



Town of Griswold



28 Main Street
Griswold, CT 06351
Phone (860) 376-7060, Fax (860) 376-7070

GRISWOLD PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARINGS & REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

FEBRUARY 13, 2006

GRISWOLD TOWN HALL

I. PUBLIC HEARING (7:00 P.M.)

1. Call to order:

Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman called this Public Hearing of the Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 7:37 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman, Members Philip Anthony, Clyde Seaman, Alternate Courtland Kinnie, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Members Daniel DeGuire, Roland Harris, Alternates Martin McKinney, John Schumaker, ZEO Peter Zvingilas

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Courtland Kinney to sit for Roland Harris. There is a quorum for this public hearing.

4. Matter Presented for Consideration:

A. SRC 01-06 Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission, 28 Main Street, Jewett City, CT.
The Commission proposes amendments to Section 5.5 of the Griswold Subdivision Regulations to increase the required dedication of open space within conventional subdivisions to 10% of the gross parcel area, and also to establish "fee in lieu-of open space" regulations.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrento to go through the background of this proposed amendment. D. Sorrentino explained that the Commission members noted in the minutes of November 14, 2005 during the discussion of the plan of conservation and development that there should be an open space requirement for subdivisions of three lots or more in the regulations. He submitted copies of the minutes to the Commission. He submitted option 2 which the Commission voted to use. D. Sorrentino referenced the legal notice of 2/1/06 published on 2/3/06 and 2/10/06 for this public hearing. He submitted copies of the legal notices for the record. He submitted a copy of Section 8-25 of the Connecticut General Statutes on Subdivision of Land for the record. He read Section 8-25 for the record.

D. Sorrentino asked the Commission how they would like him to proceed with the Section. P. Anthony suggested that D. Sorrentino read each of the sections for the audience.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.1 regarding Area into the record. G. Rooke-Norman asked how far back was the Commission going to apply this regulation to subdivisions that would be subdivided in the past and part of it is being subdivided now. D. Sorrentino explained this section was aimed at closing the loophole so that parcels could not be subdivided in 5 acre increments. G. Rooke-Norman asked if it would be applied prospectively. D. Sorrentino stated that it would not be retroactive since the regulation was not in effect at the time.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.2 regarding Standards for the record. G. Rooke-Norman asked about the bold face in the section and voiced her concerns regarding the parcel owned or controlled by the applicant. P. There was discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino read Town Attorney Branse's comments on 5.5.2 into the record.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.3 regarding Fee-in-lieu of Open Space into the record.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.3.1 concerning Amount into the record.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.3.2 concerning the Procedure to employ the fee-in lieu of open space option into the record.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.3.3 concerning method of payment into the record.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.3.4 concerning a dedicated fund into the record.

P. Anthony had a question on Section 5.5.3.4 of a mortgage or lien to be prohibitive to an applicant who wants a first mortgage to do a subdivision and was it the intent as a second mortgage. G. Rooke-Norman stated that it would require language that would make it subordinate to the first mortgage. There was lengthy discussion of this matter including reference to mortgage or lien "shall" to "may" secure and further down where Town will subordinate the lien to the developer's primary financial institution's financing.

D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.4 regarding Open Space Waiver into the record. D. Sorrentino read Section 5.5.4.1 and Section 5.5.4.2 into the record.

D. Sorrentino submitted a letter dated 12/20/05 from Attorney Mark Branse for the record. He stated that the map at the back of the room is the initial survey of towns with fee-in-lieu of open space regulations. He explained 15 towns have employed up to 10% for subdivisions, 2 towns are working on regulations and 3 have no consideration for fee-in-lieu of open space regulations.

G. Rooke-Norman questioned 5.5.4.1 regarding transfer of property to children. She was concerned that it would be opting them out of this exemption. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman questioned the language regarding legally binding documents for transfer of land. D. Sorrentino explained that it is in the State statute that it was one of the exemptions when applied to a three lot threshold. He stated that with using a five-lot threshold, this would

not apply. There was discussion of this matter. C. Kinnie suggested adding “any or no consideration” to the section. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman opened this public hearing to comments from the audience.

Walter Held stated that this was taking private property for public use. He was against this section. He stated that if the town wanted property, it should take it by eminent domain where the landowner would receive just compensation. G. Rooke-Norman explained that this would only be when there is a subdivision being created. W. Held stated that it is still private property and you are taking it for public use.

Bernard Laizer stated that he has a small 35-acre subdivision. He explained that there was an option for open space. He felt that it was being forced and the property owner was penalized 10%. He stated that should be a 10% tax break for homeowners. He stated that 5.5.3.4 for dedicate funds for open space, does Griswold plan to get into the farming business. D. Sorrentino stated that the land could be leased to farmers to be utilized to generate income.

John Faulise, Boundaries, LLC, stated that he was involved with these policies. He had a question about Section 5.5.3 the fee-in-lieu of open space that he explained that the trend in the towns in which he does business are more desirable of the fee-in-lieu of open space where the town can purchase suitable open space. He stated that he did not think that it was necessary to have another bond since there are so many bonds for developers now. J. Faulise suggested that there be a waiver for open space when the remaining lands will be retained for bona fide agricultural uses. There was discussion of this matter.

J. Faulise stated that there would be more preliminary application meetings with the Commission prior to formal applications. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the Commission anticipated that and welcomed more participation with the applicants. She stated that the developer should be responsible for paying the fee-in-lieu of open space.

B. Laizer asked that it should be worded to affect bone fide developers and not the landowner. He stated that the landowner should be able to do what he wants with his own land. G. Rooke-Norman explained that if a landowner is creating a 50 acre subdivision, the landowner is a developer whether they owned the property for a month or ten years or one hundred years. There was discussion of this matter including making this regulation as clear and as fair as the Commission can.

P. Anthony asked J. Faulise about the North Stonington example that they would negotiate with the landowner prior to coming before the Commission. He stated that it would not be fair as each developer would get different things. J. Faulise stated that the guidelines are set in the regulations. There was discussion of this matter.

Elias Baron asked if the open space can be enclosed by the lot and not have public access. D. Sorrentino stated that it needs 20 feet of frontage on the road. There was discussion of this matter. D. Sorrentino read section 5.5.2 into the record. E. Baron asked that once the plan is approved, can the location be changed. G. Rooke-Norman stated once it was approved, that was it.

There was lengthy discussion of setting up and administering a land trust by the Town. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to look into what other towns do to acquire open space. P. Anthony stated that the Selectmen needed to look into the Town's liability.

Tim Wentworth, Attorney representing Ellen Zvingilas. He stated that he was from Lebanon and explained how Lebanon administers open space and that there is no public access to the open space because of liability. G. Rooke-Norman stated what you are saying that the land provided by the developer as part of the subdivision process could not be put into a land trust but the funds in the kitty could be used to purchase land. T. Wentworth gave a short presentation of how this type of open space regulation in Lebanon has resulted in a lot of Ad Hoc parcels all over town. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for any other comments.

W. Held stated that the Town of Pomfret puts a conservation easement of 10% of the property that cannot be developed but it is still owned by the property owner.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for other comments from the audience.

J. Faulise stated that access to open space in the regulation needs to be specific. He explained that in a previous subdivision, the Commission opted not to have an easement because of problems that would arise. He suggested that the language regarding easements to utilize those regulations. There was discussion of this matter.

T. Wentworth stated that this regulation does not get money from the developer. He stated that the value of the property will be reduced by the cost to the developer by this regulation. He also explained the legal versus right argument and cited the State of Connecticut's open space where taxpayer dollars acquired the land and that Griswold would apply 10% to all property owners for open space through a town meeting. J. Wentworth stated that this would penalize landowners who have kept their land as open space for hundreds of years rather than having developed their land. He stated that the Commission should reject this regulation.

G. Rooke-Norman asked for other comments. She asked if the Commission would like to keep the hearing open. P. Anthony suggested keeping this public hearing open. G. Rooke-Norman asked if it could be discussed further in a workshop. D. Sorrentino stated that it needs to be a public hearing. There was discussion of this matter. C. Seaman stated that there were many questions that needed to be addressed including the 10% issue. He didn't think that the Town's objective was to pick up small parcels. P. Anthony stated that this should be closed and reworked. Selectwoman Anne Hatfield stated that she would recommend sending the comments and concerns back to the Town attorney for review and to redraft the regulation. C. Seaman stated that the application could be withdrawn. C. Kinnie stated that Atty. Wentworth suggested it should apply to everyone, treating everyone the same. There was discussion of this matter.

Chair G. Rooke-Norman closed the public hearing at 8:49 p.m.

II. REGULAR MEETING (8:00 P.M.)

1. Call to order:

Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman called this Regular Meeting of the Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 8:49 p.m.

2. Roll Call:

Present: Chairperson Gail Rooke-Norman, Members Philip Anthony, Clyde Seaman, Alternate Courtland Kinnie, Town Planner Demian Sorrentino, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Members Daniel DeGuire, Roland Harris, Alternates Martin McKinney, John Schumaker, ZEO Peter Zvingilas,

3. Determination of Quorum:

G. Rooke-Norman appointed Courtland Kinney to sit for Roland Harris. There is a quorum for this regular meeting.

4. Approval of Minutes:

A. Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting of January 4, 2006

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion on the minutes of the Special Meeting of January 4, 2006. P. Anthony made motion to accept the minutes. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

B. Approval of Minutes of Public Hearings and Regular Meeting of January 9, 2006

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion on the minutes of the Public Hearings and Regular Meeting of January 9, 2006. P. Anthony made a motion to accept the minutes. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. The ayes carry.

C. Approval of Minutes of Special Meeting of January 17, 2006

G. Rooke-Norman asked for a motion on the minutes of the Special Meeting of January 17, 2006. P. Anthony made a motion to accept the minutes. C. Kinnie seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

5. Correspondence and Attachments:

G. Rooke-Norman stated that there are multiple correspondences in the file. If anyone wants to review the correspondence, they are free to do so.

A. E-mail and attachments dated 1/26/06 from Attorney Eric Knapp, Branse, Willis & Knapp, LLC regarding Draft Sign Regulations.

She brought item A to the Commission's attention. She stated that this is a matter for consideration later in the meeting. D. Sorrentino stated yes.

B. Connecticut Planning Newsletter of the Connecticut Chapter of the American Planning Association, January-March 2006

C. Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments Annual Report 2005

D. Avalonia Land Conservancy Property Guide and attachments

E. Letter dated 02/01/06 from Demian Sorrentino, Town Planner in response to inter-municipal notice received from the Town of Lisbon regarding the creation of a BV-III Zoning classification in the Lisbon Zoning Regulations.

F. Memo from the Connecticut Federation of Planning & Zoning Agencies regarding the 58th Annual Conference on Thursday, March 23, 2006 at the Aqua Turf Country Club in Southington with Flyer

G. Memo from the Connecticut Federation of Planning & Zoning Agencies regarding Length of Service Awards/Lifetime Achievement Award Nominations.

6. Matters Presented for Consideration:

A. SRC 01-06 Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission, 28 Main Street, Jewett City, CT.

The Commission proposes amendments to Section 5.5 of the Griswold Subdivision Regulations to increase the required dedication of open space within conventional subdivisions to 10% of the gross parcel area, and also to establish "fee in lieu-of open space" regulations.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this was the subject of the prior public hearing and tabling this action was discussed and asked for a motion. P. Anthony made a motion to table this matter to the next regular meeting. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. The ayes carry.

B. SE 02-06 Baron, Elias, 2281 Glasgo Road, Griswold. – Property Location: 2247 Glasgo Road, Griswold – Applicants request approval of a Special Exception for gravel extraction operations associated with the construction of a farm pond for agricultural use. The subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district

C. Kinnie recused himself as being an abutting landowner.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that there were items requested that the applicant submit to our engineer and asked if those items were provided to the engineer. D. Sorrentino stated that he received plans from Mr. Camp this afternoon that are in the file. D. Sorrentino explained that he called Bob Schuch after receiving the plans and B. Schuch told him that Mr. Camp had been there but because of work commitments, B. Schuch could not review the plans. D. Sorrentino also explained that Bob Schuch had sent him an e-mail dated Monday, February 13, 2006 regarding Baron Excavation. D. Sorrentino read the e-mail for the record.

P. Anthony asked if there is an opportunity to table and is the Commission still within the realm of law. D. Sorrentino stated no, 60 days have been used up. C. Camp asked to respond to Town Engineer B. Schuch's letter. Chairperson G. Rooke-Norman stated that it was not appropriate at this time. She asked the Commission's decision. C. Seaman made a motion that we deny the application. P. Anthony seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman stated that the motion has been made and seconded to deny the application. She asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

C. SE 05-06 Route 164, LLC. - Property Location: 134 Preston Rd., Griswold. Applicant requests approval of a Special Exception and site plan for a Hotel in accordance with Section 7.3.18 and Restaurant in accordance with Section 7.3.2, located at 134 Preston Road. Applicant also requests approval of a Special Exception for building height of 49', 6" in accordance with Section 10.6, and review of proposed water line extension.

G. Rooke- Normans asked D. Sorrentino if there was anything that needed to be updated. D. Sorrentino stated that a public hearing needs to be set and he attested that the application is complete and ready to be set for public hearing. G. Rooke-Norman stated that C. Kinnie has returned to his seat for Roland Harris. D. Sorrentino explained the items in receipt. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that a public hearing needs to be set. D. Sorrentino stated that a special meeting could be set for the public hearing. There was discussion of this matter. P. Anthony made a motion to hold a special meeting for the public hearing for the Hotel SE 05-06 Route 164, LLC at 7:30 p.m. on March 2, 2006 and time allotted for a workshop for the Plan of Conservation and Development. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

D. ZC 01-06 Griswold Development & Industrial Commission. 28 Main Street, Jewett City, CT. – Property Location: 31 Barber Road, 523 Voluntown Road, 100 Brewster Road, Griswold. Applicant proposes to seek a change in zoning of three parcels of land with a total of 190 +/- acres from a combination of R40, R60, R80 and C1 zones to BP – Business Park in order to establish a BP-Business Park zoning district within the Town of Griswold.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the application is complete. D. Sorrentino stated yes. She asked the Commission to set a public hearing. There was discussion of this matter of date and time. P. Anthony made a motion to set the public hearing for 7:30 p.m. on March 13, 2006. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. The ayes carry.

E. ZC 02-06 Griswold Planning & Zoning Commission – The Commission proposes an amendment to Section 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 to allow the use of Town Roads as internal Business Park Roadways under specified conditions. Also, proposes amendments to Section 15.1.5, 15.1.7, 15.2, 15.3 and 21.28.2 regarding political signage.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if this application was correct. D. Sorrentino stated that the application is not ready for public hearing. He asked that this item be moved to the end of the agenda. C. Seaman made a motion to table the application. P. Anthony seconded the motion. There was discussion of this matter. C. Seaman made a motion to move this time to the end of the agenda. P. Anthony seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was carried.

F. SE 06-06 Crystal Water Company, 321 Main Street, Danielson, CT. Property Location: Richard Avenue Easement, Griswold, CT. Applicant requests approval of a Special Exception for proposed construction of well and water treatment facility modifications within the easement for Richard Avenue and Route 201. Subject property is located in the R-80 zoning district.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if this application was ready for public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated yes. There was discussion of this matter. P. Anthony made a motion to set the public hearing on March 13, 2006 at 7:15 p.m. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. The ayes carry.

7. Additional Business:

A. Discussion of proposed site plan revisions to “Albemarle Pleasant View” Condominiums. Original approval number is SE 02-04.

D. Sorrentino gave copies of the revised site plan to the Commission explaining that the new owners ask that the Commission grant him one-time administrative approval of the change in the plan. He explained the changes to the Commission. D. Sorrentino read his memorandum for the record of his review of Albemarle Pleasant View. C. Seaman asked D. Sorrentino to explain the changes and why. There was lengthy discussion of this matter including changes to building footprints, building height, grading, parking requirements, landscaping and relocation of a drainage structure.

C. Seaman asked for a definition of height in the regulations. D. Sorrentino stated that this Commission’s regulations do not have a definition of height in the definition section. C. Seaman stated that the building code should be cited. D. Sorrentino read the building code requirements for building height to the record. P. Anthony asked D. Sorrentino if he was confident that the building heights were in compliance. Dean Berman, Architect, explained the average height around the building to the mid height of the roofs. He explained that for this project they went the top of the roof rather than the average height of the roof. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Tristany, McFarland-Johnson Engineers, stated that the changes are to upgrade the quality of the type of housing that was originally approved. He explained the changed footprint and that the setting will more village-like. He explained that P. Zvingilas the building official has always use the average grade definition in the state building code for building height. He showed the plans of Aspinook View plans that the Commission had approved. There was discussion of this matter including more discussion of the height requirement.

C. Seaman asked what D. Sorrentino was asking from the Commission. D. Sorrentino stated that he was asking for one-time administrative approval for himself and P. Zvingilas to approve the site plan for Albemarle Pleasant View. M. Tristany read a letter for the record stating the regulations that would grant the Town Planner and Building Official administrative approval of the site plan. There was discussion of this matter.

There was a question from the audience. G. Rooke-Normans explained there would be a chance later to speak after the applicant has made his presentation. C. Seaman stated that this was not a

public hearing. D. Sorrentino stated no. M. Tristany went on to explain why they were asking for administrative approval of the site plan. There was further discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino if it was appropriate for anyone who objects to it being considered meeting the administrative approval to raise that issue at this point in time. D. Sorrentino stated that he could not answer that. G. Rooke-Norman stated that to err on the side of being broad enough, she asked if there was anyone here who believed that this does not meet the standards of administrative approval to raise their issues now.

Pamela Reinholtz asked to address the Commission in this matter. She stated that she wanted to remind this Commission of the numerous issues about this special exception regarding whether the buffer zones were adequate to prevent light pollution from the buildings as they were designed and issues of ingress and egress into this development.

G. Rooke-Norman reminded P. Reinholtz that they were not revisiting the special exception hearing. She asked the applicant if there were any change in the new design of the buffer zones. M. Tristany answered no. G. Rooke-Norman asked if there were any changes to the entrance and egress from the prior approval. M. Tristany stated that there was no change to the access to the site.

P. Reinholtz stated that the plans do not reflect the required changes. M. Tristany stated that he didn't know to what changes were being referred. D. Sorrentino explained the reference was to the stipulations in the decision. There was lengthy discussion of this matter including building height and finished grade. G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to provide P. Reinholtz a copy of the stipulations.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this meets all the administrative authority requirements under our Section 13.8. P. Anthony made a motion to grant D. Sorrentino and P. Zvingilas administrative authority on this issue. He asked that when an issue of this nature comes before the board, he would like the Commission to have more in advance on what is to be reviewed. C. Seaman seconded motion. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. The ayes carry.

B. Ken Sullivan of the JCDPU will be present to discuss a request on behalf of the Jewett City Electric Light Company regarding extension of service on Rt. 164. Specifically, the request will be for approval to install overhead lines instead of underground service.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that this was an informal discussion and that there would be a formal application.

Ken Sullivan, Representative of the Jewett City Department of Public Utilities, handed information to the Commission for their review. He presented his proposal to expand their business up Rte 164 at pole 136 near the AmericInn and east of Rte 164 and Rte 138 connector. He explained the cost of the project of underground versus overhead lines. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if there was a sketch of what exists now and what is being proposed. K. Sullivan stated that he would prepare a sketch for the Commission and he explained the number

of poles to be used for overhead and also explained what would be done if the service was placed underground. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Seaman asked to see photographs and sketches. G. Rooke-Norman stated that K. Sullivan should be placed on next month's agenda. D. Sorrentino stated that it should be decided what type of application to use. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Review of as built plan for Quiet Cove Lane. Applicant will be present to discuss current status of Quiet Cove Lane and request bond reduction.

D. Sorrentino stated that he received a fax from the applicants requesting review of the roadway plans and a bond release. He reviewed the site on February 1 with John Faulise. He explained that the grading and seeding was done and that the recommendation to replace the flared end unit had been done.

J. Faulise, Boundaries, LLC explained the flared units were replaced with a concrete unit. He explained that the road monuments have been set. He stated that the members of Quiet Cove were here this evening to answer questions from the Commission. J. Faulise stated that there was discussion about a curb from the catch basins to the roadway. He explained that the work on Quiet Cove was tied in to the work being done on Bethel Road. Ed Wisniewski explained that they had met with Paul Brycki and the contractor working for the town and that a verbal agreement that was made regarding where to terminate the work on Quiet Cove until Bethel Road was constructed. There was lengthy discussion of this matter of the drainage and the curbing that needed to be put in place to complete the project.

G. Rooke-Norman asked about the bond. D. Sorrentino explained that the compaction results have not been received from the Town's request. There was discussion of this matter.

D. Sorrentino stated that the bond was \$262,902.88 and recommended to release everything except the paving bond in the amount of \$77, 534.50 that included curbing and that the figure was based on the bond estimate for paving. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Anthony made a motion to reduce Quiet Cove Lane applicant's standing bond from \$262,902.88 to \$77,534.50. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. The ayes carry.

D. Atty. Beth Steele, of DiFrancesca & Steele requests a 90-day extension of time to file the Mylars for the approved subdivision of Bernard T. Laizer and Ernestine Kateri Stokes, Approval number SUB 02-06 Pine Road, Browning Road, Brewster Road.

Attorney Beth Steele of DiFrancesca & Steele was present to represent Bernard T. Laizer in asking for a 90 day extension to file the final Mylars. She explained the reason for the request to the Commission. There was discussion of this matter.

P. Anthony made a motion to approve a 90-day extension. C. Seaman seconded the motion. G. Rooke-Norman asked for a vote. All were in favor. Motion was passed.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that Item E regarding signage was moved to the end of the agenda. C. Seaman left the meeting at 10:15 pm.

G. Rooke-Norman expressed her feelings and concerns with the recommendations and language from Atty. Branse. She asked D. Sorrentino to send a note to the Board of Selectmen to suggest trying another attorney for all the land use functions. G. Rooke-Norman asked for input from the Commission. P. Anthony voiced his concerns.

G. Rooke-Norman asked if the Commission would like to table Item 6 E or if there were other comments on 6E. C. Kinnie asked what it would take to be ready for public hearing and does it need to run concurrently with Item D. D. Sorrentino stated no. There was discussion of this matter regarding the Signage and Sections 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 for access to the proposed business park. G. Rooke-Norman stated that this would need to be tabled to the next meeting. She would like to see ZC 02-06 for access separated from the Signage.

G. Rooke-Norman asked D. Sorrentino to get a definition for a height requirement and get it on the books. There was discussion of this matter.

8. Old Business

P. Anthony gave an update of the Jewett City Water Company will go any where the applicant would like as long as the applicant is willing to pay for the service. He submitted his update for the record.

G. Rooke-Norman stated that update on the Jewett City Water Pollution Control Authority regarding the buy-in/tie in will be reported at the next meeting.

9. New Business:

There was no new business.

10. Reports from the Enforcement Officer:

There was no report given.

11. Adjournment:

P. Anthony made a motion to adjourn. C. Kinnie seconded the motion. All were in favor. Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary