

**TOWN OF HADDAM
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT
THURSDAY, 5 APRIL 2018
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

ATTENDANCE

X	Gina Block
X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
X	Michael Farina
A	Arthur Kohs
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Edward Wallor, Secretary
X	Robert Braren, Alternate
X	Frank (Chip) Frey, Alternate - Seated
A	Diane Waddle Stock, 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. Pledge of Allegiance

The pledge was recited.

3. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates

Attendance was taken and all regular members as well as Mr. Frey, alternate member, were seated.

4. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

There were no additions/corrections to the agenda.

5. Public Comments

None.

6. CONTINUED Public Hearing: A Site Plan Review of a Proposed Site Development Plan for a 7,500 Square Foot Retail Building and Associated Parking for Property known as 85 Bridge Road and Shown on Tax Map 49 Lot 26.

Robin Pearson, Esq., Alter and Pearson, representing MCG Partners, LLC, and Matt Bruton, Professional Engineer, Principal, BL Companies, were present.

Ms. Pearson stated since the initially presentation, a lot of questions have been raised as well as comments from the public that have been considered. The building as originally presented was a 9,100

square feet and has been reduced to 7,544 square foot structure. Parking spaces have been reduced as requested. Where concern was expressed significant changes have been made to certain facades of the building. The Commission is aware the materials being used are of high quality and a significant amount of additional landscaping has been included. The applicant has also responded to all of the staff engineering reviews from Jeff Jacobson, P.E., Nathan L. Jacobson and Associates, and has met those concerns and answered questions. Ms. Pearson stated the building was moved closer to the road. In regard to moving the building closer to the road and removing the parking from the front of the building, Ms. Pearson reported the building has been moved closer to the road and a row of parking was removed to accommodate this. Ms. Pearson stated there was a meeting with Mrs. Glidden after the site walk, discussion followed with the clients, but in order to make the building viable it wasn't possible to remove all of the parking from the front.

Mr. Bruton reported the commercially zoned parcel is slightly over one acre and is currently vacant. Using the map, Mr. Bruton pointed out the abutters and reviewed the following: topography slopes from Bridge Road to the back of the site; there are no wetlands on the property; and the property is located in FEMA Flood Zone X (above 500 year flood level). Mr. Bruton stated there is an existing driveway as well as an existing ten foot wide drainage easement for the DOT drainage collected along Bridge Road.

Mr. Bruton stated the proposal calls for a 7,500 square foot retail building with 27 paved parking spaces. Application complies with all building and parking setbacks and zoning regulations. Loading has been moved to the rear of the building along with a dumpster pad and loading door. Future pedestrian connection to River Valley Provisions, Tony's Package Store, and Steady Habit Brewery and a sidewalk to the front along Bridge Road have been added. There will be one single access driveway to Bridge Road and will have to go to DOT for an Encroachment Permit if approval is granted. Utilities – electric, telephone, gas, well, and septic - are available either on site or in the right-of-way. Will be increasing the impervious surface and have provided a stormwater management system (underground retention system) located in the parking lot to attenuate peak flows off site and has been reviewed by Nathan L. Jacobson and Associates. The system also provides water quality requiring 80 percent total suspended solids (TSS) removal through a variety of catch basins - sumps and hoods, underground retention, separator.

Mr. Bruton reported erosion control during construction will include silt sacks and fencing, construction entrances, soil stockpile areas, and erosion control blankets during the construction process. Once stabilized, a hardy landscaping plan, worked out with town staff, will be implemented.

Mr. Bruton reviewed the building elevations: still a single story, slab on grade, with a façade having a peaked roof with a cupola with an applied mansard with architectural shingles on all three sides of the building. Spandrel windows (look like windows, but can't see through them) on all three sides – four on the front and three each on the long sides of the structure. Photo of windows submitted (Exhibit A). Brick wainscoting and HardiePlank will be used on all four sides of the structure. Mr. Bruton stated currently there is no tenant for the building.

Mr. Bruton stated the building complies with building and parking setbacks within the zoning regulations. The main reason for not moving the structure further forward is due to the truck movements (unloading on the street not allowed by DOT or the town) and topography. Mr. Bruton explained how the truck will enter the site, turn left into the parking lane, and then back down the side of the structure to the loading area. Discussion followed in regard to the topography and the DOT drainage easement. If parking were moved to the rear, fill would be required which would reduce the volume in the depression causing offsite flooding issues and a retaining wall would also need to be constructed for public safety reasons. Mr. Bruton stated based on town comments, the height of the retaining walls have been minimized and if pushed further forward the height of the side retaining walls would have been greater.

Ms. Pearson asked Mr. Bruton to address the handicapped parking and the plantings in response to staff comments. Mr. Bruton stated the majority of the parking is to the side and the rear of the structure with one row of parking to the front with two handicapped spaces. Mr. Bruton noted a crosswalk has been added.

Mr. Bruton reviewed the landscaping plan: 1) Majority of the lot will be sod (front) and seed (side and rear). 2) A variety of street trees will be planted to the front, spread around the perimeter, and the parking lot. 3) A row of trees will be planted along the abutting industrial zone/residential use (Botelle property). 4) At Mrs. Glidden's request, foundation plantings to the front, side, and rear of the structure will be installed. Ms. Pearson noted all plantings are native.

A brief discussion followed in regard to how much of the foundation would be exposed with the structure moved forward (less exposure). Mr. Bull stated fill will be required to install the service entry and dumpster area and suggested additional parking be placed to the rear allowing for the delivery trucks to have more room to maneuver. Mr. Bruton stated if the structure were moved all the way forward, there would not be sufficient room for the truck to turn around at the rear of the building. Mr. Braren stated a considerable amount of fill would be required to achieve Mr. Bull's suggestion. Mr. Bruton stated consideration was made to pull the structure forward; however, sightlines for the abutting businesses also had to be considered. Mr. Frey asked if a different truck could be used for deliveries. Mr. Bruton stated for any commercial applicant that would use the building, the same size truck would be used.

Ms. Block stated in the first set of plans she preferred the scale and the proportion of the gable in reference to the roofline. From the side it's very low and narrow and accentuates the length of the side of the building and the front gable and the cupola, there's more space. Mr. Bruton asked if Ms. Block was referring to the height of the building compared to the width of it. Ms. Block again reviewed her comments noting the new plans don't seem to be in proportion. Mr. Bruton stated based on comments from town staff, the building was shrunk (lost almost 2,000 square feet) and adding the windows and mansard gave it a New England look. Ms. Block voiced appreciation to the applicant's efforts to address the Commission's and staff's comments.

Mr. Frey asked if the photo is strictly for the windows with Mr. Bruton responding yes. Mr. Frey asked if the roof top units will be screened. Mr. Bruton stated they will be screened with a solid fence so as not to be visible from the rear and are not visible from the front or the sides with the mansard. The mansard is not in the rear as the roof sheets to the back (opening for stormwater to be collected and piped to the system). Mr. Braren stated this will never be seen flat on.

Mr. Farina stated the applicant has done their due diligence; and although some people do not like the idea of the structure, but it's a good start for what is trying to be obtained in Tylerville. Mr. Bruton stated they worked hard to accommodate everyone as best as they could.

Mr. Braren asked if the brick is full or veneer. Mr. Bruton stated it's a brick façade with thin brick veneer on all four sides. Mr. Bruton also stated the foundation is a stamped brick pattern.

Mr. Farina asked the type of parking lights being proposed. Mr. Bruton stated on the building goose neck down lighting and in the parking lot LED dark sky compliant full cut off fixtures minimum for safety and security is being proposed. Noted that there will be no wash to the abutters. Mrs. Glidden asked if there was a detail for the site lighting. Mr. Bruton stated he did not have it with him, but would provide it. Mr. Frey stated two goose neck site lights are being shown to the front and side of the building; whereas, on the elevations it shows four and six - two over each window and one pole over by the dumpster. Mr. Bruton stated he believes there is only one light pole and there are two lights per window and four in the front for signage.

On Plan LL-1 Mr. Frey stated the area towards the crosswalk is not planted and asked why not. Mr. Bruton stated that area is a striped island and that a raised island is located towards the rear of the building as well as plantings along the side foundation to create a greenspace.

Ms. Block asked if there a reason why the windows were switched from the two over two's to the more updated windows being shown. Mr. Bruton stated no reason he's aware of. Ms. Block asked if there was time to reconsider changing the windows back. Mr. Bruton stated he believes the adjustment can be made.

Mr. Bull asked what the trucks are backing up to at the rear of the building (no loading dock). Mr. Bruton stated the previous orientation had a loading area; however, the feedback from the Commission was that it shouldn't be visible from the street. To accommodate that request, the loading door has been moved around the corner of the building. The truck will park and the driver will unload and walk the product to the back door. The truck will not turn to the back of the building.

Mr. Bull stated the roof on the side is very narrow. Mr. Bruton stated it's a mansard. Mr. Bull asked if it were possible to go higher. Mr. Bruton stated he believes there's a couple of feet of mansard, but will speak to the architect to see if it's adjustable. Mr. Braren stated the gable is narrower than the previous version and asked if something could be done (perhaps an overhang over the roof).

Maurice Adams voiced concern over the proposal noting the POCD and bringing people into the town through tourism. Mr. Adams talked about looking at the facility in terms of what's actually going to be in it (inside is the attraction) or not considering what's inside of it (outside the attraction) or it being a strip center (one that contributes v. one that doesn't contribute). Mr. Adams stated he does not believe this is the best Haddam can do. Mr. Frey stated he felt Mr. Adams comments would be better served under Item #8 - Public Comments Regarding Tylerville Zoning Regulations; and that he would be interested in hearing more. In conclusion, Mr. Adams stated this proposal is a long term deal; and asked does it fit in with the POCD and what the residents want the community to be.

Larry Maggi, Fire Works, stated the applicant has come in and provided what everyone has asked for. As a business owner, Mr. Maggi stated the applicant has done her homework, given what's been asked, and supports the proposal.

Alan Aronow stated he wrote an article about the demolition of an historic building (Shailer-Banning House) on Bridge Road without any knowledge about the retailer coming to Haddam. Mr. Aronow stated he was a site selector for corporations and explained the business plan. Mr. Aronow submitted an article, "Grocery Wars Turn Small Chains Into Battlefield Casualties", The New York Times, 03/26/2018, into the record (Exhibit B). Mr. Aronow stated the Commission can make the physical plan much more demanding than what is being submitted. Mr. Aronow voiced concern over this location compromising the future of Bridge Road and that the proposal will not enhance the value of Bridge Road, but rather reduce it in the next 25 years. Mr. Aronow asked if anyone thought this proposal would enhance Tylerville, the future of tourism in town, or follows the POCD. Mr. Aronow stated the least the Commission can do is to demand the building have character.

Karen Blaschik, Alan's Small Engine, stated based on the photos she has seen of the proposal she supports the project. Mrs. Blaschik also stated she doesn't believe the proposal will harm the future of Bridge Road or tourism in town. Mrs. Blaschik stated existing buildings in Tylerville are not like those in Chester, Essex, or Mystic; and in order to achieve that, all structures would need to be torn down and start from scratch. Mrs. Blaschik spoke in regard to the traffic on Bridge Road and it not being a pedestrian friendly road.

Jonathan Sibley, 95 Bridge Road, asked what is the mechanical stop (fencing) of people using the generous parking lot for River Valley Provisions, Tony's Package Store, and Steady Habit Brewery, to cut across and use the proposed facility.

Patrick Pinnell, architect and planner, stated looking at the offsite effects of traffic does fall within the Commission's prevue for Site Plan Review; and as yet, he has not heard any commentary from the traffic engineer or the engineer present about the effect of the additional traffic on the queuing for the swing bridge. Mr. Pinnell stated traffic is an issue and at the very least there should be some concrete answers. Mr. Pinnell also stated there is a new retail establishment in Hartford exactly like this proposal with the initials D.G. only with parking in the rear. Mr. Pinnell stated in his opinion a different size vehicle could be used to make deliveries as D.G. does have varying sized vehicles.

Lou Milardo, River's Edge Tile and Carpet and Milardo Builders, stated the applicant is trying to their best and they've done all that has been asked of them. Mr. Milardo also stated if all parking were to the back of the building, no one would stop. Mr. Milardo felt if the building were moved closer to the road, it would be an eye sore and will block off the visual to River Valley Provisions, Tony's Package Store, and Steady Habit Brewery. Mr. Milardo talked about traffic on Bridge Road especially during the summer and when the swing bridge is open. Mr. Milardo stated the town needs business, but it cannot support mom and pop stores.

Gianna Milardo, River's Edge Tile and Carpet, stated in terms of tourism, the most beautiful building (Shailer-Banning House) was torn down. Mrs. Milardo stated she feels bad for River Valley Provisions due to the proposed building being moved forward; and in terms of the parking, if she doesn't see cars around a building, she won't stop.

Mr. Aronow stated he's sympathetic to the designer and that the retailer wanted this parcel for a reason (noted what will be siphoned off of the other business; referred to it as "catfish" - it feeds off other businesses). Mr. Aronow stated this type of business will hurt anyone who sells potato chips, soda, etc. Mr. Aronow stated on 02/12/2018 the stock in Dollar General dropped due to President Trump stating he was eliminating food stamps (the majority of its business is food stamps). Mr. Aronow stated this type of business will not enhance the Bridge Road corridor and suggested the Commission look at the Dollar Generals where towns have been demanding.

Mr. Sibley talked about the nature of the business not being the concern of the Commission so long as it conforms to the regulations. Mr. Sibley stated the town needs business, tax ratable property, and whatever business goes on the site, hopefully, it succeeds.

Mr. Laurenza stated he would like to see additional trees and the installation of a fence to stop people from going through Mr. Sibley's parking lot. Mr. Bull stated a fence should be installed at the expense of the property owner who does not want the people using his parking. Mrs. Glidden stated there had been discussion in regard to stub parking with the idea that if 95 Bridge Road would like to connect it.

Mr. Farina asked if there is any way to control the hours of deliveries or suggest delivery hours. Mrs. Glidden stated no, noting this is a Site Plan Review and a Statement of Use was provided.

Mr. Bull stated he wished Mr. Aronow and Mr. Adams had come to the meetings earlier in the process as he believes there's merit in demanding a better building.

Mr. LePard stated what has been presented is very good noting the Commission is dealing with commercial zoning and having two nice commercial buildings on Bridge Road is progress. Mr. LePard also stated to dwell on how pretty the building is is a waste of time, the applicant has done enough, and it's time to move ahead.

Alan Blaschik, Alan's Small Engine, stated the applicant has done everything the Commission has asked for and the Commission is still picking them a part.

Mr. Sibley stated his structure is a pre-engineered steel building. Mr. Sibley also stated the applicant has put a lot of effort into the proposal and it's a good project.

Lisa Wadge, owner of 85 Bridge Road, stated that her neighbors are present and all are in favor of the project. Ms. Wadge stated the application meets the current requirements and is very proud to be a part of the project.

Ms. Pearson stated the applicant has met the requirements of the town's regulations and they have moved the structure as far forward as feasible. Ms. Pearson asked Mr. Bruton to submit a response

letter from Mathew Bruton, P.E., BL Companies to Liz Glidden, Town Planner, dated 03/16/2018, as to why this wasn't feasible (Exhibit C). Ms. Pearson stated the building may not be the most attractive, but it goes beyond what others may have done under a similar situation. Ms. Pearson spoke in regard to the materials and plantings to be used.

In regard to the request to raise the roof, Ms. Pearson report Mr. Bruton sent a text message to the architect to see if it could be done; and yes, it can (the height of the mansard and the depth of the peak façade). Ms. Pearson stated no lease has been signed at this time; therefore, she was unable to say who the tenant would be. Ms. Pearson also stated there will be a landscaped strip between the back of the store and River Valley Provisions and doesn't believe it will be an impediment to the adjoining property. Ms. Pearson stated she's familiar with the site Mr. Pinnell spoke of and the reason for that structure being brought to the front was due to the parcel. Ms. Pearson stated the Commission is not deciding the appropriateness of one tenant over another; but rather a set of design standards – Site Plan Review. Ms. Pearson stated a good faith effort was made with this application.

Mr. Bruton stated that the pedestrian crosswalk and the stub driveway were added at the request of town staff and that he doesn't believe parking will be spilling over onto another parcel. In terms of traffic, a traffic impact study was submitted and the results of that are that the sightlines are adequate. Mr. Bruton stated the level of service at the store will not affect the traffic on Bridge Road and DOT will have full control over the driveway and will also receive the traffic impact study. Mr. Bruton also stated the dumpster is tucked behind the building with a vinyl fence on top of the retaining wall. Mr. Bruton addressed comments pertaining to the Hartford site.

Mr. Frey asked about signage. Mr. Bruton stated a proposed sign location at the driveway is shown on the plans, but it's unclear who the tenant will be and will return to the town once that's known.

Mr. Sibley stated the only way any development in Tylerville will happen is by the people who are putting their money into the market. Mr. Sibley also stated perhaps it would be best to have those who have a vested interest be the ones to come up with some sort of a consensus regarding Tylerville.

Mr. Adams stated other people have interest in the town and again talked about the POCD. Mr. Adams suggested instead of brick veneer, Haddam granite be used.

MOTION: Wayne LePard moved to close the public hearing at 8:25 p.m. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Public Meeting: A Site Plan Review of a Proposed Site Development Plan for a 7,500 Square Foot Retail Building and Associated Parking for Property known as 85 Bridge Road and Shown on Tax Map 49 Lot 26

Robin Pearson, Esq., Alter and Pearson, and Matt Bruton, Professional Engineer, Principal, BL Companies, were present.

Mr. Bull asked about the setback from the street. Mrs. Glidden stated it's a 30 foot setback (minimum). The proposal does not violate the regulations. Mr. Bull stated Mr. Aronow and Mr. Adams both brought up good ideas, but due to the application being a Site Review, the comments cannot be addressed. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, and that she's hearing concerning about the potential end user. Mrs. Glidden also stated Tylerville needs to have different regulations and design guidelines that will direct growth and the way buildings look. Mrs. Glidden stated the application has come a long way; and as the Commission considers its vote, it shouldn't be about the end user, but about how the building looks.

Mr. Bull stated under the current regulations he sees no reason to deny the application. Mr. Bull also stated it's a nice looking building even though it's a Butler builder.

Mr. LePard stated there are two big projects taking place simultaneously – 1) look at an application under the old zoning regulations and 2) forming new village regulations. Mr. LePard felt the Commission should finish what's before them first (approve it) and then move on to the village regulations. Discussion followed in regard to the Commission trying to raise the bar in the quality of design that is presented whether a national franchise or a small business (they have to be held to the same standard).

Mrs. Glidden stated she had heard possibly two other conditions: two over two windows and to raise the height of the mansard roof and the depth of the peak.

Mr. Frey asked Mr. Braren, an architect, his opinion in regard to the windows and the roof. Mr. Braren stated in regard to the windows it would be a preference; and in regard to the roof he felt the mansard should be taller, but how to achieve that is in question.

Mr. Bull apologized for a comment he had made earlier noting that it was not meant to offend only to point out the style of the building.

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to approve a site plan for a 7,544 square foot retail building proposed at 85 Bridge Road, per submitted plans dated January 9, 2018, part of a 17 page set, titled as "Land Development Plans Issued for Site Plan Application for Proposed Retail Development" drawn by Jeffrey Bord, P.E. with BL Companies, and revised March 22, 2018 and titled the same. **Conditions:** 1. That all the suggested conditions outlined in April 4, 2018 memo from Geoffrey Jacobson, P.E., be included as a condition of approval. These include: A revised lighting plan to be submitted to the Town Planner for approval, a permanent pedestrian access easement, an as-built drawing for the modified depression and berm and for the subsurface stormwater detention system and outlet control structure, and a CTDOT Encroachment Permit be submitted prior to initiating site work. 2. Two over two windows. 3. Increase the height of the mansard roof, widen the gable to minimize narrow appearance suitable to the approval of the town planner. **Exhibits:** 1. Application for site plan review received in the Land Use Office on January 3, 2018. 2. Statement of Use for 85 Bridge Road, dated January 3, 2018, and signed by Gary Eucalitto of Garrett Homes, LLC. 3. A 17 page set of plans titled as "Land Development Plans Issued for Site Plan Application for Proposed Retail Development" drawn by Jeffrey Bord, P.E. with BL Companies, for 85 Bridge Road, dated January 3, 2018, with revisions dated February 13, March 5, and March 22, 2018, and titled the same. 4. Traffic Impact Study Proposed Retail Store, 85 Bridge Road, Haddam CT prepared by BL Companies, dated February 2018. 5. Stormwater Management Report for the retail development located at 85 Bridge Road, prepared by BL Companies, dated January 3, 2018 and revised January 13, 2018. 6. Comment Review Letter from Geoffrey Jacobson, P.E., consulting engineer for the Town of Haddam, addressed to Mrs. Liz Glidden and dated January 18, 2018. 7. Comment Review Letter to Matthew Burton, P.E. from Liz Glidden, Town Planner, dated February 5, 2018. 8. Memorandum from Andrew Chakraborty, P.E. to Liz Glidden titled "traffic memo" and dated 12/28/17. 9. Review letter submitted by Ryan Grenon, MPA of the CT River Area Health District and dated January 23, 2018. 10. Legal Notice in Haddam News printed 2/1/18 and 2/8/18. 11. Response letter dated February 13, 2018 from Mathew Bruton, P.E. to Geoffrey Jacobson P.E. 12. Response letter dated February 13, 2018 from Mathew Bruton, P.E. to Liz Glidden, Town Planner. 13. Letter dated February 28, 2018, from Robin Messier Pearson, Esq. to Jamin Laurenza, Chairman, Planning and Zoning Commission, consenting to an extension of time for hearing on 85 Bridge Road, Haddam, CT. 14. Review Letter dated April 3, 2018 to Jamin Laurenza, PZC chairman from Liz Glidden, Town Planner. 15. Review letter to Liz Glidden, Town Planner from consulting engineer Jeff Jacobson P.E. dated April 4, 2018. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Discussion Regarding Zoning Regulations for the Tylerville Area

Mrs. Glidden reported she is merely looking for comments, corrections, and discussion and that she would like to be able to put them on the web to share with everyone in order to get feedback.

Design Guidelines - Mr. Bull felt the guidelines were repetitive and suggested it be bulleted and then go into detail only once. Mr. Bull also felt chain link fencing should be prohibited. Mrs. Glidden stated she was hesitant to prohibit chain link fence noting these are only guidelines. Mrs. Glidden also stated the intent was for fencing between properties. Discussion followed with Mr. Frey asking if anyone had noticed the chain link vinyl coated fence at the pharmacy (in front of the dumpsters).

Mr. Frey stated under Sense of Place, Item D, he felt board and batten wood should be included. Mr. LePard stated he thought Handie board also made board and batten.

Ms. Block stated under Sense of Place, Item C asked if up lighting for plantings could be added. Mr. Frey stated it can be difficult with signs and it's pushing dark sky. Mrs. Glidden stated she could word it as "accent lighting"; however, she's hesitant to include it noting dark sky was mentioned in the POCD.

Mr. Frey talked about roof heights, etc., under Scale and Character Mrs. Glidden stated cupola, weather-vanes, etc., are exempt. Mr. Wallor asked if a cupola is exempt in the Gateway. Mrs. Glidden reviewed the definition of height.

Mr. Frey asked what an off-site sign was. Mrs. Glidden stated something like "Great food! 200 feet ahead." or a sign promoting a business on another businesses' property.

Section 7C - Connecticut River District – Mrs. Glidden reviewed the properties that would be included in this district. Mr. LePard asked if the Commission will be doing both districts at one time. Mrs. Glidden stated yes. Mr. LePard asked why not leave these properties commercial. Discussion followed. Mrs. Glidden asked the Commission to review for the next meeting and that she hopes to have a proposed map by then.

9. Public Comments Regarding Tylerville Zoning Regulations

Donna Torza asked for an explanation of internal lighting. Mr. Frey stated a plastic box with a light inside it. Ms. Torza asked if there were any of these types of lights currently in the town. Mrs. Glidden stated yes; and if these types of lights exist currently, they will be grandfathered in, but new ones will not be allowed.

Lisa Malloy asked if the design criteria would be able available for the public to review. Mr. Laurenza stated he had decided to hand the guidelines out to the Commission to allow for review and then place it on the web.

Ms. Wadge thanked the Commission for their time and made two comments in regard to the POCD. 1) Didn't understand what would be read into the POCD and it wasn't a comprehensive study. Walkability is problematic. 2) Doesn't know what the village district covers. Requested DBP property on Brookes Court not be included in the district. Ms. Wadge claimed she had lost a buyer due to the moratorium. Ms. Wadge asked if a map of the village district is available. Mrs. Glidden stated she hopes to have a map available on the web next week. Mrs. Glidden also stated there are a number of opportunities on the DBP property (commercial and Housing Opportunity District).

Ed Schwing stated the Commission should have a map to start with to know the geographic area. Mrs. Glidden stated a map will be available for the hearing. Mr. Laurenza stated there have been several draft maps over the past few weeks that the Commission have been working on, but there is nothing in stone to date.

Melissa Schlag stated she understands the Commission is trying to control the look of certain properties and to request certain things on site plans. Ms. Schlag also stated she would like to see the either the

ZEO or the town planner check that these items whether originally on the plan or a condition of approval are being addressed. Mr. Frey stated people are doing their jobs. Mr. LePard stated that's called "closure". Mrs. Glidden talked about the various transitions of planners over the years.

Mr. Schwing stated he was encouraged to see the neighbors and the owners in the area taking part in the process. Mr. Schwing stated he hopes the Commission will take their comments into consideration.

10. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

MOTION: Ed Wallor moved to approve the 29 March 2018 minutes as submitted. Steve Bull second. Motion carried with Mr. LePard abstaining.

11. Chairman's Report

None.

12. Scheduling of Hearings

Mrs. Glidden reported the hearing originally scheduled for 04/19/2018 will more than likely be opened and immediately continued as the plans have changed.

Mr. Laurenza asked if a barn is going in on Route 154 near Old Cart Road. Mr. LePard stated it's a garage.

13. Town Planner's Report

None.

14. Adjournment

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to adjourn. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner

Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 12 April 2018, 7:00 p.m.