

**TOWN OF HADDAM
 PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
 PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING
 TOWN HALL
 21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT
 THURSDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 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	Richard Roberts, Esq., Halloran and Sage, Land Use Counsel for the Commission
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 well as Mr. Frey, alternate member, were seated.

4. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

Mr. LePard questioned the reciting of the pledge. Mr. Laurenza stated he had been asked by a few people about reciting the pledge and didn't think anyone would be opposed to it.

There were no additions/corrections to the agenda.

5. Public Comments

Marge DeBold asked for a copy of the agenda.

6. Public Hearing: A Site Plan review of a Proposed Site Development Plan for a 9,100 Square Foot Retail Building and Associated Parking for Property known as 85 Bridge Road and Shown on Tax Map 49 Lot 26

William Fries, Senior Project Manager, Principal, BL Companies; Fred Greenberg, Traffic Engineer, Principal, BL Companies; Douglas Grunert, Project Manager, BKA Architects; and Lisa Wadge, representing the owner, HWGA; were present.

Using a map, Mr. Fries reported the property is located within a C-1 Zone and is approximately 1.13 acres. The proposal calls for a 9,100 square foot retail building, 31 parking spaces (as required) and parking to the front and side of the building, full access off Bridge Road (will require DOT approval; DOT Encroachment Permit to be submitted depending on the outcome of the hearing), loading area to the back right corner of the building, fully enclosed dumpster area (two dumpsters). Site will be serviced by electric and telephone, drainage handled by an underground recharge area (meeting pre-imposed flows), catch basins with sumps to collect all of the total suspended solids in the system, site slopes from Route 82 down to the back of the site, and meet all of the bulk standards for the C-1 Zone for parking, setbacks, and building coverages. Signage: monument sign to the front of the building that will be under or right at the allowable square footage (32 square feet) and a building sign. Landscaping: two trees (one tree per every 21 parking spaces required), five street trees, and a couple of more along the side. An existing well is on site (approvals and operating in hand). Mr. Fries noted there will be a water line project coming through and they will be required to tie into it. A septic system to the rear of the site is proposed and plans have been submitted to Dept. of Public Health (DPH) and are currently under review.

As the architect had not yet arrived, Mr. Fries gave a brief overview of the architecture: New England style building, cupola on the roof, gable roof, clapboard siding, some brick at the bottom of the structure for the water table, and HVAC system on the roof (screening to be provided). Mr. Fries noted that the side elevation shows where it drops. Mrs. Glidden asked for the elevations to be brought closer and if the metal panels are still there. Mr. Fries stated he believes so. Mrs. Glidden stated on the east side of the structure (visible as traveling towards the swing bridge) there are windows and brick trim, but on the west side (traveling towards Route 154) there is metal siding and exposed concrete foundation. Mr. Fries stated yes. Mr. Bull asked if there was a reason for this. Mr. Fries stated he would need to check with the architect, but it may have to do with the way the interior is laid out and how the grade drops off.

Mr. Frey asked if the windows are faux windows or real windows. Mr. Fries stated he believed they were faux windows. Mr. Frey and Mr. Bull stated faux windows could be placed on the other side of the structure as well. Mr. Fries stated he would check with the architect.

Jim McHutchison, Haddam Neck, asked for faux to be defined. Mr. Frey stated faux means fake; pretend; not real windows. Mr. McHutchison stated he thought that was the case, but wanted to check; and thanked the Commission.

Marge DeBold, Higganum, stated one of her concerns is the traffic pattern along Route 82 and the existing entrances into Dunkin Donuts and River Valley Provisions and the proposed entrance. Mrs. DeBold asked if state approval is required. Mr. Fries pointed out the driveway entrances and turned the matter over to Mr. Greenberg to address circulation. Mrs. DeBold thanked Mr. Fries.

Mr. Greenberg stated the proposed curb cut is essentially in the same location as the curb cut for the old building and is about 100 feet east of the curb cut for the Dunkin Donuts and self-storage facility and 200 feet from the main access driveway to Dunkin Donuts. Mr. Greenberg also stated Bridge Road is a state maintained minor arterial road (10,000 trips per day, 35 mph speed limit); that a complete traffic study was conducted; and under normal conditions doesn't see the project having a significant impact as there are excellent sight distances in both directions along Route 82 (exceeding DOT guidelines) and it should be relatively easy to get in and out of the site.

In terms of internal circulation, Mr. Greenberg reported there are two areas to park – front and side. For the side parking area, a stop bar and stop sign have been added to mitigate anyone from pulling up and blocking off the driveway.

Donna Tyrseck, Haddam, asked how the trucks will turn around if parking is allowed along the side of the building. Mr. Fries stated trucks will enter the site, turn left into a 36 foot wide aisle in the front parking area, and back down the side driving lane to the loading area. Ms. Tyrseck asked how many deliveries per day are expected. Mr. Fries stated one tractor trailer per week and then smaller vehicles periodically for retail buildings this size. Mr. Frey asked what type of business is being proposed for the building. Mr. Fries stated a retail building (no tenants signed at this time). Ms. Tyrseck asked Mr. Fries if he knows what type of retail. Mr. Fries stated convenient type goods. Ms. Tyrseck stated the building has been designed for a specific type retail. Mr. Fries stated yes, there are a number of retailers who have similar designs. Ms. Tyrseck asked about the septic system being under the parking. Mr. Fries stated a septic system is allowed under the parking and the system was designed for a flow for a retail development (system will not be overly large as calculations for retail are lower than residential and restaurants) and is currently under review with DPH and the local health dept. (comments forthcoming).

Terry Smith, Higganum, voiced concern over the traffic especially during the summer noting it's difficult to make a left hand turn on or off of Bridge Road. Mr. Smith also voiced concern about the character of the proposed structure looking like a mini-Home Depot. Mr. Smith asked if something more could be done with the structure to retain the historical nature of Haddam.

Brain Fresher, Haddam, asked if this retail facility would be used by more than one tenant at a time. Mr. Fries stated at this time the structure is set up for one tenant. Mr. Fresher asked if a CVS or a dollar store could go into the structure. Mr. Fries stated the size of the building would allow for those types of businesses. Mr. Fresher also stated he and his wife share concerns over the traffic, especially when the bridge closes down. Mr. Fresher talked about the character of the area being consistent with the other side of the river.

Mrs. Glidden asked if food would be sold and if there would be refrigeration units within the building. Mr. Fries stated he didn't know. Mrs. Glidden asked if the traffic would be impacted if the tenant were to be selling fresh food. Mr. Greenberg stated it's not a restaurant and that he's not sure if food will be sold from the facility.

In response to the comment about parking requirements, Mrs. Glidden stated the Town of Haddam does not have parking requirements, but rather suggested guidelines; therefore, the amount of parking could be minimized as shown on the plan, especially since the parking lot will be stubbed and parking could be shared with adjacent users. Mrs. Glidden asked if consideration was taken into this. Mr. Fries pointed out the stub and stated he followed the town's guidelines. Mrs. Glidden stated she had provided a comment letter, dated 02/05/2018, recommending the reduction of parking; and asked if any consideration was given to that recommendation. Mr. Fries will look into the matter and get back to Mrs. Glidden. Mrs. Glidden also stated within the comment letter the reduction of impervious surface was addressed as parking spaces are wider than what needs to be and could they be reduced (both the town's engineer and planner noted this); and asked if any consideration was given to this recommendation. Mr. Fries will look at reducing the size of the spaces.

Mrs. Glidden stated previously there was an historic building located on the site close to the road; and asked if any consideration was given to using the footprint either through a grandfathering clause or moving the building closer to the road to allow for parking and/or loading and/or deliveries to the rear of the property as is required under Section 14. Mr. Fries stated the problem with the circulation is trying to get a larger vehicle in to maneuver; and if parking is put to the rear where the site drops off, it's more difficult for the driver to maneuver in and spin around. Mrs. Glidden stated if the building was moved to the front and the west, it may eliminate the need for trucks to back into the loading area and may be able improve overall circulation. Mr. Fries will look at the sketch to see how it would layout.

Mrs. Glidden stated there are trees proposed to the front, but only grass is proposed along the side (east) and rear (south) of the proposed structure where there's an abutting residential property. Mr. Fries stated there are existing trees. Mrs. Glidden asked if the trees are located on 85 Bridge Road property or an adjacent property. Mr. Fries stated the trees straddle the line and there are existing trees to the back of the property that are located on 85 Bridge Road. Mrs. Glidden asked if the trees will remain and noted the trees are not being proposed, but are on another property.

Mrs. Glidden stated in BL's response comment letter, dated 02/13/2018, it was mention that one of the evergreen trees will be removed; and asked which trees are proposed to be removed. Mr. Fries stated it would be one of the trees along the east side. Mr. Fries will offer an exhibit showing the trees proposed to be removed.

Mrs. Glidden stated Section 14 requires when there is more than 20 parking spaces an interior landscape area is required.

Mrs. Glidden stated in her comment letter of 02/05/2018 she mentioned, as did the town's engineer, there's an area in the northwest corner of the property proposed to be paved; and asked if there was any consideration of landscaping the area instead. Mr. Fries stated the area would need to be paved for truck maneuvering, but will relook at other areas for an interior landscape area. Mr. Laurenza stated he was getting a sense that traffic flow is a bit of an issue. Mr. Fries stated there's adequate space for two way traffic, loading and backing up, and for the dumpsters.

Mr. Smith asked what would happen if the truck comes into the parking area, turns to the left, and there are ten cars there. Mr. Fries stated they will work with the tenant to have tractor trailers come during off peak hours. Mr. Smith asked if the store will be open more than 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Mr. Fries stated retail could be 12 hours and noted there is a 36 foot wide aisle for the tractor trailer to maneuver.

Allison Fresher, Haddam, voiced concern over access and aesthetics. Mrs. Fresher stated when the bridge is closed the traffic backs up to the highway; and questioned why anyone would think this is a great place for a retail establishment. Mrs. Fresher asked about the signage and if it will be approved by the Commission. Mrs. Glidden asked Mr. Fries if there is any proposed signage. Mr. Fries stated no plans have been submitted; however, a monument sign to the front and a building sign that would meet the regulations are proposed.

Amy Roper, Haddam, voiced concern for the property owners and businesses already in Tylerville; and asked what impact this proposal will have on River Valley Provisions and Higganum Market if the retail store sells food. Mr. Frey stated the Commission has regulations which they have to follow.

Lou Milardo, Haddam, owner of River Edge Carpet and Tile, Tylerville, stated the applicant is proposing something where the trucks can turnaround on their own property as opposed to the road. Mr. Milardo talked about having to block the road for deliveries to his business. Mr. Milardo also stated cobble stones could be used for landscaping. Mr. Milardo stated he's heard Tylerville is a dump and if the proposal will add to the community and be presentable, he's fine with it.

Elizabeth Malloy, Executive Director, Haddam Historical Society, Haddam Neck, asked to see the elevations again as she had not seen those presented. Mrs. Malloy stated that her comments are based on the original proposal. Mrs. Malloy asked if the front façade will be wood clapboards and if the faux windows will be just metal inserts. Mr. Fries stated Hardie board will be used and the windows will be multi paned.

Mr. Grunert apologized for being late and began his presentation. Mr. Grunert stated the side that is facing Bridge Road will be Hardie board as well as the side facing the side parking lot. There will be no glass windows - the windows are the same material as the clapboard to make it look like windows and to

soften up the wall. Unfortunately, with a retail client there is usually product for the windows so real glass can't be used. Mrs. Glidden asked if people can see through the faux windows. Mr. Grunert stated yes, they are completely opaque, it's a façade.

Mrs. Malloy questioned that the other two elevations will not be the faux clapboard. Mr. Grunert stated yes; due to the transition of the grading to the back and facing the abutter, vertical panels will be installed. Mr. Grunert stated the color for the Hardie board and the vertical panels will match. Mrs. Malloy clarified that the long side facing the abutters (Botelles) will not have windows on it. Mr. Grunert stated yes. Mrs. Malloy asked if the basement level was exposed concert. Mr. Grunert stated yes, and that is to address the grade drop as well. Mrs. Malloy asked if the grade drop wouldn't be addressed. Mr. Grunert stated yes, other than landscaping (an attempt to camouflage as best as possible). Mrs. Glidden noted there is no landscaping shown. Mrs. Malloy asked if the gable entrance way is clapboard. Mr. Grunert stated its clapboard, but a different color. Mr. Grunert stated because of the proximity of residential neighbors the façade was softened up by putting a mansard roof with gray asphalt shingles; and the same shingles will be on the gable as well.

Mrs. Malloy read her comment letter (Exhibit A, 2 pages) asking the Commission to deny the application citing several reasons such as traffic, structure not in harmony with the area, and proposal not in conformance with the POCD to name a few.

Lisa Wadge, owner of Tylerville Village, stated she has four empty businesses and cannot get family owned businesses to pay the rent. Ms. Wadge applauds small businesses, but costs are too high especially for retail. Ms. Wadge stated when the bridge is opened, businesses and residents are in a tough bind and there's nothing that can be done about it.

Ms. Wadge commenting for HWGA, owner of 85 Bridge Road, stated the property was for sale for three years and she was not contacted by the Historical Society to purchase the property, to walk it, to renovate it, or to work with the owner. Ms. Wadge stated at one point there was a yarn business in the old structure, but they too went out of business.

Ms. Wadge stated the application meets all of the requirements of the town's regulations. Ms. Wadge also stated she was willing to talk to the Commission, but noted the land is commercial as well as the Botelle's abutting property and they plan to develop their property as well. Ms. Wadge stated the Shailer Banning House could not be saved – it had termites, and it could not be moved – beehive oven; however, the wood and stone have been recycled. Ms. Wadge stated this house could not be rescued and that the site is not an historic site, no evidence of it being on the state register, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHIPO), or any archeological artifacts list. Ms. Wadge stated there needs to be some positive energy in town in order to draw people to the town. Ms. Wadge stated the development is good for the property and for Haddam.

Mrs. DeBold asked if the landscaping on the river side of the structure will be enough to make it attractive on the applicant's property and if the applicant is counting on the neighbors not cutting their own trees. Mr. Fries stated he'll go back and look at that side of the structure to try to spruce it up.

Mr. Frey stated he meant no disrespect, but everything in the lighting plan is a disclaimer. Mr. Frey stated Wal-Pak luminaires are shown; and according to the pavement code, there should be a maximum of four and a minimum of point two (.2), but there's a lot of zero point zero (0.0) foot candles in the parking areas which is not very safe. Mr. Frey also stated in order to illuminate those areas the light would need to be projected out and this is not sky friendly and the applicant would need to show pulse to do that properly.

Mr. Laurenza asked how many of the comments from Jeff Jacobson, Town Engineer, and Liz Glidden, Town Planner, were addressed in the latest set of prints. Mr. Frey stated the document he was talking about was submitted at the 01/18/2018 meeting and he did not see a lighting plan in the new set. Mr. Fries stated they will address the matter.

In regard to the east side of the building, Mr. Laurenza asked if it was said that Hardie board could not go on that side of the building due to the elevation of the ground. Mr. Grunert stated it's difficult due to the transition with the two materials. Mrs. Glidden asked why it's not on the other side. Mr. Grunert stated there's brick. After a brief discussion, Mr. Grunert stated they could look at putting in additional brick. Mr. Wallor asked how much planting can be done on the east side as he thought there was drainage for Route 82 on that side. Mrs. Glidden stated there is a drainage easement on that side; however, the applicant is proposing a vinyl fence. Mrs. Glidden discussed Section 7.1 noting although the proposed parcel is zoned commercial, it's used residentially. Further discussion followed in regard to the pine buffer on the Botelle property. Ms. Wadge stated she spoke to the Botelles and they are willing to agree that the buffer will be retained during the development. Mr. Bull stated the agreement has to live forever and the buffer needs to be on the applicant's property.

Mr. Bull asked if a private traffic study was conducted and if the state needs to weigh in. Mr. Greenberg and Mr. Fries stated yes to both questions. Mr. Bull asked if there is enough room for a truck to turn easterly out of the parking lot. Mr. Fries stated there's enough room to turn in either direction and that DOT will be looking at that as well.

Mr. Bull stated the building needs to move up to the front and the parking relocated. Mr. Bull also stated then the easterly elevation problems would be solved by moving the building to the front; however, a rear elevation problem is created, but can be resolved by adding fill.

Ms. Tyrseck asked if the client has daily projections on vehicles coming and going. Mr. Greenberg stated based on a fairly busy retail use approximately 500-600 trips per day and most of the traffic is already driving by. Mrs. Glidden questioned the number of trips noting Mr. Greenberg's report cited 63. Mr. Greenberg stated that's peak hours daily. Mr. Greenberg also stated they are not adding 500-600 cars per day, that would be how much is coming in and out of the driveway, and what they're adding is half of that - 250-300 per day. Ms. Tyrseck stated she's still worried about traffic.

Mr. Smith asked the requirements for a sign. Mr. Wallor stated 32 square feet (the size of a piece of plywood).

Mr. Frey asked those in the audience who have retail businesses what their hours are. A couple of business owners stated 9 to 5 and 9 to 9. Mr. Frey stated hours are anywhere from 8 to 10 hours per day, approximately 25 cars an hour. Mrs. Milardo stated the road handles 13,000 cars per day from October to April and during the summer 30,000 per day.

Mr. Laurenza asked Mrs. Glidden if the Commission should be addressing hours of operation. Mrs. Glidden stated it was not in the applicant's Use Statement and that would be helpful information. Mr. Fries stated retailers of this size are usually open 12 hours, but once they know the tenant they would work with the town planner on hours of operation that would be a best fit for the area. Mr. Fries also stated they are not looking at a 24 hour establishment.

Larry Maggi, Haddam, and owner of Fireworks, Tylerville, stated everyone is getting tied up in the traffic and the traffic is going to be there no matter what. Mr. Maggi talked about the businesses trying to give each other business as well.

Mr. Milardo stated Haddam people do not come to Tylerville and that it isn't worth staying open later at night because when people are trying to get home from work, they're only stopping at the grocery store or package store. Mr. Milardo also stated if the proposal helps the other businesses in the area, and he doesn't want River Valley Provisions hurt, he welcomes the proposal. Mr. Milardo noted if the building is moved to the front of the parcel the line of sight will be poor; whereas, with the building located where it's proposed, it will be proper to River Valley Provisions.

Ms. Block stated the Commission asking questions is part of their job and it's a valid concern if more traffic is being added to an existing driveway noting it's worth giving consideration to connecting the two parking lots and having a single entrance. In terms of bringing the building forward, Ms. Block stated the Commission is trying to encourage a village type district; and if sidewalks come in, the Commission would like pedestrians to have direct access to these buildings. Ms. Block stated the POCD encourages businesses to move up to the street and parking to the back.

In regard to the shared access, Ms. Wadge stated the neighbor is a federally regulated repro corrective action site under the EPA and the DEEP. Ms. Wadge also stated there is no possibility that they will sign a contract for a shared driveway with someone who is in criminal enforcement with the EPA. Ms. Wadge further stated if it were a clean piece of real estate, it would be logical; but there is no way they will share a driveway with a federally regulated contaminated site that hasn't been remediated as there's too much risk. Ms. Wadge stated a shared driveway is a great idea, but not with a contaminated site.

Ms. Block asked if the 31 parking spaces being called for are exclusive of handicapped spaces or if it includes the handicapped spaces. Mrs. Glidden stated it includes the handicapped spaces. Ms. Block also asked does this account for employee parking taking up some of the spaces or is it included. Mrs. Glidden stated it's included in the calculations.

Mr. Maggi asked if there is a way to tweak the parking in the front to allow for an entrance in and out. Mr. Fries stated the State of Connecticut will dictate whether it would be allowed and usually for a property this small they will only allow for one access point.

Mrs. Glidden read letters from Patrick Pinnell to Jamin Laurenza, dated 02/14/2018, outlining his concerns and urged the application be denied or at least deferred (Exhibit B); Robert and Sharon Botelle to Liz Glidden, dated 02/07/2018, support the proposal (Exhibit C); Town Planner Liz Glidden's comment letter to Mathew Bruton, P.E., BL Companies, dated 02/05/2018, (Exhibit D, 3 pages), and Town Engineer Jeff Jacobson's comment letter to Liz Glidden, Town Planner, dated 01/18/2018 (Exhibit E, 6 pages). Mrs. Glidden noted that revised plans were received on 02/14/2018 that addressed some of the concerns, but not all of them; and for that reason recommended the Commission deny the application as incomplete. Mrs. Glidden distributed and reviewed a motion sheet (Exhibit G, 3 pages) outlining the deficiencies in the site plan and a copy was provided to the applicant.

Mr. Bull asked if BL did not have enough time to address the items. Mr. Fries stated he believed that to be true. Mr. Bull asked could the items be addressed if given more time. Mr. Fries stated he believed so. Mrs. Glidden noted BL addressed some but not all. Discussion followed at length in regard to the Commission's process pertaining to large projects and the state statutes and the time frame for making a decision. Attorney Roberts stated the application before the Commission is for a site plan and the Commission has only 65 days total from 01/04/2018 to act on the matter. Mr. Roberts also stated the applicant could ask for an extension. Further discussion followed in regard with Mr. Laurenza taking a one by one poll to see if the Commission was agreeable to keep the hearing open.

Ms. Wadge stated she could not come back with an application for six months due to the moratorium and she believes there's a prejudice against the project because of the old house and the moratorium. Ms. Wadge also stated she has brought applications before the Commission in the past where continuance were granted and for some of the items listed as missing, she has to go to outside entities to gather the information and/or permits. Ms. Wadge stated she wants to give the Commission what they are looking for, but pointed out some of the items are subjective as the regulations are general.

Mrs. Glidden asked Ms. Wadge if the DPH approval will be available by the next meeting. Ms. Wadge stated she already has the approval as she has a public water supply well on the property, has an ID number, is a DPH certified public water supply operator, and had the water tested quarterly until the house was demolished. Mrs. Glidden asked Ms. Wadge if she had her Phase I and Phase II and

Certificate of Public Necessity. Ms. Wadge stated yes, and will provide the information. Mr. Bull asked if that information was required with the application. Ms. Wadge stated it's DEEP data. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, the information was to have been submitted.

Mr. Laurenza stated he would like to see the building softened up, especially the east side, and the building moved toward Bridge Road. Mr. Bull stated the Commission has been talking for years about creating a village style.

Mr. Frey asked what would happen if the Commission can't make a decision. Attorney Roberts stated the application will automatically be approved. Mrs. Glidden stated the applicant can request an extension which would be in their best interest and the Commission can grant that. Discussion followed as to what the Commission would like to do.

Mrs. Glidden asked Attorney Roberts could the Commission grandfather in the old foundation or no because it's gone. Attorney Roberts stated no because the foundation is gone; however, he's unaware of the flexibility the Commission may have within their regulations. Mrs. Glidden stated not much.

Items of concern: the location of the building (move as far forward as possible to encourage pedestrian access), parking, mobility around the building, landscaped areas – islands and between the sidewalk and building; east and west side exterior of building need to match (clapboards, brick façade, faux windows; no metal Butler building paneling); and dormers were suggested to break up the 130 foot long wall.

Mr. Fries stated if the building is moved, the front door would change helping to break up the long wall; and by moving the building it will restrict the client from how he will tenant the structure. Mr. Fries asked for consideration to speak to the client. Mrs. Glidden stated the treatment on the front should remain to help promote pedestrian access.

Dan Luisi asked why the Commission would want a building of that size sitting close to the road. Mr. Luisi stated it would be less of an eyesore sitting further back on the parcel. Ms. Block stated the intention is to get the buildings to move closer to the road. Mr. Luisi stated he understands, but there are a number of buildings that are set back and perhaps a nice sidewalk leading up to their store would work.

Lori Maggi, Haddam, business owner, and commissioner, stated she would like to see the Commission allow extra time to work with the applicant as the town is known for not being business friendly. In regard to the Commission being perceived as not business friendly, Mr. Laurenza stated in the ten years he's been on the Commission only one application has been denied. Mr. Milardo stated the Commission is not like that, but it's what people hear.

In regard to moving the building forward, Mr. Milardo stated the River Valley Provision people and their customers will now have to look at a loading dock, trucks being unloaded, and dumpsters. Mr. Milardo also stated conforming may be good in certain places, but not in all circumstances.

Ms. Wadge asked if it would be more pedestrian friendly to move the building to the front or to the side (closer to River Valley Provisions). Attorney Roberts stated the proposed tenant will tell which, if either, will work best for them and then come back and explain why.

MOTION: Ed Wallor moved to continue the public hearing until Thursday, 1 March 2018, 7:00 p.m., Town Hall, 21 Field Park Drive, Haddam. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Public Meeting: A Site Plan Review of a Proposed Site Development Plan for a 9,100 Square Foot Retail Building and Associated Parking for Property known as 85 Bridge Road and Shown on Tax Map 49 Lot 26

William Fries, Senior Project Manager, Principal, BL Companies; Fred Greenberg, Traffic Engineer, Principal, BL Companies; Douglas Grunert, Project Manager, BKA Architects; and Lisa Wadge, representing the owner, HWGA; were present.

Item continued until Thursday, 1 March 2018.

8. Discussion Regarding Zoning Regulations for the Tylerville Area

Mrs. Glidden reported she needed additional time as she was still gathering information. A brief discussion followed in regard to the Commission holding a workshop. Attorney Roberts stated a workshop doesn't need to be noticed like a public hearing, but there should be some advanced notice.

Item continued until Thursday, 1 March 2018.

9. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

Correction to the 18 January 2018 minutes: page 2, sixth paragraph, third line - change "don't" to "done".

Correction to the 3 February 2018 minutes: Adjournment - change "p.m." to "a.m."

MOTION: Ed Wallor moved to approve the 18 January 2018 Public Hearing/Meeting and the 3 February 2018 Site Walk minutes as amended. Jamin Laurenza second. Motion carried unanimously.

10. Chairman's Report

None.

11. Scheduling of Hearings

No new hearings at this time.

12. Town Planner's Report

Roundabout at Route 154 and Route 82 – Mrs. Glidden reported DOT was proposing a roundabout at Routes 154 and 82; however, it's assumed that the funding as dried up with all the state projects and this item is off the table for now.

Sidewalks – Mrs. Glidden report a Request for Proposals (RFP) and Request for Qualifications (RFQ) were done pertaining to the sidewalks in Tylerville. The federally funded Transportation Alternatives Program Grant (TAP) is still available and it will be recommended that the town enter into a contract with Nathan L. Jacobson and Associates who will be doing surveying and construction drawings over the course of the next year. A brief discussion followed in regard to the pedestrian pathway on the swing bridge (no DOT funding).

13. Adjournment

MOTION: Ed Wallor moved to adjourn. Jamin Laurenza second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner

Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 1 March 2018.