

**TOWN OF HADDAM
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING/MEETING
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT
THURSDAY, 5 JANUARY 2017
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

ATTENDANCE

X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
X	Arthur Kohs
X	Michael Lagace
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Carmelo Rosa
X	Edward Wallor, Secretary
X	Robert Braren, Alternate
A	Raul de Brigard, Alternate
X	Frank (Chip) Frey, Alternate
X	Liz West Glidden, Town Planner
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

Mr. Laurenza, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates

Attendance was taken and all regular members were seated.

3. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

None.

4. Public Comments

Regulation Revision Suggestion – Melissa Schlag suggested the Commission consider revising their regulations for zone change to include the mailing of a certified letter to, at the very least, the neighborhood property owners, if not up to a quarter mile around the proposed zone change.

5. Public Hearing/Public Meeting: A Petition to Change Zoning Designation from (Residential) R2 to Industrial Park for property located on the Northwestern side of Killingworth Road, Shown between 439 and 457 Killingworth Road and also Known as Tax Map 34, Lot 4-1

Jeff Polke, owner/applicant, was present.

Mr. Polke reported he is requesting a zone change from Residential to Industrial Park for a recently purchased parcel adjacent to a parcel he currently owns and was rezoned to Industrial Park on 22 September 2016. Mr. Polke stated nothing has changed in regard to his original proposal to construct a warehouse; however, the second lot will allow him additional room for building placement as well as helping the neighbors out with a little more buffering.

Jason Estes, neighboring landowner, asked if there was a ten day requirement for the posting of the public hearing sign noting that he does not believe the sign had been up for more than three days. Mr. Polke stated he posted the sign on 23 December 2016, 7:00 p.m., next to a mail box, and a photo was sent via email to Mrs. Glidden. Mrs. Glidden reported she drove by the property on 27 December 2016 and saw the sign, a Legal Notice was posted in the newspaper, and the agenda was posted on the town's website meeting the criteria of a legal notice. Mr. Estes stated he's questioning the sign requirement and again stated he does not believe the sign was posted for ten days. Mr. Polke located the email on his phone and showed it to Mr. Laurenza. Mr. Laurenza noted the email was dated 24 December 2016. Mrs. Glidden stated she would argue that the legal notice had been satisfied. Mr. Laurenza stated he's satisfied with the dated email and picture; and asked the Commission's opinion. The Commission was in agreement.

Those who spoke in favor of the proposal: Joey Benson, Larkspur Road, and Rob McKenzie, owner, CrossFit Gym, Killingworth Road, stated they both were present at the 22 September 2016 hearing to support Mr. Polke's request and support the current request for zone change. Jack Murphy, resident and local business owner, stated he was in favor of the proposal noting Mr. Polke is attempting to create additional buffer for the neighbors and he would like to see an existing business expand in town. A gentleman from Old Turnpike Road stated the proposal would be beneficial to the neighbors and would add additional tax base to the town without impacting the school system. Jody Lynn, local realtor, Saybrook Road, spoke in favor of the request noting Mr. Polke has an existing business/warehouse in Haddam and is willing to accommodate the neighbors. Ms. Lynn stated she sees no problem with moving forward with the proposed zone change.

Those who spoke against the proposal: Gail Reynolds, Killingworth Road, stated she's opposed to spot zoning noting the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) recommends development in the town centers as opposed to outside of the town centers. Mrs. Reynolds stated there are wetlands in the area, the area has residences, a church, and a business complex, and suggested there be a plan rather than haphazard planning. Mrs. Reynolds also stated she was glad the business was doing well enough to expand, but believes better planning is required. Sam Hipsher, Killingworth Road, stated he and his wife, submitted a letter at the 22 September 2016 hearing in which they addressed spot zoning. Mr. Hipsher stated the first change was made in a residential area and was not part of a major plan of development. Mr. Hipsher also stated the request should not be approved unless it's a part of an overall updating of a plan; and urged the Commission to deny the plan. Jennifer Estes, owner of 471 Killingworth Road, agreed with Mr. Hipsher's comments; and stated the neighbors should have been notified directly as it will impact their property values. Mrs. Estes also stated there should have been some kind of research done to see how it will impact the neighbors.

Mrs. Glidden asked Mrs. Estes if she lives at 471 Killingworth Road. Mrs. Estes stated no, they own the property and their daughter lives there. Mrs. Glidden asked if it's a rental property with Mrs. Estes responding yes. Mrs. Glidden then asked Mrs. Estes if they are using the property as a business. Mrs. Estes responded yes.

Mr. McKenzie stated Mr. Polke owns the property, there's no change to the original building plan concept, and the purchase of the additional land allows for more buffer for the neighbors who don't want the impact of the proposed building. Mr. McKenzie also stated this proposal would allow for more privacy.

Mrs. Estes stated the latest proposal is in between two residences. Mrs. Glidden stated those residences are rental properties. Mr. Estes stated no, the log cabin is not a rental property.

Ron Kauffman, Little City Road, asked if the proposal will go before the Inland Wetlands Commission, as a stream that runs through the property. Mr. Laurenza stated he would imagine it would. Mr. Kauffman stated the Guiliani's were required to send certified letters to everyone in the neighborhood as to their proposal when they wanted to put up a farm stand; and asked why is it now different. Mrs. Glidden stated she could not speak directly in regard to the Guiliani matter; however, in the eight years she has been Haddam's town planner there has not been a requirement to send a certified mailing. After further discussion it was determined that the Guiliani's had requested a Special Permit (a different process).

Mr. Laurenza asked Mr. Polke if he's shifting the building and combining the two parcels. Mr. Polke stated he will be requesting a lot line revision to create one parcel. Mr. Laurenza asked if this will allow him to shift the building and enhance the buffer area. Mr. Polke stated yes, and the worst case scenario would be that there would be two different building zones within one lot. Mr. Polke again stated the building will still be constructed as planned and with a lot line revision one of the side yards will move so he won't need the forty feet. Mr. Laurenza asked if the side yard was near one of residents properties. Mr. Polke again stated the purpose of the proposal is to create a better buffer for the neighbors. Mr. Laurenza asked if the side yard was near the Estes' property. Mr. Polke said the whole point of the proposal is to create a better buffer for the neighbors as he was aware the property had some challenges when he came in with the other lot.

Mr. Estes asked if spot zoning can be placed anywhere in town, will it not have a negative effect on commercial property values. Mr. Estes believes this will lower the town tax base. Mrs. Glidden stated until this property at 457 was zoned Industrial Park, the town did not have any Industrial Park Zone property and there appears to be a need for Industrial Zone land, especially Industrial Park Zone. Mrs. Glidden also stated if this proposal could have been done in the Village District or in one of the existing vacant buildings, it would have been a different situation. Mr. Estes stated it's a cost matter. Mr. Polke stated it's not about cost, but rather about the location of the property (better designed due to its location to the highway rather than having trucks driving through town). Mr. Polke agreed with Mr. Estes that there is other property in town; however, it does not lend itself to easy on and off highway access.

Jennifer Lamy, Candlewood Hill Road, stated Mr. Polke already owns one parcel and is not asking for rezoning across town, but asking for an adjoining parcel. Ms. Lamy also stated Mr. Polke will build the building no matter what; however, with this proposal he'll be allowed additional buffer area to accommodate the neighbors.

Mrs. Reynolds stated as a Commission, P&Z should think about different zones. Mrs. Reynolds asked why work on the POCD and not follow it. Mrs. Reynolds suggested perhaps this could be a mixed use zone where there is some industrial; and then the Commission could give some thought as to where this would be permissible and where it isn't, instead of doing each one individually. Mrs. Reynolds stated perhaps the Estes' are receiving an income by renting out their property, but the property is zoned residential.

Ed Schwing, Church Hill Road, stated the Commission is aware of his stance on spot zoning and the opening of a Pandora's Box noting another application for an Industrial Zone in his neighborhood. Mr. Schwing stated the Commission needs to develop a plan so people can clearly see where residential and business areas are. Mr. Schwing also stated there was industrial land in town, but it was rezoned to commercial. Mr. Schwing stated the process needs to be reviewed.

Gina Bloch, Saybrook Road, stated she has nothing against business or Mr. Polke as she patronizes his business; however, P&Z needs to be more proactive rather than reactive and look at concentrating industrial and commercial zones and trying to define the town centers better. Ms. Bloch stated a dangerous precedent could be set and believes it could create sprawl (do not want to see a Berlin Turnpike).

Nancy Hipsher, Killingworth Road, spoke in regard to comments she made at the 22 September 2016 hearing. Mrs. Hipsher stated she is in favor of business in town; however, just because there's an exit off of Route 9 does not mean it is supposed to become an industrial area. Mrs. Hipsher stated the area is residential and always has been. Mrs. Hipsher suggested Mr. Polke may want two warehouses should the Commission agree to this proposal. Mrs. Hipsher stated it was a mistake to approve an Industrial Park in the first place and told the Commission not to compound the mistake.

Ms. Schlag echoed everyone's sentiments, but stressed Mrs. Reynolds comments in regard to planning and Ms. Bloch's in regard to being proactive. Ms. Schlag stated she's happy Mr. Polke is able to expand his business and wants to keep it in Haddam, but not until there has been some formal planning. Ms. Schlag also stated there were other industrial parcels in town that could have been purchased and there are commercial parcels that could be rezoned. Ms. Schlag stated planning is the key especially with the

POCD being updated and suggested the Commission wait until the process is complete before any further spot zoning takes place.

Mr. LePard stated when he first joined the Commission, there wasn't any industrial property in the town other than a few parcels in Tylerville went to commercial due to a larger interest in commercial property. Mr. LePard stated the town needs income in order to reduce taxes and save on foreclosures, etc. Mr. LePard also stated there isn't any industrial property for someone to go to; and a comment made in the past was when it was needed P&Z could change the zoning to accommodate an industrial interest. Mr. LePard stated we can either look in the past when Connecticut Yankee was viable or we can look forward to see what we can do to relieve the residents in this town. Mr. LePard stated he's proud to be on the Commission and doing this because he believes it's what the town needs.

In regard to the POCD, Mr. LePard stated at the workshop held on 1 December 2016 a map showed 450 acres of industrial land, but the presenter was unable to say where it exists. Mr. LePard stated there is no industrial land and opportunities will be missed if the Commission does not act. Mr. LePard stated a great place to put an industrial park is at the intersection of Routes 9 and 81 on the hill to the left.

Ms. Schlag stated she understands Mr. LePard's point; however, the planning part is overlooked and the POCD process allows residents to express their opinions as to where the industrial zone should be. Ms. Schlag asked the Commission to contemplate whether this area offers enough space for more than one business. Ms. Schlag again suggested the Commission plan ahead to zone an area for an industrial park; and reminded Commission this business could be wonderful, but what happens when it sells.

Mr. Laurenza stated he's looking at the people who are supporting the proposal while the others are saying to put the industrial park in another area. Mr. Laurenza also stated if there was a meeting where the Commission was contemplating the placement of a specific zone, there would be more people saying not here or there. Mr. Laurenza stated the proposal is being asked for on a state road and not on a town road.

Mrs. Hipsher stated if the Commission responds to someone who is threatening to take his business out of town if he doesn't get his way, it's like a bully on a playground, and it's wrong. Mrs. Hipsher asked who's in charge. Mrs. Hipsher asked the Commission to hold off on advancing anything until a further study is done. Mrs. Hipsher stated there's a need for planning and no one wants this in their backyard. Mrs. Hipsher asked how much her taxes will be reduced due to the spot zoning.

In response to Mrs. Hipsher's comment, Mr. Polke stated there are a lot of things in life he doesn't mind being call, but a bully is the wrong word. Mrs. Hipsher stated she didn't call him a bully, but rather he sounds like one. Mr. Polke stated he has made no statements to the effect that he's giving the town an ultimatum that he would move his business out if he did receive the approval. Mrs. Hipsher stated Mr. LePard indicated that by stating the Commission has to respond to what comes before them if the town doesn't want to lose tax dollars. Mrs. Hipsher also stated Haddam's financial problems are nothing new as the State of Connecticut has the same financial problems and it's not going to be solved by spot zoning or enlarging the site.

Mr. Frey stated it sounds as if people would be in favor of the proposal if it were for a change to commercial zone; however, he would not be, as there is commercial and retail for a reason. Mr. Frey also stated if the Commission were to make an Industrial Park at Routes 154 and 81, there would be people complaining about that as well. Mr. Frey stated industrial cannot be put in a commercial zone. Mr. Estes asked if it makes it o.k. to be placed in a residential zone. Mr. Frey stated he did not say that. Mr. Frey stated the proposal is on a state highway as well as near one (Routes 81 and 9, respectively) and there's existing traffic from the high school, the doctor's office, and a commuter lot. Mr. Frey reiterated what Mr. LePard had stated earlier that a lot of businesses back out of here because the town doesn't want to talk; and at least this is an answer.

Mr. Polke stated Mr. Estes, technically, runs a business from his rental house. Mr. Polke described the area from the doctors' offices south, one residential lot, industrial park, Estes' rental house (although residential, a business), and then Guiliani's (no longer a pizza house, residential).

Ms. Lynn stated it's unclear as to where these other possible properties are that people keep talking about for Mr. Polke's business to relocate as there are no other industrial places in town noting, as a realtor, she has received calls looking for industrial property. Ms. Lynn also stated she was present at the 22 September 2016 hearing and did not hear the petitioner issue an ultimatum that he would take his business elsewhere if he didn't receive an approval; and that it's a misrepresentation of what took place.

Mr. Bull asked Mr. Polke if he was planning on doing a lot line revision regardless of whether or not he receives approval on the current petition. Mr. Polke stated yes. Mr. Bull asked Mrs. Glidden how this will work. Mrs. Glidden explained Mr. Polke will present a survey merging the two lots, it will be reviewed, and then filed in the Town Clerk's Office on the Land Records. Mr. Bull and Mr. Rosa asked if two separate zones could be merged. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, that it would be one lot with two separate zones (an imaginary line). Mr. Braren asked how setbacks would be determined. Mrs. Glidden stated Mr. Polke would have to keep the industrial portion exclusively on the Industrial Park Zone (no accessory uses, parking, building on the other portion); and the only thing Mr. Polke might gain was some wriggle room (setback) because he would own the entire five acres. Mr. Bull and Mr. Braren asked if he could move the building closer to the line. Mrs. Glidden stated yes. Mr. Braren asked if that option would be better rather than allowing the building to be sited on the whole lot with additional buffer. Mr. Polke stated that was the point, to help the neighbors by listening to their concerns and help with the buffer. Mr. Polke stated if not, it will be pushed more to the south. Mr. Bull asked if Mr. Polke sells the property, could another building be built close to the other lots. Ms. Lynn stated it would need to come before the Commission and receive approval. Mrs. Glidden stated that scenario would require a Special Permit and the need to come before the Commission. Mr. Polke stated it was unclear if two different buildings would be allowed under the town's regulations.

Julia Estes, Killingworth Road, stated she understands the parcel is convenient to the highway; however, people live at the adjoining Killingworth Road property and it's not something that should be placed between where people live.

Mr. McKenzie noted over the years various ventures that had been proposed in other areas of the state that were dismissed and the proposals went to other locations. Mr. McKenzie stated how economic development can be turned away, sometimes for justifiable reasons/concerns; however, at the end of the day this state hurts, it hurts businessmen and it hurts people trying to make a difference trying to pay taxes and employee people. Mr. McKenzie also stated in this instance Mr. Polke will make the property a better parcel than it currently is because he's attempting to position the building so there's less of an impact to the neighbors. Mr. Estes noted the building has not been approved.

Mrs. Estes stated she understands Mr. McKenzie's comments; however, her concerns are bigger – fear other parcels will be bought and made into industrial. Mrs. Estes also stated she took offense to Mr. Polke calling her apartment building a business.

In regard to there being no industrial land, Ms. Schlag noted approximately a year ago, the Commission rezoned industrial land to commercial. Ms. Schlag also noted these previously zone industrial lots were up for sale and would have been perfect for an industrial park. Ms. Schlag again stated planning ahead is important rather than being reactive. Mr. Laurenza stated the owner of the parcels Ms. Schlag mentioned came before the Commission requesting the zone change and noted no one was in attendance to argue the point. Mr. Laurenza also stated the owner thought it was a good move to change the zoning designation at that time as did the Commission. Ms. Schlag asked where did the Commission plan for an industrial park when the change was made.

MOTION: Art Kohs moved to close the public hearing at 7:50 p.m. Chip Frey second. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Meeting: Mr. Laurenza opened the public meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Mr. Bull asked if there would be a problem regarding the posting of the sign. Mrs. Glidden stated there is case law that would say the residents knew about the public hearing, the Legal Notice was advertised, the agenda was posted in the Town Clerk's Office and the town's website; therefore, it has met the legal notice standards. A brief discussion followed. Mr. Lagace noted there are a number of residents from the area in attendance so they're aware of the situation.

Mr. Bull stated Mr. Polke's personality has nothing to do with how the Commission will vote on the matter.

Mr. Bull stated he would argue that this was part of a plan, not a long plan, but Mrs. Glidden did present the Commission with some rough plans of the area. Mr. Bull stated this could be a nice industrial park. Mr. Bull spoke on the first change – he voted against the proposal as it was spot zoning – however, the Commission approved it and this second proposal, in his mind, is not spot zoning as there is industrial in the area and believes the proposal is now enhancing the area.

Mr. LePard stated the Commission has to be reactive noting a few years back the potential of a new drug store and how they did all they could to move it through rapidly even though in the end it did not come to fruition. Mr. LePard stated he would rather be called a reactionary commission rather than one that let everything die. Mr. LePard also stated he's proud that the Commission is doing things that are going to help the town. Mr. LePard agreed there isn't a lot of planning on Planning and Zoning noting he only plan made was the emergency access road off Gunger Hill Road were the residents had been blocked in during a storm. Mr. LePard stated perhaps Haddam can be a model for the state by being more open minded (attempting to retain or attract business) rather than rigid (loose business).

Mr. Laurenza stated the Commission's plan for a whole generation was to deny everything and now this generation is trying to recoup some of it.

Mrs. Glidden stated she can see both sides of the story noting the POCD update. Mrs. Glidden stated as hard as a planner or a commission tries to foresee things in the future, you can't always get it right. Mrs. Glidden discussed the possibility of a zoning moratorium; however, it could be a death sentence to a town that is trying to revive itself. Mrs. Glidden stated there's a need for reasonableness. Mrs. Glidden also stated if the residents would like to see more planning, they need to support funding through the Board of Finance to support marketing studies to help develop those plans.

Mr. Laurenza suggested draft language be considered for the next meeting to address the public's concerns about certified mailings to abutting property owners.

Mr. Wallor asked if the structure can be larger if the Commission approves the application before them. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, as Mr. Polke will have more land to work with and have a greater envelop to work within. Mrs. Glidden also stated Mr. Polke will need to submit a Special Permit application and provide the Commission plans showing he's capable of constructing the structure. Mr. Wallor asked if the Commission can control the size of the building under the Special permit. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, as the Special Permit allows for quite a bit of leverage.

Mr. Laurenza asked if under the old 2007 meeting minutes for the POCD if there was discussion for a plan for industrial. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, that EDC was going to form a task force to look at areas for industrial zoning. Mrs. Glidden stated although it didn't happen, there were some setbacks.

Mrs. Glidden noted that the deed showing Mr. Polke as the property owner was filed 5 January 2017.

MOTION: Steven Bull moved to approve a petition to change the zoning designation of approximately 2.45 acres from Residential to Industrial Park for the subject property. **Conditions:** None. **Exhibits:** 1. Letter addressed to Liz Glidden, Town Planner, from Jeffrey Polke of Grace Polke Associates, dated December 15, 2016. 2. Locational map. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Public Hearing/Meeting: A Petition to Allow a HOD Zoning District to be Overlain on Properties Known as 1564 Saybrook Road, and 3, 4, and 6 Brookes Court, Owned by DBP, LLC, also known as the “Brookes Property” due South of the Saybrook at Haddam.

Lisa Wadge, owner/applicant, was present.

Mr. Laurenza opened the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Ms. Wadge reported she's requesting an HOD Zoning District for a multi-family development in accordance with the POCD for the town and that the plans are generic at this time. Ms. Wadge stated it's difficult to be a developer as well as being on the Commission as no one knows the future; however, there's a need for affordable housing for work force people.

Ms. Wadge stated it's unclear what the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), Department of Public Health (DPH), and the Connecticut Water Company are going to require of her. Ms. Wadge stated the plan before the Commission is by Roger Nemergut, engineer, and rather than come before the Commission with a detailed plan felt it best to wait until the Water Company, etc., have made a decision. Ms. Wadge stated she cannot file an application with the DEEP or the water company until she receives approval from the Commission. Ms. Wadge noted the Commission will be working with the same team of people they've worked with in the past and potentially Fuss and O'Neill as well.

Mr. Laurenza asked Ms. Wadge if she is only expecting the Commission to approve the overlay for the HOD Zone. Ms. Wadge stated yes. Mrs. Glidden stated an approval will give Ms. Wadge the flexibility in development so she can move forward while retaining the commercial zoning. Mr. Laurenza stated he only wanted to clarify that the Commission would not be approving the site plan before them. Mr. Bull asked if this is a normal progression. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, and explained what the HOD Zone allows.

Mr. Laurenza stated the layout presented is subject to change once DEEP, etc., reviews the proposal. Ms. Wadge stated what she and Mr. Nemergut wanted to demonstrate was that they could comply with the town's regulations to show the parking, the coverage, the setbacks, the wells, etc. Ms. Wadge also stated there are ten plans that will work.

Mr. Bull asked how many buildings are being proposed. Ms. Wadge stated six buildings. Mr. Kohs asked two stories. Ms. Wadge stated yes. Mr. Rosa asked again if the Commission was only approving the overlay. Mrs. Glidden and Ms. Wadge stated yes. Ms. Wadge also stated the Commission is required to see something from her and she took the effort to show what the current plan is to open the dialog to obtain feedback. Ms. Wadge stated the confining items will be septic and well.

Ms. Schlag thanked Ms. Wadge for her proposal and noted this was something the Commission did plan for and that it's an excellent idea.

Mr. Schwing stated Ms. Wadge has been an anchor for Tylerville and has done tremendous work to try to create everything and bring businesses to Haddam. Mr. Schwing stated this is part of a plan and supports it.

Mr. Bull asked if each building will be 15 - two bedroom units. Ms. Wadge stated it's not allowed to do more than 15 units. Mr. Bull stated there are density guidelines and asked Mrs. Glidden if the proposal will work on the parcel. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, but again noted the Commission is not approving the plans. The plans are just demonstrating the applicant can meet the density requirements on the acreage. The Commission is only approving the zoning change (the overlay). Mrs. Glidden reported that a very dense application will be presented (financials, architectural renderings, etc.). Ms. Wadge stated a lot of thought was put into this to come up with the matrix that worked for both zoning, water, and sewer (has been reviewed by Jeff Jacobson, town engineer, Nathan L. Jacobson and Associates; Fuss and O'Neill; DEEP; the Connecticut Water Company). Ms. Wadge stated there will be some changes, but does not anticipate radical changes.

Mr. Laurenza asked if DEEP had provided a time line on how quick this will take once they get started. Ms. Wadge stated she has heard two different things –1) if zone approved and application complete, six months and 2) one year. Ms. Wadge stated she thinks possibly six to nine months and that she and Mr. Nemergut will be working on the application with the assistance of Mr. Jacobson.

MOTION: Art Kohs moved to close the public hearing at 8:20 p.m. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Meeting: Mr. Laurenza opened the public meeting 8:20 p.m..

Mr. Bull questioned the numbers in the motion as read by Mr. Rosa. Mrs. Glidden stated it is a bit confusing as there are lot numbers and street numbers and they're similar.

Mr. Rosa read into the record a letter from Lisa Wadge, Member DBP, LLC, dated 12/12/16 (on file in the Land Use Dept.)

MOTION: Carmelo Rosa moved to approve a petition to allow an HOD zoning district to be overlaid on properties known as 1564 Saybrook Road, and 3, 4, and 6 Brookes Court, owned by DBP, LLC, also known as the "Brookes property" due south of the Saybrook at Haddam. **Conditions:** None. **Exhibits:** 1. Letter addressed to Liz Glidden, Town Planner, from DBP, LLC dated 12/12/16. 2. Locational map. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Continuation: Public Hearing/Public Meeting: Text Amendment to the *Haddam Zoning Regulations* to Revise the Open Space Requirements for the Industrial Park Zone as Shown in Section 9.5 of the Zoning Regulations.

This is a continuation of the public hearing from Thursday, 15 December 2016.

Mr. Laurenza reopened the public hearing at 8:30 p.m.

Mrs. Glidden reported the text amendments have been on file at the Town Clerk's Office and reviewed the proposed amendments with the Commission. The section removed concerned the open space to floor ratio (Section 9.5 second paragraph and subsections A, B, C, and D). Mrs. Glidden reported there are still setbacks and standards in place.

Ms. Schlag asked for clarification for the setback from any property line. Mrs. Glidden stated for the Industrial Park the minimum front yard is 70 feet and the side yard is 30 feet, but it's an aggregate of 70; therefore, it would be 30 feet on one side and 40 feet on the other side. The minimum rear yard is 40 feet; maximum height is 35 feet; and maximum percent of land coverage is 30 percent.

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to close the public hearing at 8:35 p.m. Carmelo Rosa second. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Meeting: Mr. Laurenza opened the public meeting at 8:35 p.m.

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to approve the amendment of Town of Haddam Zoning Regulations Section 9.5 of the Industrial Park Zone as drafted and attached. **Conditions:** 1. Standard Permit Conditions. 2. Special Conditions/Modifications – No. Carmelo Rosa second. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

Correction to the 15 December 2016 minutes: page 5, third paragraph, first sentence – change "why" to "way".

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to approve the 15 December 2016 minutes as amended. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried with Mr. Laurenza and Mr. Frey abstaining.

9. Chairman's Report

None.

10. Scheduling of Hearings

Mrs. Glidden reported on the following:

Continuation: Petition to Change Zoning Designation from (Residential) R2 to (Industrial) I-1 for a 6 acre Parcel on Beaver Meadow Road, owned by Gilbert Madore and Shown on Tax Map 46, Lot 2 and a Special Permit to allow for Material Processing on Site and the Outdoor Storage of Materials – hearing/meeting continued to 19 January 2017.

Site Walk: Interior Lot off Beaver Meadow Road, Map 46, Lot 002, Proposed Activity: Zoning Change from R1 to I1, Special Permit for Outdoor Storage and Processing of Materials - Saturday, 7 January 2017, 10:00 a.m.

11. Town Planner's Report

Text Amendment Revision – Notification of Application – Mr. Laurenza asked that an amendment be made in regard to notify the neighbors. Mrs. Glidden will generate a draft and have it available for review at the 19 January 2017 meeting.

12. Adjournment

MOTION: Art Kohs moved to adjourn. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner

Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 19 January 2017.