

NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting and Public Hearing

January 23, 2013

Chairman David Pruet called the regular meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room L101 at the Newington Town Hall, 131 Cedar Street, Newington, Connecticut.

I. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES

Commissioners Present

Commissioner Carol Anest
Vice-Chairman Michele Camerota
Commissioner Michael Camillo
Commissioner Cathleen Hall
Commissioner David Lenares
Chairman David Pruet
Commissioner Stanley Sobieski
Commissioner Frank Aieta-A
Commissioner Audra Ekstrom-A
Commissioner Kenneth Leggo-A

Commissioners Absent

Staff Present

Craig Minor, Town Planner

Chairman Pruet: I'd like to welcome our new Commissioner, Ken Leggo, glad you could serve.

Commissioner Leggo: Thank you.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No Changes

III. PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Pruet: I'm going to recommend a change here, that we hear Petition 02-13 before Petition 38-12. Does that meet with everyone's approval?

A. Petition 02-13 Special Exception (Section 3.15.6; Health Club) at 3153 Berlin Turnpike, McBride Properties, owner; Oana Nita, 55 Highgate Road Apt. B5 Newington, CT applicant/contact person.

Chairman Pruet: If the applicant would come forward please? Just state your name and address for the record please?

Oana Nita, 55 Highgate Road: I'm planning on opening a women's only fitness studio. Clients will participate in exercise, training and mind and body, Pilates, yoga, Zumba, and then with personal trainers. I couldn't find this anywhere else in the area. We will have

qualified trainers and group instructors for the program that is especially for women. We will deliver the best workout and training.

Chairman Pruet: Okay, very good. Staff comments on this petition?

Craig Minor: This is a permitted use by Special Exception in that zone. It's an existing building so nothing has come up in my review that would be a problem with the application per se, I do have a housekeeping thing though to point out, which the applicant is not aware of. The Zoning Regulations require that the Planning Department staff send written notice to the abutting property owners about the application. The staff neglected to do that. So the abutting property owners were not notified of the public hearing. Now it is in your regulations that abutting property owners be notified so that they can come and ask questions, for and against. That didn't happen. There was a legal notice published in the newspaper, there was the sign out in front, but my staff did not send notice to the abutters. Now, you have a number of choices. You can proceed with the public hearing, table it, continue it next time, at which point we will notify the abutters so they will be able to come and if they have questions to ask or whatever their points are that they wish to make, close the hearing that night, and then either vote on it that night or the following meeting. The other option, and I hesitate to suggest it, but I'm just laying it out there as an option, if the Commission feels that it's, shall we say, unlikely that any of the neighbors would have an objection, not out of the question, but let's just say, unlikely, if the Commission feels it appropriate the possibility is to approve the application but with the condition that if any abutter, and the staff will tomorrow quickly notify the abutting property owners, if any neighbors object to the Commission's having approved it tonight, that the approval is null and void and then we would have to start again the following meeting. I certainly wouldn't recommend that you do that frequently and I wouldn't even suggest it if it were a more complicated application such as Firestone, which applies to Firestone also, but luckily I don't think we are going to be closing the hearing on Firestone tonight anyway, so it's not going to be a problem for Firestone, but if the Commission was inclined to close the hearing tonight, and act on it, I would suggest that you put that condition in there, that it be null and void if any abutter comes forward in the next week or so, after the staff reaches out to them, to object. So that is really the only comment that I have, is again just that administrative item. I don't have any issue with the application itself.

Chairman Pruet: The application is satisfactory?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Chairman Pruet: Yes, Commissioner comments on the application or anything, or any other subject.

Commissioner Hall: I just had a question. I'm assuming that this is on the south side of McBride Plaza and the parking is adequate?

Craig Minor: Well, it's a building, well, let me start over, no more parking is required for this use than any other business use, so yes, there is sufficient parking.

Commissioner Hall: And the abutters, as I see it in my mind, which could be completely wrong, a gas station and Mortensen's on the other side would have to be notified because, are you doing it front door to front door?

Craig Minor: No, where the property abuts, on other sides and across the street is our practice.

Commissioner Hall: Then the gas station and Mortensen's I think.

Commissioner Aieta: No, there's residences.....

Commissioner Hall: Well, that's in the back. Pebble Court?

Commissioner Camerota: I have a question. Hours of operation?

Oana Nita: We will open at 7:00 in the morning, and go through until evening.

Commissioner Camerota: Okay, so what time do you start the classes in the morning?

Oana Nita: 7:00 o'clock

Commissioner Camerota: Seven.

Oana Nita: 7:00 o'clock, and then from 5:00 at night until about 8:00. People work.

Chairman Pruet: Any other comments from the Commissioners before I call upon the public? Anybody from the public wishing to speak in favor of this petition? Anybody from the public wishing to speak against this petition or any comment what so ever. Seeing none, what is the pleasure of the Commission on how to handle and go forward with this?

Commissioner Hall: I don't want to start a new precedent. I would just as soon keep it open, notify and then next meeting, what it is, the 13th, I believe, have people come if they want to at that point. I don't want to start anything we don't want to start.

Commissioner Anest: I agree.

Commissioner Aieta: Mr. Chairman, that is the procedure that we usually follow. Is that we hear it, we close it, and we continue it to the next meeting. We don't have to close it, we can continue it to the next meeting and then they can get the notification out.

Chairman Pruet: I think that is the consensus of the Commission. We are going to continue this petition until our next meeting on the 13th of February.

B. Petition 38-12: Special Exception (Section 3.15.8 Motor Vehicle Service Use) at 2903 Berlin Turnpike. Wex-Tuck Realty LLC, owner, Bismarck Real Estate Partners Inc., applicant; Jason Mikrut P.E. 54 Tuttle Place, Middletown, CT contact person.

Chairman Pruet: If the petitioner is here, they can step forward and please just state your name and address for the record please?

Amy Souchuns: Good evening, I'm Amy Souchuns from the law firm of Hurwitz, Sagarin, Slossberg & Knuff, representing the petitioner. Could I clarify for the record Mr. Chairman whether in fact the notices were sent out by the staff on this application as well, or were they not?

Craig Minor: They were not.

Amy Souchuns: They were not. Could I have a moment to speak with my client?

Chairman Pruet: Sure, absolutely.

Amy Souchuns: After speaking with my clients and looking the schedule, we'd like to postpone our presentation tonight to allow the town staff to send out the notices to the abutting property owners. We will maintain the public notice sign on the property to allow town staff to send notices and publish legal notices for the meeting of the 13th.

Craig Minor: So for the record, you are giving us an extension to begin the public hearing.

Amy Souchuns: This is an extension to start the public hearing, yes.

Chairman Pruet: I'd like to apologize on behalf of the town for that failure for official notification.

Amy Souchuns: I appreciate it, we've certainly run into this situation before and it's understandable. Thank you very much for your consideration.

IV. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (for items not listed on the Agenda; each speaker limited to two minutes.)

Rose Lyons, 46 Elton Drive: First of all, I'd like to say how nice the Farmington Savings Bank looks. I remember a lot of discussion about the windows and the bricks matching Dunkin Donuts old building and the new building and that seems to be fine. The parking seems to be more of an issue, I don't know if anyone has mentioned this before, but even if they put in a temporary entrance because people who are used to going in one way, granted they have to get used to going in a different way, but I know that people who go there frequently have told me, I don't go there that often, that people are trying to back out onto Main Street. It's pretty bad. It's bad enough that we have the situation with Webster Bank heading south onto Main Street, people trying to get in there, now we have people coming north and they don't know what entrance to use. Just thought I would mention it because it did seem to me that there was discussion around this table about the building and how it was going to look. I don't recall any discussions about the parking. It looks very nice in the back, with colonial lights. Very nice job. I know that you are going to discuss signage. The last time I was here I happened to notice coming down New Britain Avenue heading towards Willard Avenue, Clem Lemire park, that there is a sign up there advertising an event coming up in town. Personally as a resident, I have no problem with the signs advertising for our events and things like that, and even when they put the signs, sheets up for the kids for graduation, I think it looks nice, but I'm just wondering if the town is exempt when they put signs up on the fence, the chain link fence there? Some other times they are advertising registration for various sports, which is all fine and good, but I think there should be something where they would conform with what is in the center of town. I know that when the Committee on Community Safety was in existence there was some talk about putting some signs around town for areas other than just the center of town. That never came to be, but if there are signs around town, I think they should be made to conform. Thank you.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you for your comments. Just a follow up to that, the owner of that property has been notified of our concern about parking, so, we share your concerns. Anybody else from the public wishing to speak at this time?

V. **REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None

VI. MINUTES

January 9, 2013

Commissioner Camerota moved to accept the minutes of the January 9, 2012 Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with six voting YES.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. **Petition 39-12: Site Plan Approval (Firestone Complete Car Care) at 2903 Berlin Turnpike, Wex-Tuck Realty LLC, owner, Bismarck Real Estate Partners Inc., applicant; James Mikrut P.E. 54 Tuttle Place, Middletown CT contact person.**
- B. **Petition 40-12: DMV Location Approval Site Plan Approval (Firestone Complete Car Care) at 2903 Berlin Turnpike, Wex-Tuck Realty LLC, owner, Bismarck Real Estate Partners Inc., applicant; James Mikrut P.E. 54 Tuttle Place, Middletown CT contact person.**

Rescheduled to February 13, 2013

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

None

IX. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING (February 13, and 27)

- A. Petition 03-13 Special Exception Section 3.15.6; Health Club at 193 Pascone Place. Frederick and Barbara Alciati, owner, Bionic Athletics Inc., applicant; Michael T. Jordan, 40 Hillside Road, Kensington CT contact person.
- B. Petition 04-13: Special Exception (Section 6.2.4 Free Standing Business Sign) at 40 Commerce Court. Progressive Casualty Insurance Company, owner; Alan Bongiovanni, 170 Pane Road, Newington CT applicant/contact person.

Craig Minor: We have two items for scheduling. The first is item Petition 03-13, Special Exception for a Health Club at 193 Pascone Place. This is another personnel fitness type of activity and I won't be here, but I have no objection to you hearing it on the 13th, it seems like a pretty straight forward application. I would suggest that you proceed without me on that one.

Commissioner Aieta: What else do we have on for the 13th? Just Firestone?

Craig Minor: Well yes, Firestone, and then let me just talk about the next one and you can talk about that. Petition 04-13, this is for a free standing business sign at the corner of Commerce Court and Fenn Road. It's, it will be in addition to another free standing sign on the opposite corner, but they are tenants in the Omar Coffee sign, they want to have their own sign, so they have applied for a free standing sign, Progressive Casualty, which is a business on Commerce Court. Actually 40 Commerce Court, although the building itself is down the road a ways, it's actually a corner lot, their property extends all the way to Fenn Road, and they have a site plan which helps for the next meeting, at the corner of Fenn and Commerce Court. Where they want to put the sign is within a hundred feet of a wetland so

they need to get a permit from the Conservation Commission. They didn't get their application in, in time to be received at the January Conservation Commission meeting, that means it won't be received until the February meeting and they won't act on it that same night, it won't be approved until March, so this is actually this is a fair way from getting through the Wetlands arena, so I think I will suggest that you take no action at this time.

Chairman Pruet: We'll just revisit when it's timely and close to the time.

Craig Minor: Correct, so the only hearing that I recommend that you schedule tonight is the health, Bionic Athletics Inc.

Chairman Pruet: I don't see a problem putting that on the agenda. Does anybody.....

X. TOWN PLANNER REPORT

A. Staff Report

Craig Minor: The first topic is the Zoning Enforcement Issues that were raised at the previous TPZ meetings. The issue of the red windows of the CVS on Main Street, they have asked us what the process is to be able to keep those red windows. I explained well, you would have to apply for a modification to the Special Permit that you got eight years ago or so. So they asked what the process is to do that, I explained it to them, so I think they are going to ask to have it modified. It's their prerogative to ask.

The issue with the Dunkin Donuts parking configuration, I did get in touch with their architect, he e-mailed back to me today saying that they will consider it, but they have already, as he put it, they have already poured the curbs and so, but he said they will consider it, and we will follow up.

The format of the ZEO report, I have asked the IT department to help me develop a new format because I know the existing format is confusing and the IT gentleman and I are going to get together on Friday to work on a more user friendly format for that report for the ZEO report.

Bonds, nothing new, I'm still going through the list, actually I haven't spent any time on it since our last meeting, so nothing new to report on that.

Modern Tire, nothing new to report.

Newington Walk, Toll Brothers, let me come back to that, because that is kind of lengthy.

Newington Junction Planning Study, we are meeting with the consultants this Friday, Commissioner Camillo and I and the town staff, we are meeting to get a better sense of what exactly it is they're providing us. These planned services are being provided by CCROG, I'm not sure exactly what they are going to do for us, but I know what we want is some good information on the potential for zone changes up in the area of Newington Junction in anticipation of to prepare for the impact of the busway.

Low Impact Development Regulations. The committee had its first meeting on January 11th, it was a good meeting. We got some good information from my counterpart in Plainville who went through this process a year ago, he was very helpful. As the Commission may recall, it's a two pronged project, one is to revise land use regulations to include best management practices that are low impact, but also a demonstration project. Something in town to show these practices in real life and there are some ideas that have been kicking around that we could do. We're having the next meeting I think next week, I sent out an e-mail earlier this afternoon, so you probably haven't seen it yet, but we'll be meeting next week.

The last item is also complicated, so let me come back to that also. Let me come back to Newington, the Toll Brothers project. At the Conservation Commission meeting last night the applicant submitted a significantly revised plan, and I have a copy and I will show it to you. It's a plan that significantly removes the wetlands issues of concern and is, presents a far

less of an impact on the wetlands, however, unfortunately for this Commission, it is absolutely, it would require a new approval of subdivision from this Commission. It's the same number of lots, but it would mean coming back to you for another presentation and public hearing and the whole nine yards. It's hard to see but there are some purple lines. The purple lines represent a road and three lots that were in the original design. Toll Brothers has eliminated the cross road, and has taken those three houses and squeezed them in up there, so it's still 48 lots, it's the same number of lots, but it will be two different roads. One cul-de-sac up here, and then kind of a split cul-de-sac down here. So because they have eliminated the wetlands crossing here, this presentation is more acceptable to the Conservation Commission but it is significantly different from what you approved. By law this would be a re-subdivision, this is a change in the road configuration of the approved subdivision, and it was an approved subdivision so this Toll Brothers will have to come back for a reapplication.

Chairman Pruet: Is it still going to go forward. How is the Conservation Commission moving forward on this new application? Is that what they are meeting for on Thursday?

Craig Minor: Yes, this is still the subject of an on-going public hearing. They haven't closed the hearing on it yet. They are having another special meeting in a couple of days. I think Toll Brothers hope is that the Conservation Commission closes the hearing, Thursday is their deadline for closing the hearing, and then within the next thirty-five days, make a decision.

Commissioner Aieta: So we will see this maybe in March.

Chairman Pruet: Are there other issues, are the issues still prevalent, would their issues still be prevalent on this proposed change as it pertains to the original application? Or are there issues on the table for consideration?

Craig Minor: Well, it would certainly be to Toll Brothers advantage when they make their presentation to show you how this design addresses those twenty-four or whatever, but those now are all moot, because theoretically they are, not abandoning the approval because you never give up something once you go it, but in a sense, they're putting that aside and starting from scratch, but it would certainly be wise for them to show you how this plan does address those concerns. I can see for example, there is a little parking lot down here for people who chose to walk around the Old Highway, the two cul-de-sacs stop short of the Old Highway, and under the original design they came all the way down. I will probably, just for my own information, compare this with the conditions of the original approval but those are all technically moot at this point when Toll Brothers comes in for an approval of this.

Commissioner Aieta: I would hope that the Commission could see its way clear to have the public hearing and not drag it out for say a month, excessive public input. We've already heard this once, I would hope that we would be able to hear it, and close it without extending it. We've heard all of the comments, in the past, I don't want to shut the public off, but I don't want to go through that rehashing of this thing again. It was brutal the first time, and we kept it open for an exorbitant amount of time, and I want to hear from the public, but I don't want to hear it fifty times. I hope we can hear it and close the hearing in a timely manner.

Chairman Pruet: I hope so too.

Craig Minor: The last item that I have, is addressed in a separate memo in front of you, and the issue is Incentive Housing. I'll paraphrase the memo. I know Ed Meehan brought this up briefly because I've read through the minutes of the current Plan of Development, this topic came up, somewhat, but not definitively, and it's been suggested to me that I present it to the

Commission again to consider. The intent of housing zone concept was created by an Act of the Connecticut Legislature a number of years ago and it's a mechanism to encourage towns to increase the density, the existing density in appropriate areas of town. Areas of town that have city water, and sewer, that have access to public transportation, areas where slightly greater density might be appropriate. The State is encouraging such amendments financially, in a number of ways. First of all they are offering towns grants to do, grants that are called technical assistance grants, whereby a town could hire a consultant to help the town decide whether incentive housing is good for that town. That's one financial incentive, another is town's that do adopt these regulations and then receive an application for approval and approve an actual application, the State, if money is available, the town would be eligible for a grant of \$2,000.00 per house in an approved incentive housing zone development, and then when that house actually gets built, the town would be eligible for another \$5,000.00. Now there are towns that are several years ahead of us in this project, that have gone through this process and have actually gotten some money from the state. But I believe there are also towns that have gone through the process and were told by the state, well, we ran out of money, so, although the money is nice, the concept I think needs to stand on its own merits. I think the Town needs, any town, needs to feel that slightly higher density to create slightly more affordable housing is appropriate for the town, with or without this icing on the cake. Now, and I mentioned in my memo, to be eligible, the town has to agree to increase the existing density by not less than 25 percent and that a project that comes in, under such regulations, would be as of right. Now, the town would, you would have the right to identify incentive housing zones which of course is discretionary, you don't have to designate an area of town for that zone, but once you have done that, once you have gone through the public hearing process, once you have decided that yes, that is an area of town that's appropriate for higher density development, at that point, when the applicant comes in with an application, it's just site plan approval. If it meets your regulations, you have to approve it. Now your regulations can be very detailed, you can do to whatever minute details you want, specify exactly what needs to be in such a site plan, so it's not as if you are writing a blank check, but and it's a big but, understanding that this greater density is as of right. You have to approve it if it meets all of your requirements at that point. So, I was, I'm considering asking you or suggesting that you direct me to prepare at least the grant application for the money, but I'm not, I don't want to do that unless you tell me that I am not totally wasting my time because if this 25 percent density bonus is a complete non-starter to you folks, then there is really no point in me spending my time on the grant application.

Chairman Pruet: And also the fact that the money has the propensity of not being there, the way the current financial state of the State of Connecticut is.

Craig Minor: When I was in Cromwell, we went through the same process and I explained the incentive housing zone program to the Commission. The Commission voted narrowly, by one vote, to apply for the technical assistance grant and we hired Planimetrics to come in and they did a lot of really good research. They did a good analysis of the housing market and demographics in Cromwell, and at the end of the day, the Commission decided based on this really detailed information that Cromwell did not have the affordable housing problems that other towns have, and decided at that point to stop the process, and that was okay. The technical assistance grant is not conditional. You're not obligated to go forward with adopting regulations if you decide that it's not right for Newington; but don't apply for the grant with no intention of adopting the incentive housing down the road just so you can get some good state of the art data on your town.

Commissioner Aieta: If this was 35 years ago, and the town was half built, I would maybe consider something like this, but the facts are that the Town of Newington is ninety percent

something developed, I think we would be wasting our time, the state's money, to even to consider a grant from the state to even go forward, because I don't see myself or some of the other Commissioners here voting to do affordable housing in the Town of Newington. The fact is, most of the housing in the Town of Newington is affordable and does meet the criteria that the State has put forward for affordable housing. We have housing in this town that was pre-war housing, little capes, little ranches, that fall into, are actually affordable housing and I don't know where you would put this. Is this a carrot from the state so they can get housing along the busway so they could get the rider ship that is required to make it a half way viable project. I believe so. I'm not interested in it as a Commissioner.

Chairman Pruet: Also, in our ten year plan too, I believe we beat this horse to death too, and the consensus was after eighteen months of putting together a ten year plan we have enough high density homes. Like Frank said too, we have a survey that we have affordable housing and the fact that we want to maintain our present community status as what Newington is. I echo your sentiments, I don't think that would be appropriate for this.

Commissioner Sobieski: Just one question, would this apply to someone who has less than (inaudible) right now. There are lots of houses in the old areas where you may have a 60 foot lot, and not an 80. Would somebody then be able to buy and reduce that lot for affordable housing? That's my question.

Craig Minor: Well, I guess theoretically they could ask you to approve, it's an overlay zone, not a zone change, on a half acre parcel, but you would deny it. You would say no, that's not appropriate. It wouldn't be appropriate to do anything less than five or ten acres, in fact you would probably have that in the regulations, the minimum assemblage would be five acres.

Commissioner Aieta: I don't think there's too many sites left that are five acres in the Town of Newington that we would consider for that type of housing.

Chairman Pruet: Anybody else want to comment? Okay, I think you got a good direction. Anything else on your report?

Craig Minor: No, that's all.

XI. COMMUNICATIONS

None.

XII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (for items not listed on the Agenda; each speaker limited to two minutes.)

Rose Lyons, 46 Elton Drive: I know there is no dialogue with the Commission but maybe you can answer this question. I read recently in the paper that the VA is putting another facility on their property. I know that they came before you, before the Board of Ed, the Town Council, to show their plans, for Victory Gardens. It appears that there is going to be a meeting, an informational meeting, on February 4th, and we're not going to get into that again because they had so many problems with Victory Gardens, they came to three different meetings and then there were problems at the end, so this can't be the only meeting.

Last night at the Town Council meeting Jaime Trevethan gave her report on the blight, I don't know if the Council shared that with you. It might be something that you might take a look at. Seems like she is doing a good job on that, Jaime seems to have a good handle on that.

Lastly, I was just wondering, talking about Toll Brothers, what the clearing is for at the top of the mountain, are they going to start with the gas station?

Craig Minor: I think that they are just trying to make it more visible in the hopes of selling it, to a developer. That's the Hunter Development, a hotel, gas station, I think a restaurant.

Rose Lyons: So there is nobody interested in it yet, so they are trying to make it.....

Craig Minor: More marketable, yes.

Domenic Pane, 638 Church St: Mr. Chair, Commission Members, I would like to know whether or not a letter was received under Communications from an attorney concerning the auto use and why that hasn't been made public to the Commission members tonight, if the town has received something, and also on December 11th, I talked to you briefly about this Mr. Chairman, there was a letter sent to the town from East PBE located on Pane Road, and it was received by the Town of Newington, and it was never put into the minutes on the December 12th meeting and nothing, I didn't see anything on the last meeting. I would like to know why letters coming to the town are not being presented to the Commission.

Craig Minor: I'll address the second one, quicker. Not every letter that comes to the department gets sent on to the Commission. The letters are housekeeping, some are dealt with by the staff; no means does every letter that comes to the office get presented to the Commission as Communications. Your agenda packets would be this thick. So, that's staff discretion, which items weren't being given to the Commission as Communications. That's my position on that. That's the answer to your question. The first letter though, the letter from Attorney Hollister, the Commissioners got that, because that letter was sent as part of the Firestone application. So it will be an exhibit in the public record for the Firestone application, and the Commissioners do in fact have that letter because it is part of an application.

Domenic Pane: Thank you very much. I wasn't aware of that. As far as the first one, concerning East PBE, it was their intent when they sent this letter to have it be part of the public hearing.

Craig Minor: But the other reason that I did not do that is, East PBE, they are one of the appellants in the Modern Tire, we are in litigation with them, that's why there should not be any communication between this Commission and them. They are, we're in litigation with them.

Domenic Pane: It wasn't communication between you and them, it was a communication that was just sent to the town for them to put on the records. Just like I could come in here and I could talk about that, and I have the right to talk about it, and if the lawyers want to feel that they want to take something from it, then they can. But it shouldn't be you to determine something that comes in from the public should or should not be put into the minutes. Thank you.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you.

XIII. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Aieta: Quickly on what Domenic said, if something comes in and it's pertaining to an application, the commission should see it.

Craig Minor: An application, yes.

Commissioner Aieta: Wasn't that part of.....

Craig Minor: No.

Commissioner Aieta: It was not?

Craig Minor: No.

Commissioner Aieta: I'm not concerned about that particular, but just Communications, they should be passed on to us. I don't want a packet like that either, but if it's important I want to see the information that is coming into the town if it pertains to zoning.

Craig Minor: What I can do is to sit down with the Chairman and present all of the correspondence that has come in to him, and then if he feels it warrants going on the agenda, we can do that.

Chairman Pruet: I think we have done that in the past.

XIV. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Pruet: Again, I'd like to welcome Commissioner Ken Leggo to the board. Mr. Minor will get you a booklet and look forward to you participating.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Anest moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski. The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Norine Addis,
Recording Secretary