ft. of landscaping per parking space required by the zoning regulations. He distributed pictures of the proposed landscaping and buffering, describing them in detail. The storm water plan was also illustrated.

Mr. Bergin asked if a dumpster will be added to the site. Mr. Bushnell replied that the applicant’s use will only require standard trash barrels on the curb.

Mr. Bergin inquired whether there will be any change to the outdoor lighting. Mr. Bushnell did not believe that lighting had been discussed up to this point, though he noted they would have to comply with the zoning regulations.

Ms. Scorso asked for clarification of the parking areas being removed and then reseeded, as well as the existing parking area. Mr. Bushnell demonstrated on the site plan the areas that will be removed and reseeded, and said he assumed the parking lot will be repaved. Ms. Scorso reiterated that the applicant intends to repave the parking lot and Mr. Bushnell concurred.

Mr. Sabia questioned whether the handicapped access will be a ramp or straight into the building. Mr. Bushnell informed that the handicapped access will be straight-in access. He noted that there will be regrading of the area to improve water removal.

Mr. Mark Lamson, Architectural Engineer, FLB Architecture and Planning, introduced himself. He detailed the exterior and interior changes as well as specifications of the building, noting the potential uses for each area. The exterior materials, he explained, will be essentially the same. The roof and siding will be repaired; the front will be repainted with earth tones along with a color in the white family. Signage will be minimal, as noted on the drawing, he stated. Attorney Penny referred to Art. IV, Sec. 20 of the regulations, which sets forth the criteria for special exceptions, relating each to the application.

1. Suitable location for use.
  - a. Neighborhood compatibility.
  - b. The proposal is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development.
  - c. The church is less intensive than the prior business.
2. Adequate streets for use.
  - a. North Street is not an arterial or collector roadway. However, it is only 450 ft. from the site via Wood Lane to Union Street, which is a collector roadway.
  - b. North Street and Kerry Street also connect North Main Street and Union Street with North Main, an arterial roadway, only 950 ft. from the subject site.
  - c. The proximity means that church-generated traffic will disperse from the neighborhood quickly, easily and directly with minimal impact on the residents.
  - d. The ZBA recognized the significance of the proximity to arterial and collector roadways when granting the variance to the applicant. Such proximity has been a reason cited by the ZBA several times in approving similar variances for places of worship on a local street.
  - e. The traffic impact statement submitted by the applicant concludes that “the activities proposed by this application will not have an adverse traffic impact on North or any adjacent streets” and there were no Town Staff comments that challenged the conclusion.
3. Adequate parking and access.
  - a. The 26 standard and 2 handicapped parking spaces identified on the proposed site plan meet the requirements of the zoning regulations and some of the parishioners will arrive by the church-owned van.
  - b. Town Staff comments asked about the relative need for street parking for one anniversary celebration, which would be held each year on the anniversary of having received their permits to occupy the facility.
4. Adequate public utilities.
  - a. The utility impact statement concludes that the proposed use will not have an adverse impact on the currently-utilized public utilities or existing site drainage.
  - b. The Town Engineering Staff found no issues with the applicant’s proposed use of the available public water and sewer infrastructure and there are no adverse Staff comments in that regard.
5. Suitable structures for use.
  - a. The existing building height, size and design at the formerly commercial location is compatible with the Plan of Conservation and Development.
6. Environmental protection and conservation.
  - a. The only physical change proposed is reducing the amount of impervious surface.

Attorney Penny referred to Art. II, Sec. 1.00.02(e) 4 to determine what may be required to “adequately screen adjoining residential properties” from the places of worship special exception use. Existing vegetation (landscaping) and/or natural topography (grading) may be sufficient to meet the screening requirement without the need, beyond the existing stockade fence along one boundary, for a landscape berm or masonry walls.

In conclusion, Attorney Penny noted:

- There are no Staff comments that would preclude a favorable decision.
- The proposed church use will be less impactful in the predominantly residential area than the prior commercial use.
- The use is a special exception use in the zone compatible with the immediate mixed use neighborhood contemplated by the Plan of Conservation and Development.
- The existing building is compatible in height, size and design with the neighborhood.

Attorney Penny noted that the Town Attorney is desperate to see this eyesore removed from the neighborhood. Additionally, the Town is owed substantial taxes on the property, which it stands to collect if the application is approved. He reported the bankruptcy attorney representing the current owner is very interested in seeing this sale conclude.

Mr. Stoppelman inquired where the church is moving from. Attorney Penny responded that there is a facility in East Hartford, which they will retain; this will be an additional location.

Mr. Bergin inquired about the anniversary date. Attorney Penny replied that the church will be celebrating either the date on which they obtained their permits or the date on which they take occupancy on an annual basis and, thus, the date has not been set.

Mr. Bordeaux reported two outstanding Staff comments. He stated that his comment related to the discrepancy in the number of stated attendees at the largest congregation; it was previously stated as 80 and the floor plan showed 84 seats. The second comment was from the Zoning Enforcement Officer, asking for revisions to the plans to show proposed grading for the parking lot at the entrance and the proposed grading for the two-family house to be removed.

Mr. Bordeaux read from a letter received January 17<sup>th</sup> from Ms. Martha LaFranchise, 64 North Street:

“My only concern having a church across the street from my house at 64 North Street is the parking on both sides of North Street. A few years ago there were ‘no parking’ signs on the even number side of North Street. Now these signs are no longer there. North Street is narrow and would be a hazard to fire trucks, health vans, etc. I hope you will check into the single side parking for everyone’s safety. Thank you.”

Mr. Stoppelman inquired whether there was a site plan that would be required for the actual colors to be approved. Mr. Bordeaux stated that is at the discretion of the Commission, as there is no regulation stating what the color should be.

Mr. Stoppelman contemplated whether it would be worth having it approved by the Chairman and Mr. Anderson. Mr. Anderson responded that it is not in an overlay zone, and he is not sure what authority they would have to discuss the colors, though they would be open to discussing it with the applicant.

Mr. Bordeaux reported that a work order has been placed to address the comments from Martha LaFranchise. Replacement signs for “no parking” on the east side of North Street will be placed.

**MOTION:** Mr. Bergin moved to close the public hearing on this application. Mr. Sabia seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

AMERCO REAL ESTATE COMPANY/MOSES EASON – Request a special exception per Art. II, Sec. 24.02.01 to allow self-storage and truck/trailer sharing uses at 440 Oakland Street. – Special Exception (2018-133)

Ms. Katherine Stevens introduced herself as representing Amerco and U-Haul of Central Connecticut. The special exception application is to allow self-storage and truck sharing uses and will require no change to the existing building footprint. She reported that approximately 1,900 sq. ft. of drive-up accessible storage is being proposed on the property. The applicant is proposing adaptive re-use of the Beacon Light building to include retail space and self-storage, she explained. U-Haul takes pride in adaptively re-using existing buildings to sustainably expand the buildings while revitalizing underutilized commercial spaces, Ms. Stevens said, and she projected several examples of such rehabbed buildings.

Ms. Stevens displayed the current U-Haul Center on 432 Oakland Street and the building for which the applicant has applied for special exception. She explained the details of the parking areas, as well as the preliminary floor plans and the proposed location of outdoor storage units. There are no plans to change the exterior of the building, and it will be similar to the abutting U-Haul Center in color and design, she said.

Mr. Bordeaux reported outstanding Staff comments from the Zoning Enforcement Officer, requesting that the applicant fulfill the detailed plan of development requirements for a special exception. He sought additional information on renderings of the accessory structures and details on the building elevations, floor plans and material; some of the items were provided, though the Zoning Enforcement Officer had not had an opportunity to review the additional information. According to Mr. Bordeaux, the ZEO asked for the applicant to show existing and proposed handicapped parking spaces, and to verify the plans clearly show all proposed parking areas.

**MOTION:** Mr. Bergin moved to close the public hearing on this application. Mr. Sabia seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – To revise Art. I, Sec. 2 (Definitions) to add definitions for Agri-Tourism and related terms, and to revise Art. II, Sec. 2 (Rural Residence Zones) to add Low-Impact Agri-Tourism as a permitted use and High-Impact Agri-Tourism as a special exception use. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-131)

Mr. Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner, Town of Manchester Planning Department, introduced himself. He reported that the Planning and Zoning Commission, Staff, and members of the public have collaborated in workshops and small-scale meetings to develop a set of regulations to address agri-tourism in Manchester.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that the intent of the proposed regulation is to address the Plan of Conservation and Development's Growth Management Principle (GMP) 1, Objective A3. However, he noted, to keep farms economically viable, farmers' creativity has outpaced regulations. The PZC is charged with considering impacts inherent in a zoning district where primary uses include residential and agricultural activity, Mr. Bordeaux explained.

Under the current regulations, according to Mr. Bordeaux, agriculture is undefined and is a permitted use in the Rural Residence zone. The permitted uses incorporate farming, including dairy, livestock raising, horticulture, the keeping of horses, and various accessory uses. He explained the minimum lot size in the Rural Residence zone is 30,000 sq. ft., approximately two-thirds of an acre.

One of the challenges with the Rural Residence zone and the preservation and promotion of agriculture is the minimum lot size of 30,000 sq. ft., according to Mr. Bordeaux. For a residential lot in a Rural Residence zone, that could be considered small, he stated. The proposed regulation considers definitions, many of which are being adopted straight from the State regulations, seeking consistency. The intent is to define agri-tourism and how agri-tourism uses differ from what are considered traditional agricultural activities.

Mr. Bordeaux reported the proposed amendments are as follows:

1. Definitions
  - Consistency with State regulations
2. What is Agri-Tourism?
  - How are the activities different from "traditional" farming activities?
3. Mitigation of Impacts, Suitability of Site, Preservation and Promotion of Agriculture.

#### Definitions

- Agriculture – CGS 1-1(q) or as amended.
- Agri-Tourism
  - ❖ Activity to attract visitors to view or participate
- Low-Impact Agri-Tourism
  - ❖ Activities that engage visitors in agriculture
- High-Impact Tourism
  - ❖ Activities that are enhanced by a farm setting
  - ❖ May require site improvements or structures not directly used for agriculture
- Farm Brewery – Public Act 17-160
  - ❖ Must use 25% of ingredients grown in CT in 1<sup>st</sup> year (50% in subsequent years)
- Farm Winery – 04-111

- ❖ Must grow fruit equal to/not less than 25% of amount used in manufacture of permittee's wine
- Farmers' Market – CGS 22-6r
  - ❖ Marketplace for farmers - at least two must sell CT-grown fresh produce
- Farm
- Farm Stand
- Community Garden or Urban Farm

## Agri-Tourism Activities

### Low-Impact

2 acres or greater  
 Safe access  
 Adequate internal access  
 Adequate parking  
 Compliance with other applicable regulations

### High-Impact

Requirements of Low-Impact  
 Consideration of future farm productivity  
 Consideration of impact on surrounding properties  
 Special Exception Permit

Based on feedback received from the farming community and the Commission, because the intent is for an agri-tourism activity to be an accessory to the primary agricultural activity, the proposed regulation provides that the Commission should consider the impacts of the proposed agri-tourism activity on the ability for the farm to remain in productive agricultural use in the future. Essentially, Mr. Bordeaux explained, the site will not be entirely paved, structures will not dominate the landscape, and soils will not be contaminated or eroded – the kinds of impacts that could come with a higher-intensity agri-tourism activity. He stated the Commission should also consider the impact on surrounding properties, noise and light especially, and the proposed regulation gives the Commission the jurisdiction to require conditions that may mitigate some of those impacts. Examples would include buffering, hours of operation, and similar conditions, Mr. Bordeaux explained.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that this is a special exception use and a special exception permit is required. The general criteria of Art. IV, Sec. 20 of the regulations for special exception activities will apply to a high impact agri-tourism activity. The consensus, he reported, is that there is more than enough language in that section of the regulations to provide that the proposed high-impact agri-tourism activities be compatible and suitable.

Mr. Stoppelman questioned whether farm stands are restricted to Rural Residence zones. Mr. Bordeaux stated that is correct; it is found in the general provisions for residential zones.

Mr. Stoppelman referred to parking which is usually required to be paved. Mr. Bordeaux noted that for Low-Impact Agri-Tourism Activities, Item C of the proposed regulations states: “Adequate internal access thereto and sufficient parking shall be provided in a designated area to accommodate projected visitors. Pervious parking areas are permitted.”

Mr. Bergin sought to understand how the keeping of horses moves from the definition of agriculture to high-impact and low-impact agri-tourism, and whether or not the keeping of horses

happens in Manchester on plots that are less than 2 acres. If agri-tourism is meant to occur only on farms, he considered whether or not the keeping of horses meets the definition of a farm, even if the site is greater than 2 acres, and whether that would be regulating those activities by omission in any way.

Mr. Bordeaux reported that there is a separate section that addresses the keeping of horses. While it is an agricultural activity, there are specific requirements when it comes to the keeping of horses. It was his belief that the requirements relate to a certain size lot and an additional half acre for every horse. He explained that the proposal will not have any impact on the existing regulations that apply to the keeping of horses.

Mr. Bergin questioned whether, if an individual had a tangential business related to horses, but the lot was 1.5 acres, the use would rise to the level of low-impact or high-impact agri-tourism. Additionally, he asked if it would be permitted because the place where the horses are kept does not meet the definition of farm or some other consideration based on the definitions. Mr. Bergin speculated whether that was something to be reviewed at a later date.

Mr. Anderson stated that it depends on what type of use is associated with the horses. Currently, in certain circumstances, residents may keep their own horses; commercial uses of horses are not contemplated. He did acknowledge that if it is somehow related to an agricultural use, that may be something that would need to be addressed in the future.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that there are regulations for the keeping of horses for private use, and there are regulations for the keeping of horses for commercial purposes, i.e., stabling, riding academies, etc. He asked if Mr. Bergin's question was whether or not the keeping of horses for commercial purposes would be an agri-tourism activity.

Mr. Bergin acknowledged that the definition of a farm is that its principle use is for agriculture. He asked, if a property is used as both a residence and for private or commercial use of horses, whether that would satisfy the definition of farm in the regulations and, therefore, fall under agri-tourism. The definitions of agri-tourism, as he read them, both apply to activities permitted on a farm. Mr. Bordeaux noted that it would be a farm in which owners are attracting visitors for essentially a commercial purpose. If the keeping of horses is for private use, the regulation does not apply.

Mr. Anderson raised the issue of whether the keeping of horses is considered a farm, which it is not.

Mr. Kennedy stated that when there is a specific set of regulations governing the keeping of horses, generally the more specific regulations would control the more general ones. In his opinion, this would not give people a way around the specific regulations concerning horses.

Mr. Stoppelman thanked the Commission, Staff, and the farming community for dealing with this very difficult issue. He questioned whether special events would fall under low-impact agri-tourism.

Mr. Bordeaux replied that it would depend on the attractions the public is being invited to participate in. If the use would be traditional, i.e., a corn maze or pick-your-own fruit or vegetable, those would be relatively short-term. Only so much space could be dedicated to any given crop to make it worth it to pick-your-own. Mr. Bordeaux stated that the criteria would be whether adequate parking could be provided onsite, whether there would be safe access from a public street, and whether emergency access would be possible.

Mr. Kennedy noted that high-impact agri-tourism would provide a laundry list of specific things.

Mr. Anderson described the “corn maze test.” For example, with a corn maze, patrons would go to the farm for a corn maze which would be considered low-impact.

Mr. Bergin inquired how 2 acres was selected as the number to use in the regulations.

Mr. Bordeaux responded that the original intent was to use 5 acres, which is a threshold used in other communities for the definition of a farm. The consensus was that there should be a certain amount of acreage and, because Manchester has small Rural Residence parcels, with hard work 2 acres could be productive. Depending on the use, and subject to site plan review or special exception review, the applicant must show that the site is suitable and large enough for the proposed use, he explained.

Mr. Mark Connors, 531 Lydall Street, introduced himself and distributed a handout. Mr. Connors explained that he has what he refers to as a “hobby farm.” He noted that one neighbor has a livestock/poultry farm business and his other neighbor has a horse farm. Mr. Connors relayed that he had spoken with Mr. Bordeaux about the changes to the regulations and had received a copy of the proposed changes, which he had tried to condense onto one page. He then expressed his concerns with the proposed changes and the possible complications. In his opinion, a lawyer could interpret and argue the regulations. Mr. Connors commented that he was not aware of or included in any meetings held on the subject. He posed the possibility that an interest that has nothing to do with farming could purchase two acres in the Rural Residence zone, call it a farm because they have a couple of beehives or sell some firewood, and then want to have a high-impact agri-tourism use, such as an ATV track or horse racing.

Mr. D.J. Lupacchino, 555 Lydall Street, introduced himself. He reported that he had only received the notice of the meeting a couple of days prior. Mr. Lupacchino stated that he had discussed the issue with Mr. Bordeaux and recommended that a farm should be in State 490 and should have a Reg 8, which means it is running a legitimate farm business. He explained this would narrow the scope of properties that could be classified as a farm. The State and the federal government require that a certain amount of money be made every year to qualify, he noted. Mr. Lupacchino also speculated that the Town may have to incorporate the building tax exemption for farms to push farms to a level to generate a profit and qualify for exemptions on the farm buildings.

Mr. Stoppelman questioned whether Mr. Lupacchino was referring to high-impact agri-tourism only, or both. Mr. Lupacchino reported he was referring to both high- and low-impact agri-tourism.

Mr. Fred Lea, 176 Gardner Street, introduced himself. Mr. Lea thanked Staff and the Commission for their patience and for their willingness to be open to the farmers' input. He noted he is not a large-scale farmer and he appreciates the thought that went into protecting small farmers. Mr. Lea noted he conducts no agri-tourism activities, though he welcomes visitors to his farm. He praised Mr. Bordeaux for his efforts and commented that the proposal is a great start.

Ms. Tracy Longoria, 555 Lydall Street, introduced herself. Ms. Longoria thanked Staff for their efforts. She referred to the many people who cherish her farm and its activities. There is a great deal of interest in weddings and birthday parties at farms, Ms. Longoria reported, and farming is changing.

Mr. Anderson apologized to Mr. Connors for shaking his head during Mr. Connors's testimony. He explained that it had nothing to do with Mr. Connors. Mr. Anderson referred to the definition, "a tract of land containing two acres or more and used principally for agriculture," and noted that the principal use must be agriculture; just because there is a chicken coop or firewood on a site, that does not mean that it would be considered a farm. He noted that Staff addressed many of Mr. Connors's comments in their efforts.

Mr. Connors acknowledged Mr. Anderson's explanation of the definition and reiterated the lack of notice about the meeting. Referring to his own property, Mr. Connors reported that he has two acres in the back, and speculated whether he could state that is 100% forest land and, therefore, a farm.

Mr. D. J. Lupacchino questioned Mr. Bordeaux about the procedures to adopt the regulations.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that Staff makes an application with the proposed language, distributes it to Staff for their review, and sends a copy of the proposed regulations to the Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG), who provides a report. He reported that the Planning Department issues a Public Hearing Notice two weeks in advance of the meeting and another one approximately 5-10 days prior to the meeting. The Commission then can either ask for more information or consider amendments, he explained. The Commission can either close the public hearing tonight and consider the business item or propose changes and keep the public hearing open to make revisions. He did convey that the Commission is limited by State Statutes to close the public hearing within 35 days after it is opened. Mr. Bordeaux related that the list of those who participated in the workshops was generated from the Assessor's list of people who have land in Public Act 490, and those same individuals were sent the Public Hearing Notice, which is not the ordinary practice.

In terms of Staff review, the Zoning Enforcement Officer submitted comments which Mr. Bordeaux has addressed. He informed the Commission members that the copy of the regulations in front of them is not the originally-submitted draft. One of the changes was that, in the definition of farm, the 2 acres were put into the low-impact agri-tourism criteria. According to Mr. Bordeaux, a farm is a site whose principle use is agricultural activities, but residential use may also be on site. There are provisions in the regulations for conversion of a single-family

house to a two-family house. He reported there were provisions for the amount of impervious surface permitted on a site which has been removed.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that the Planning Department submitted the application and the proposed language to CROG and read the response from CROG.

Mr. Bergin requested that Staff reiterate how an individual using their farm for low-impact agri-tourism purposes goes about seeking a special exception permit, which may address the slippery slope argument.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that the Detailed Plan of Development regulations, Art. I, Sec. 4.04, application requirements would apply. Plans would be submitted along with a narrative outlining the proposal and statements regarding traffic impacts, utility impacts, and storm water impacts. All the same provisions that would apply to other special exception applications would apply to a proposal for a high-impact agri-tourism activity.

Mr. Bergin concluded that if an individual who operated a bona fide farm were seeking more high-impact uses including retail sales, pig roasts, etc., the individual would come with more specificity and a drawn-out plan and narrative to the Commission, which would vote on the activity.

Mr. Stoppelman stated that the issue is relatively vague and he would prefer to hear from the absent members. Mr. Kennedy noted that the absent Commissioners would not vote on this application. Mr. Stoppelman assumed they would be able to express opinions.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the purpose of keeping a public hearing open would be to get more information. Many of the comments have been on draftsmanship, not the usual reasons for keeping a public hearing open.

Ms. Scorso reported that she understands what Mr. Stoppelman is stating, that he would like more input, but she feels comfortable with the current definitions and the information from the meeting. She deemed it important that there is language for high-impact agri-tourism and the mechanism to bring such items before the Commission.

**MOTION:** Mr. Bergin moved to close the public hearing. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion. Mr. Stoppelman abstained from the vote. Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Ike and Mr. Sabia voted in favor of the motion.

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 8:48 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

February 20, 2019

Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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