

NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting and Public Hearing

December 11, 2013

I. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES

Chairman Cathleen Hall called the regular meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Helen Nelson Meeting Room at the Newington Town Hall, 131 Cedar Street, Newington, Connecticut.

I. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES

Commissioners Present

Commissioner Frank Aieta
Commissioner Carol Anest
Commissioner Michael Camillo
Chairman Cathleen Hall
Commissioner Kenneth Leggo
Commissioner Robert Serra Sr.
Commissioner Stanley Sobieski

Commissioners Absent

Staff Present

Craig Minor, Town Planner

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Craig Minor: Madam Chairman, I recommend that you delete Item A, Petition 60-13. The attorney for the applicant is not available tonight, so she asked that it be continued until next month.

Chairman Hall: I don't see a problem with that, so we will do that. Any additions?

Craig Minor: No.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. Petition 60-13 Special Exception (Section 6.13) Accessory Apartment) at 18 Homecrest Street, Miguel Braga, owner/applicant, Attorney Jesssica Dornelas, 350 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, CT, contact. Continued from November 26, 2013.**

Deleted

- B. Petition 47-13: Zoning Text Amendment (New Section 6.15 Medical Marijuana) Town Plan and Zoning Commission, applicant. Continued from November 26, 2013.**

Chairman Hall: Craig, if you would like to lead us on this?

Craig Minor: I have nothing new to add from last week, but the public hearing was continued to give anyone from the public the opportunity to speak who wasn't here previously, or give anyone who did speak before to think upon it further, offer some additional ideas, and for that matter give the Commission the opportunity to ask the audience of there are any other thoughts that they want to share with the Commission.

Chairman Hall: This is a public hearing so we will start with anyone who wishes to speak in favor of this petition. Come forward. Is there anyone who wishes to speak in opposition, please come forward, state your name and address for the record.

Gail Bedrejko, 21 Isabelle Terrace, Newington: I'm actually not sure in terms of the petition I'm for or against but I have comments after what I read in the paper and whatever, so, but first I'd like to commend the TPZ for being pro-active and discussing this topic, and I'm not here to give my opinion on the law, but this is a place to talk about its impact on Newington and to insure that the locations are in secure, reliable and appropriate sites in the town. As an aside, I really hadn't followed the issue closely until I read an article in the Courant dated November 27th reporting on your last meeting, and I really felt compelled to comment, because I saw a quote from our Director of Economic Development which truly concerned me when he said, "we're open for all business. We're not so highfalutin' that we are going to determine and try to say what is best for Newington." I respectfully disagree. It's all our responsibility to try to determine what is best for Newington, particularly town officials. For example, I wouldn't want a town filled with adult entertainment businesses, prisons, pawn shops, check cashing fronts or wind turbines, despite how much tax revenue would be generated. It is incumbent on members of this Commission and it is their duty to within a law to regulate land use that is in harmony with the town's character and its mission as outlined in the 2020 plan. Now back to the issue at hand. The draft regulations as written are prudent and safe for the initial go-around, including the buffers and restrictions. Regarding dispensaries, this is a unique product and at this time shouldn't be compared to selling aspirin, vitamins, or antibiotics as was stated by an official in your last meeting. It's different from a normal retail pharmacy because it will be selling and dispensing only one product and its paraphernalia to a restricted clientele. Second, this is not just a local business that will be serving primarily Newington residents. Given the limited number of dispensaries and production licenses that will be granted this will be a regional destination. Thirdly, the state regulations prohibit the consumption of the drug on the premises, but seem to be silent on the consumption in the vicinity outside, therefore the 1000 foot buffer for schools, playgrounds, residential areas and places of worship is reasonable in the event that clients may be indiscrete in their consumption which incidentally has been an issue in other states. Again, this is new territory and caution at the outset should not be derided as moral judgment but rather as prudent planning. The amendment as written does not prohibit the business from coming into town, which is fine, but it also balances appropriate access to locations to those in need but also tried to mitigate any negative impact to the community. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you Gail. Is there anyone else who would like to speak in opposition to this petition? Is there anyone who would simply like to speak to this petition, either for or against? Seeing none from the public, Commissioners?

Commissioner Leggo: I have a couple, after listening to what the public had to say at the last meeting, and actually kind of goes along with what was just said, I have a couple of recommendations that I would like to bring forward. One is, in the separation requirements, 6.15.4, I was just looking at A into two different categories, separating the dispensary from the production facility. With the buffer, no medical marijuana dispensary facility shall be within a thousand feet of church, temple or other places, primary for religious worship, public buildings, private recreation area, or school, playground, park or child daycare facility, and

then having no medical marijuana production facility shall be within a hundred feet of church, temple, other places, you know, the same wording, basically just stating that after what was heard, is that the production facility is kind of a different entity completely from a dispensary. That it is a closed building and somewhat secured in that way. The other recommendation that I had was on page two under the security requirements under the hours of operation, again separating the dispensary and the production facility, that the medical marijuana dispensary facility shall be operated within the hours of 7:00 am to 7:00 pm, seven days a week, rather than 7:00 to 5:00, and the medical marijuana production facility shall be allowed to operate twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, again, because being a different entity and you know, they are working around the clock for what they have to do within that facility. Those are my thoughts.

Chairman Hall: Thank you. Anyone else in reaction to Kenny, or new thoughts?

Commissioner Camillo: The production, I think there should be a minimum of a building size, square footage of 25,000 square feet. As far as anything else, I agree with what Kenny just said.

Commissioner Aieta: A hundred foot buffer between a house of worship or a playground or a school or a residence for a production facility is I think too close. We debated this and we didn't break the two apart, the dispensary and the production facility but I think that is a little too close. That opens up a lot, a huge area in the town in the Industrial Zones for a production facility. I would like to see what that would do to the map that we have restricted area if we went down to a hundred feet. I agree with the possibility, the growing of marijuana facility probably you have to have people there more than from seven in the morning until five at night, so maybe we could change the times for the production facility, making the changes to accommodate the growth of the marijuana, but people have shown interest in the town for basically dispensaries. As far as building size, I'm just curious how you came up with 25,000 square feet?

Commissioner Carillo: It's a farm, it's an indoor farm. With today's technology they don't need a lot of room, but we have all these empty buildings in town in the Industrial area, Mountain Road, Pane Road....

Commissioner Aieta: Pane Road is in the PD Zone. The Industrial zones are along Fenn Road, Mountain Road.....

Commissioner Carillo: Would this come under a farm?

Craig Minor: Well, I think most people would see this as an industrial use because it takes place within the four walls of the building. If someone wanted to grow mushrooms in Newington, inside a building, would we consider that a farm or industrial, I'm not sure.

Commissioner Aieta: A farm is defined as a minimum of five acres in the Town of Newington. That is how a farm is defined.

Chairman Hall: Any other thoughts?

Commissioner Anest: I'm thinking, if we reduce the buffer for the production to just one hundred, two hundred, whatever, feet and then put a minimum square footage on the building, that is going to reduce where people can go, so if there is not a building of 25,000 square feet, that's a good, we're widening it, but we are narrowing it again with the square footage of the building.

Commissioner Aieta: I'd like to see the map that shows, I'd like to see the Commission come up with the distance requirement of 100 feet, if we all agree if that is what it is, or 500 or 800 or whatever it is that we agree upon, I'd like to see the map, and then I would like to see the buildings that would be, that possibly could be used. Sounds like someone already has a building that size.

Chairman Hall: Any other thoughts? What I would like to see is a map that shows 100, 500 and 1,000. In that way, it should give us a pretty good idea as to what we have, and that would be for production and dispensaries, so where any of these would be able to fit in on our map, if we could do that.

Craig Minor: Okay.

Commissioner Aieta: I thought we agreed that the dispensaries were at 1000 feet.

Chairman Hall: Let's see what happens if we bring it down to say, 500.

Commissioner Leggo: If you had a map showing 100, 500, 1000.....

Chairman Hall: Right.

Commissioner Leggo: It doesn't matter what it is showing, but we're looking at what would be available.

Commissioner Aieta: We're keeping the zone Industrial?

Chairman Hall: I believe so, I think we were pretty adamant on that the last time.

Commissioner Leggo: And still the wording that they had to be, 1000, I have it right here, 1000 feet apart, the dispensary from the production facility. They can't be in the same building and they can't be right next to each other.

Chairman Hall: Correct. That was part of rational, keep the production in one area, and then dispensary, which is a totally different function, in a different spot.

Commissioner Leggo: That's what really made me start to think about it, the fact that they are two separate, two totally separate things, even though one is making and one is dispensing, they really aren't connected other than that.

Chairman Hall: Right, we have different clientele, we have different employees, so the whole operation is different.

Craig Minor: I just wanted to share one thing with you. After the hearing last time I went back to my collection of zoning regulations from other towns, that specifically regulate medical marijuana to find if any other towns have a distance requirement or a buffer, and I went through all that I could find, there are six or seven of them, and I only found, well, initially I only found one town that has a buffer requirement and that was Southington, which as a coincidence was the town that I modeled our regulations on. Then I kept researching and I found that West Haven, their regulations also require a buffer, so I called the Town Planner and asked him, how did he come upon that idea, he said he got it from Southington. So, not to be flippant, I'm calling Southington patient zero, because that seems to be where the idea of a buffer starts from. No other town has buffers except those of us who have copied it from Southington. I just throwing that fact out to you, I don't know if that's an

important fact, or just an interesting fact, but Southington and now those of us who have been influenced by Southington are the only towns that I know of are the only towns talking about having a buffer for medical marijuana.

Chairman Hall: I think part of what we are concerned with is the fact that Newington is dense. We don't have a lot of room to do anything in town, whether it be residential, industrial, or whatever, so I think that anytime that we have a new concept we have to be very careful about making it more dense. I think the buffers would be very important for us because we just want to make sure when we do something we are not creating another issue. Southington certainly has a lot more open space than we do. West Haven, certainly more than Newington.

Commissioner Anest: Was Southington the 500, I can't remember, I think that was the original we had.

Craig Minor: Yes.

Chairman Hall: I know that we upped it to 1000.

Commissioner Aieta: It was 750.

Commissioner Sobieski: Craig, has East Hartford passed anything? I know East Hartford was looking at something.

Craig Minor: Not that I know of, but I can go back and look.

Commissioner Sobieski: I think they were looking at their industrial area also.

Craig Minor: A lot of towns decided that the regulations currently already allow medical marijuana. I know Middletown did, and therefore decided that they didn't need to make any changes to their regulations.

Commissioner Aieta: Just a point. A lot of towns that are looking at it are being very prudent and are putting a moratorium on it, and waiting for the first round of approvals from the state to happen and up and running to see what kind of problems they have, if any, and I think that is a pretty good approach. If we get hung up on this, I would recommend that we wait on this, on the whole medical marijuana issue, and wait until after this first round and see how the towns that have them work out. I mean, they are only letting out so many licenses, just a very small number, and a lot of towns are looking at it that way and maybe we should be looking at it, not to be the first one to jump into the pool.

Chairman Hall: I seem to be getting the impression that we have no desire to close this at this point, we want to keep it open, more questions, more research, is that a fair assessment?

Commissioner Anest: I also think if we come up with something that we should probably run it by our Town Attorney before we vote on it so there is no issue.

Chairman Hall: Absolutely.

Craig Minor: I notice that Mr. Ghulam has showed up, do you want to give him the opportunity to speak if he wants to?

Chairman Hall: Certainly

Craig Minor: This is the public hearing on the medical marijuana regulations so did you have anything that you wanted to say?

Mr. Ghulam: No.

Craig Minor: Okay.

Chairman Hall: Then at this point we would like to leave Petition 47-13 open.

IV. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (for items not listed on the agenda, speakers limited to two minutes.)

Rose Lyons, 46 Elton Drive: As I look around the table, welcome back to the Commissioners that were here, welcome to the Commissioners that weren't here, and I'm delighted to see you sitting across from me Chairman Hall.

Chairman Hall: Thank you.

Rose Lyons: Again, and hopefully next time you'll fill the other side, but not me though, I want to still sit out there.

Chairman Hall: Thank you Rose. Anyone else wishing to speak?

V. **REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None

VI. **MINUTES**

A. November 26, 2013

Commissioner Sobieski moved to accept the minutes of the November 26, 2013 Regular Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leggo. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with six voting YES.

VII. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. "Low Impact Development (LID presentation)

Chairman Hall: We have Mr. Chalder with us this evening.....

Craig Minor: And Mr. Reardon.

Chairman Hall: This will be a new concept for the people just coming on the board, and frankly, it's a new concept to many people.

Glenn Chalder: Why don't we just take a minute to give a quick overview. I'm Glenn Chalder from Planometrics, and this is Jim Reardon from Fuss and O'Neil and the State of Connecticut awarded the Town of Newington a grant to study Low Impact Development and that phrase, low impact development isn't really self explanatory so the basic concept beyond low impact development is a new way of thinking about drainage. Historically the way that we drain goes back to ancient times. We have gutters in streets, in Roman times, etc., and we end up putting pipes in the ground, and catch basins and generally sort of the whole idea

with drainage was, get it into the pipes and move it out quickly. What we have learned over time is that that type of approach can cause a number of problems. It exacerbates flooding because pipes don't have a lot of friction and water moves quickly and downstream flooding can be a problem and it also minimizes or prevents or detracts from ground water recharge, so as a result our brooks and streams can go dry and the wild life that depends on that don't have the benefit of that and the other thing is, when drainage goes into the pipes and gets discharged quickly, there is actually no opportunity to capture that rainwater and treat it in terms of pollutants that can get into it. So LID is a new approach to deal with issues of drainage in a more holistic way. To address the issues of flooding, and in particular the issues of water quality and this is what our study is about, our recommendations that we are going to be going over tonight.

James Reardon: I think that's it, and there were two elements to this and I know that Glenn is going to cover the aspect related to the regulations, and then additionally we put together a low impact development manual which includes design standards, describes different scenarios that you might use low impact development in, particularly focuses on residential issues, and it includes standards as to how you would implement low impact development, in other words under what kind of hydrologic conditions you would design the low impact development.

Glenn Chalder: So the basic approaches right now for a developer, if we were developers and were about to present a site plan to you, or a subdivision plan, it's highly likely that our plan would show catch basins and drainage and we would have a report from the engineering and the planner and everybody would say, yup, the calculations all work and everything is good. What we are really talking about is a new situation where through the work of Fuss and O'Neil and the preparation of a design manual for low impact development, there are recommended techniques where the water would go into a water quality basins, or other best management practices, tools or techniques that would attempt to pick up the pollutants and allow the vegetation to renovate it so that the water once discharged is cleaner, and to hold the water so in fact it can percolate into the ground. So that's under the manual, in essence our first step in rain water, rather than try to get rid of it as quickly as possible which creates downstream major problem areas, what we're trying to do is find ways for each property to build the drainage that falls and then creates and then discharges and it's just a gentler approach. So as part of our work we went through the regulations and said, well, what's in the Newington regulations today that addresses the issue of drainage. There was curbing requirements, soft water running off onto the grass, there are parking requirements which require large areas of pavement, road width requirements, a lot of things in the regulations that just didn't kind of set the stage, or actually could prevent somebody from addressing low impact development strategies. So we looked at those issues and then working with the committee, made up of representatives of local boards and commissions, and town staff and came up with some suggested regulatory changes. What I would like to do tonight I think is go through these with you, essentially line by line, so if you have any questions, or section by section, or page by page okay, but just to make certain that the Commission members are comfortable at this, because when you are comfortable, we would encourage you to think about scheduling a public hearing and move towards adoption because town Planning and Zoning, the Wetlands and Conservation Commission, there are changes to the wetland regulations, and all of these regulations all sort of tie together. Any questions overall before we start going through, line by line.

Commissioner Aieta: You make an assumption that the Commission, that this is a done deal for the Commission, and it's not. The town is ninety-five percent developed, we're looking at five percent of our land, and we're looking at putting restrictions on that five percent that's left, or redevelopment areas. It's not a done deal, we've taken a grant from the state to study it,

you know, it looks like we are pushing to go into changes in the regulations. I'm willing to look at all of this, but my first blush at this thing is that, if it's a mandatory requirement on the five percent that is left, I'd say, I would not vote for changes in regulations to implement this. I don't know how else you could do it, if you would be looking at a voluntary basis, I would be concerned about what it would do to homeowners doing improvements to their properties, particularly looking at three hundred square feet of pavement that, after that point a homeowner would have to do some special stuff to their property that might be cost prohibitive, some of the pervious materials that are required are tremendously expensive, particularly to residents, homeowners who are doing improvements or driveway improvements to their properties, so I would be looking at it, I don't think it's a done deal that we are changing, you are saying we would like to schedule a public hearing. I would like to see how we're going to, I'm not convinced that we should implement this at all, and I said at the last meeting, if this was an area where the town was twenty-five, thirty percent developed, I'd say yes, it would be a great way to start and keep our development, but the five percent, the effect it would have on storm water, the storm water, would be minimal number one. Number two, we already have in our regulations that a development has to have zero runoff, so we're.....

James Reardon: Every property has run-off.....

Commissioner Aieta: That's the criteria they use.

Craig Minor: Zero increase in run-off.

Glenn Chalder: Zero increase in the rate of run-off.

James Reardon: I guess I would say I concur with you that you shouldn't take any change of your regulations lightly, and this is certainly by no means a done deal, and the whole reason we are here tonight is to go over these issues, and it's definitely not intended to be a rubber stamp. A couple of points, major difference, since this came up, major difference between rate and volume. The difference is, rate you can control things like weirs, structures, detention basins, things like that. Volume, which is quite a bit different, you have to control by retaining water and somehow putting it back into the ground. So it is quite a bit different in terms of how you design things, it's also very different in the impact that it has on the ecology, flooding, things like that. If you are just controlling rate, you can have a rate that is similar to the rate that you would have during an undeveloped condition, but you can have it for a very long time, and you can have that for a bunch of different properties, which then can result in some very significant flooding because the volume still continues, it's just that it gets metered out during the course of twenty-four or forty-eight hours as opposed to happening more quickly. A couple other things I would point out. We had initially looked at that three hundred square feet, we're actually talking at this point about six hundred square feet. I know there are a couple of different numbers mentioned in the materials and six hundred square feet is about the size of a good size two car garage, part of the reason that we picked that. Also, the standards only apply to those projects that would get permitting. So, say an increase in driveway size, or paving a driveway, going from unpaved to paved, or putting in a patio or something like that, wouldn't have to comply with the low impact development standards because it's not a permitted project. There's really no way for the town to track those kind of things and hence the reason that we made that point. While you guys are ninety-five percent developed, there is the change, the likelihood in fact of redevelopment that will occur. What these standards would allow is for you to regulate that, redevelopment in a way that discourages the kind of flooding that permeates the town. Additionally I'd say, five percent may not sound like a lot, but it will have an impact on the kind of run-off condition that you will see, and the likelihood of flooding and with the increase in the intensity of rain storms that

we are seeing more and more these days, I think it's important, even though it seems like a small amount.

Commissioner Aieta: The five percent that is not developed, it's probably undevelopable land. It's either high slopes, wetlands, we're talking about the overall undeveloped land in Newington, and most of it has restrictions on it because of the nature of (inaudible) so it's not five percent that's out there that is developable land, it's land that is out there that cannot be developed because of slopes and some other features.

Glenn Chalder: Some of the best soil types in town to accommodate this are actually along the Berlin Turnpike where there has been quite a bit of development and redevelopment over the year, so these are some of the areas that generate the most runoff in town, and if we can make a small percentage change there, downstream it will likely start to have significant progress, so I think what we are looking at is to kind of change the thinking from catch basins and get rid of rain water, to deal with it where the circumstances and conditions will allow us to do that.

Commissioner Aieta: What is the carrot that we are offering to the people to do this type of thing?

Chairman Hall: Frank, let's have them explain what they want to tonight, and then I'm sure there will be quite a few questions to follow. Let's have them get started on their presentation and then we can take notes and ask them questions, okay? Thank you.

Glenn Chalder: Well, I think my goal is to start to go through the proposed regulatory changes so that you get a sense if you will, of the nature of the changes that we are talking about. I think we'll start the subdivisions first if that's okay with the Commission. We have proposed two definitions to be added to the subdivision regulations. One is the definition of impervious surface, so that we clearly define what it is we are concerned about in terms of impervious surface, and then also the definition of low impact development techniques. This is specifically where we refer to the manual, the types of techniques that are shown and recommended in the manual, to be considered, so I think any type or level of regulations, the terms should be defined and well defined, and these definitions are proposed for the subdivision regulations, the zoning regulations and also the character of the wetland regulations as well.

Then, on page two in the subdivision regulations, we're proposing a new section here entitled storm water management. We currently have drainage improvements and storm water requirements in the subdivision regulations, and we're introducing here the implementation of low impact development techniques and strategy to manage storm water and referring people again to the low impact development storm water manual for the town, and the standards that would be referred to. The standards that would be applicable would be the use of low impact development to reduce storm water runoff and pollutants. Standard number two, to control the peak flow of runoff from a site, and practices similar to the zero increase we were just talking about; standard three would be construction of erosion and sediment control, standard four would be making appropriate provisions for operation and maintenance of the various drainage improvements, and then standard five relates to properties being redeveloped, what standards would apply. So those standards are laid out in the manual and again, if Jim and I were engineers or applicants before you tonight, the Commission would be asking us what provisions we had made in terms of implementing low impact development techniques and our compliance and consistency with the manual for the town.

There are some other minor changes in here, but again, most of these are the introduction of the phrase storm water and reference to the low impact development storm water manual for the town.

Actually up to page five now, here we are talking about modifications to the street requirements of the subdivision regulations. There is a provision in here which allows the Commission to modify or waive the requirements for curbs in a subdivision. Again, if the curbs are there, the drainage is basically directed to the basins. If there are situations on a flat road, etc., where there is an opportunity for runoff and infiltration, not having curbs there will allow that to function better, so this is an opportunity for the Commission to modify those standards based on the recommendations from staff.

On page six, we have identified the possible opportunity to be a little bit more frugal in the amount of pavement on local roads. I think, as Frank points out, we don't expect too many more subdivisions in town, but there will be some, and this situation is an opportunity for us to have narrow pavement if it is appropriate. This is a minimum paved width standard, so as part of the review and approval process, the Commission can determine the situation in the neighborhood and what they feel is appropriate, but more pavement than might be necessary might not always be required.

There are some other minor modifications on page seven that were requested by the engineering staff in regards to the center line radius of the street, and basically what that means is how twisty the street is, how sharp the curve is. Some minor modifications in the dimension of the cul-de-sac at the end of a dead end street.

Page eight, this is the material that would be submitted as part of the subdivision application in terms of the evaluation of low impact development. What we are asking for is that the plans show the design specifications for the slope, and the other technical information for drainage, whether it's conventional drainage or low impact development techniques. We are also asking that information be submitted along with the application about the types of soil on the property, the trees, six inch or larger caliper trees are interceptors of rainfall and are a tremendous benefit in terms of avoiding flooding. Sensitive natural areas, areas of disturbance and compaction, and the location and extent of impervious surfaces anticipated being installed as a result of the proposal. Again, these are the types of review considerations that would be important in relation to drainage. So those are the nature of the changes to the subdivision regulations. I think to quickly recap, we are adding some definitions in, about impervious surface and low impact development, a section in that refers to the storm water manual as being the operative manual for the applications which come before the Commission, granting some flexibility into the road standards, so that curbing can be modified or that road requirements can be adjusted by the Commission, and then finally some submission requirements for information to come to staff and to the Commission in terms of review. So those are the nature of the changes that are being proposed. Any comments or questions on this?

Commissioner Sobieski: Just one quick questions, your proposal basically for a retention basin, for water to be held.....

Glenn Chalder: That would be one of the techniques, yes.

Commissioner Sobieski: The, we would need to establish the frequency, how often it would be cleaned, and graded and adjusted, I do know that we have several around town now that haven't been touched in a number of years. The other area of concern to me is that Newington is, as you well know, is a lot of clay. Clay is notorious for transmitting water, not allowing it to disperse. I don't know if there is any way of fixing that at a reasonable cost to the property owner. That's just a couple of my concerns, but otherwise I think it's fantastic what you have done so far.

Glenn Chalder: I think the regulations themselves, in terms of storm water management identify that operation remains the key consideration so in terms of commercial property owners, the Commission can, as a condition of approval establish operation and

maintenance requirements. That is talked about in the manual. In addition to that, there are specifications in the manual here for the requirements that need to be met, some of the standards that I identified, so the manual requires that.

Commissioner Aieta: It would be a good idea to have the manual to go over.

Craig Minor: Well it's very lengthy and we'll definitely get them to you well before any actual hearing, but thinking of the taxpayers, I didn't make copies of the manual, but I have one here to pass around if you would like to look at it while we are talking.

Glenn Chalder: What I wanted to say overall, the manual reflects or recommends that there are different soil types in town, and for property owners who are on clay, the soil does not have that much ability to accept infiltration of soil, so there is relief granted in that situation. We're not asking people to comply with an unattainable standard. So, it's table 2.11.

James Reardon: There are several different standards in the manual related to hydrology and soil types, things like that, and as Glenn correctly points out, there is an infiltration standard, and it changes depending on the soil type. Clay soil has a much less requirement, I think it was about two tenths of an inch. The other thing to point out, as far as low impact development goes, there are types of BMP's that are subdrain, so that instead of, when a lot of people think about low impact development they think about infiltration as being the primary mechanisms, and it is one of the mechanisms that is often used with best management practices, however there are BMP's that are included that subdrains on them, and they are specifically intended for tight soils, for areas where you might have contamination in soil or in the ground water or something like that and you don't want to transmit, you want to keep that as compacted as possible, so there are allowances for that in the manual and there are best management practices for that.

Glenn Chalder: So those are the nature of the changes to the subdivision regulations, and if the Commission is comfortable, I'll kick over to zoning. There's a lot of similarities between the two, and I think at that point in time we'll sort have covered the gambit, and if there are other questions and things we can go through those. Is that okay?

Chairman Hall: Yes.

Glenn Chalder: So, now on to the zoning regulation changes. On the first page again are the definitions, as in the subdivision regulations and also the wetland regulations. We're proposing, as shown on page 2 a new storm water management section in the zoning regulations. Basically establishes the requirement that unless modified by the Commission every application shall provide for storm water management system including low impact development techniques as specified in this section, it refers to the manual as we discussed earlier. On page two, down at the bottom of the page item 6.15.2, there is a threshold in there identified as 300 square feet, and I think what we have talked about is the standard there for 600 square feet as being the appropriate threshold for a residential addition or other activity as to when somebody would be asked to evaluate and comply with these standards. I recognize that is something that we are going to talk about later, so we will come back to that, but I wanted to highlight where that is in the regulations so you can start to.....again, we refer to the standards in the manual, I'm on page three now, and down at the bottom of this page, the item 6.15.3.a, you will also see 300 square feet, you can circle that, and I think from discussion that number may be changed to 600 square feet or some other standard, whatever the Commission feels is appropriate. Again, this is a key section in the regulations. Right now in your regulations, under the standards, the review standards section at the end is where we talk about drainage considerations, but there is really never a regulation that says,

these are our storm water standards. I think this is why this is probably shown as number two here in the sequence of regulation changes, because I think it's important to say to people, storm water management is important to us and here are the standards that we are going to be looking for.

Starting on page four, we are recommending some possible changes to your parking regulations. We have looked at your parking regulations in terms of the number of parking spaces required for the amount of square footage. We have compared this with information from the Institute of Traffic Engineers, Transportation Engineers, in terms of parking occupancy that is observed for different types of facilities. We think that there is the opportunity for the Commission to modify its parking standards if you feel comfortable doing so. We think your regulations today may be requiring more parking spaces than are actually needed or used, even on days like Black Friday, but this is our professional recommendation, our sense to you that could be an opportunity for the Commission, for you to consider as part of this.

So, on pages five, six, seven and eight we have identified a new column in this table. In the first column we have what your current standard is for minimum required parking spaces. We have adjusted that number and said, you have to have at least this number of spaces and what you will see, the underlined text with the strikeout, the new standard is typically lower than what you are doing right now today. There is also the next column which basically says, if a developer or a property owner chooses to install more parking spaces than we think that they need the parking spaces about this threshold shall be pervious some way, shape, or form. So it's not that they can't do it, of course you want people to feel that they have enough parking spaces, but since they could be unoccupied ninety or ninety-five percent of the time, at that point in time they will be built in sort of management practices for storm water drainage. So these are fairly big concepts, and I want to highlight them for the Commission for our discussion and your consideration. The numbers are generally numbers that come from the Institute of Transportation Engineers based on nation wide studies of parking utilization. If you have different experience in Newington, we should factor that in to make sure that we are comfortable with these standards.

Moving ahead at this point to page eleven, language in here, this is in the middle of the page on Item E. We are suggesting for consideration some language which would allow the Commission to reduce the number of parking spaces when the parking needs of the users occur at different times of the day, or different days of the week. So you might have a situation for example where a home improvement store is busy with traffic in the evening or weekends, but there are other stores that are perhaps more active during the day. If an applicant can document to you that the parking needs are not additive, they are in fact meshed in some way, you can reduce the impervious surface, potentially get more square footage of building and tax base for the same amount of paved area, and reduce the amount of runoff. So again, these are concepts for your consideration and again based on what a number of other communities are doing.

On page twelve, we have identified the different types of surface materials that might be appropriate, in Newington, in parking lots including traditional bituminous concrete or different types of pervious pavements or concretes or pavers which are being used in different places today. Not really a mandate, the manual provides for a standard, a threshold an applicant would be required to meet and one of the ways they could do it is through pervious pavement, but if they choose not to there are other ways and techniques that they can use. So the regulations are not intended to be so prescriptive that there is only one choice to an applicant. We would like you to accomplish the following, and you figure out on your site how that best could be done.

We also have some language in here for deferral of immediate installation. Our regulations require that four parking spaces be installed per thousand square feet, the developer doesn't think he is going to need that, he said he would only need three, he would show four on the site plan, four spaces per thousand on the site plan, but build three and the remaining spaces

are shown on the site plan, and there is a notation on the file plan that those parking spaces can be installed when the Commission feels that they are required or the applicant wants to. Again, it's a way to kind of have our cake and eat it too. We're not going to allow you to have more square footage, but let's see what happens with actual parking occupancy in this situation. Again, there are a number of towns around the state that do this as well.

Just some minor modifications to the off-street loading requirements, in terms of landscaping requirements for parking lots, we've added in some new language which allows parking spaces or parking islands to be used for drainage. Have people here been to visit Evergreen Walk in South Windsor? Some of the islands at Evergreen Walk are called innies, and what innies means is that instead of being a raised planter, it's actually curbing but it has an inlet so the water can get in and then percolate and go down, and that is an example of a best management practice to help renovate the rain water. Normal curbing would force it to a catch basin into the pipe and then off to the detention basin or something else, elsewhere, but in fact, in that type of situation, by catching the runoff closer to where it fell, you are able to start treating it early in the treatment train, and actually provide some benefits. It's still landscaping, it's still green, it's just when it rains, it acts differently than what we are used to. This provides the opportunity for that to happen, if an applicant chooses to. It doesn't say he has to do it, but it doesn't prevent him from doing it either.

Now to page fifteen in terms of landscaping regulations, we've added some new headers in here to help people identify what the section is all about, we added in some references in certain situations that landscape areas can be used to implement low impact development techniques. Landscape areas are in fact some of the best areas for these types of techniques. I just want to make people aware of that opportunity, and to encourage them to come up with ways to do this. As part of our work with the committee, we looked at some examples of landscaped areas that had been used in different projects and they can be quite attractive, so again, it's a different way to approach this type of situation.

On page sixteen, at the bottom, we have also authorized a situation where the Commission can allow a buffer area to be used for low impact development techniques.

On page seventeen we have added in some new language related to the content of the site plan, so that when a plan is submitted, and Craig reviews it for completeness, we are asking for information on the soil types on the property, again, large trees which provide some benefit environmentally from a drainage perspective, and making sure that things which are of concern in terms of evaluating the drainage system are shown on the plan. So there are some modest changes to this section of the regulations.

Starting on page twenty, this is where we are now into the site plan review standards. This would be a site plan that is before the Commission and the Commission is evaluating whether or not to approve the plan, we've added in some additional criteria and information here in terms of referring to the low impact development and storm water manual, in addition to other manuals which may be appropriate and then reference to driveways and parking, driveway width, and again other requirements related to the different pavement styles that would be appropriate, the use of curbing or waiver of curbing in certain situations, again referencing the storm water manual.

I think those are the nature of the changes to the zoning regulations. Just to recap again, we are adding some definitions up front to describe what we are talking about, a storm water section that refers to the manual as being the operative guide as to how we want to address issues of drainage, some suggested changes to parking standards and I would expect the Commission to have some discussion about that situation, how you think parking standards could or should be changed, some landscaping, some changes to the landscaping section, and then the materials submitted on a site plan and then the review criteria. So the changes are not that many words if you will, but I think the implication of all of this, to try get a new drainage situation, we are able to address storm water quality and quantity closer to where the raindrops fall, and through that enhance water quality and downstream flooding.

I know that there must be some questions.

Chairman Hall: Anybody have any questions?

Craig Minor: Can I just throw something out there, Glenn and Jim didn't say it enough, but the phrase, maximum extent possible kept coming up during our committee meetings. Not every site is going to be able to support low impact development techniques. Some site is going to be going to mostly clay, some site is going to be very well drained. The same house and size lot on the clayey soil would not be expected, if you wanted to expand that house or add on an addition, would not be expected to provide just as much LID as a house on a well drained piece of property because it is not pragmatic, it's not possible, so again, an important point to remember is in all cases, it would be to the maximum extent possible and not totally onerous.

Glenn Chalder: Well, the question ends up being, we are pushing applicants in this direction, we would like them to embrace it and implement it on their site, but should there be situations that come up, which they feel are perhaps onerous, they will work through staff and perhaps the Commission and say, it's very challenging for us to be able to do this, and the Commission can say, okay, then we'll accept a recommendation from staff or the applicant to modify that. The worst case scenario, they are still going to be complying with the drainage standards the way that they are done today, so if they come to you and say, my site is rock and on a hillside, I can't do anything, and Chris and Craig agree, you can modify it and you will just deal with it as you do today. So, we're not making the situation any worse, we are creating opportunities for the situation to be better and get better over time. I think it's important too because one of the conversations that we also had as part of our working group is some of the issues that MDC is having with inflow and infiltration, and they are going to be capping pipes and other things which may exacerbate some drainage problems in town. So whatever we can do for existing property owners I think is going to make the situation better where those opportunities exist.

James Reardon: One thing I'd like to say and it goes along with what Craig and Glenn have been saying the last couple of minutes here and during this evening, this presentation, is that the, a large part of the idea of low impact development is to add opportunities to manage storm water through new management techniques and technology. So it adds flexibility as opposed to restriction. The existing state standards allow for a lot of these best management practices, there are several other towns around here that have adopted these sort of standards too. What a lot of our work really focused on was identifying places in your existing standards and regulations where there are existing restrictions that prevent the use of these best management practices. The way the manual is set up takes into account the different kinds of soil conditions, other conditions that design engineers consider when they are trying to design for these kind of situations, the maximum practical standard will allow the regulators in town flexibility to say, okay, you, design engineer you come to me with a situation that we hadn't envisioned when we were putting the regulations for the manual together, therefore, we have some flexibility here to work with you, and make this something that does work.

One more thing that I guess I would emphasize, maybe two more things, one in particular is that while a lot of folks think about low impact development as really being focused on infiltration, that is one of the tools in the tool box. There are a lot of other tools in the tool box, all sorts of things, including best management practices. The last thing I guess I would like to point out, is where these standards have been implemented in other parts of the country, other parts of Southern New England what they find is not an increase in cost of doing business with best management practices or low impact development, actually finding a decrease in cost up to fifty percent in a lot of cases for production and costs for managing the storm water.

Glenn Chalder: For example, in Harwinton, we did a case study and actually redesigned the site for an applicant. Because they didn't need to put in the drainage pipes, the catch basins and the other bedding, the excavation, etc., they were able to deal with it differently, they were able to save quite a bit of money in terms of their site costs and they were pretty ecstatic about the end result, so it doesn't have to be more expensive. An applicant has the opportunity to find ways on their site that work, and pick the management practices that work best. So I think it's an opportunistic situation again, to be administered by the Commission.

Chairman Hall: Any other questions? It's a lot of information, and certainly it's a new concept and most people, frankly, have never even heard of LID, so the people who have been working with it for a period of time are a wealth of information for us, it's just that we have to process it and I think as time goes on, if we can break it down into smaller pieces as well and have examples. Now I happen to sit on the LID committee, so I was brought up to speed on this, I knew nothing about it before I started, but some of the examples of LID practices made perfect sense. Rain gardens, now who has ever heard of a rain garden, yet you use it in construction, your home, businesses, whatever and all of a sudden it's beautiful as well as practical. And who in this town of Newington hasn't had an issue with water. I mean, we have a huge water problem in Newington, a high water table, certain sections of the town flood often, basements, so these types of things, in the long term, if we can implement them, will help the situation overall. With parking, almost everyone has been out to Westfarms Mall. That whole southern section of parking is really LID. They only use it this time of year pretty much, yet it's various types of surface, for parking, but it also helps drain, and once you can see it, and we can give you examples, up at UConn, the new Storrs project is rife with LID. You don't know it when you look at it from the surface, yet when people point it out to you then you realize all of these things that have been taken into consideration to help. It's a fascinating concept and as we go on, I think you'll see that there is a place for it in our regulations, and we do appreciate you taking the time tonight to explain all of this, and I'm sure that it's not the last we will hear.

Glenn Chalder: No, we're going to be talking to the Conservation Commission as well, in part of this, so I encourage you to get familiar with the concept and we will come back and assist you with this particular effort. The only thing that I want to add is that it has been a pleasure working with the committee. The town is actually, did they complete the rain garden installation at the park?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Chairman Hall: At Churchill Park. We have one at Churchill Park and most people don't know it's there.

Glenn Chalder: So the town built, as a demonstration project to understand how it would work, to actually build it themselves, and be comfortable with it, and that is underway, so we are going to start to have examples around town that people can look to and say, oh, okay, I understand it now, I get it, as Cathy pointed out, so, please make yourself familiar with the materials, if you have any questions, share them with Craig. I know we will be back, but exactly what the timing of that is, we'll coordinate with Craig.

Commissioner Anest: The next time you do this, can we have a power point for the people in the audience so that they can kind of follow along.

Craig Minor: Certainly.

Commissioner Anest: And the other thing is, where in Churchill Park?

Chairman Hall: It's between the skate park and the driveway that.....

Commissioner Anest: Clem Lemire then.

Chairman Hall: Clem Lemire right. You can actually see it from Willard. If you were driving by in the fall and you saw a bunch of guys working on something, you were probably wondering what that was all about, but....

Commissioner Anest: Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you very much for taking the time.

Glenn Chalder: You're very welcome.

B. Performance Bond for "Packard's Way" residential subdivision.

Craig Minor: This was on the table when you came in tonight because this was a last minute thing. There is a memo, but I'll paraphrase it. This is a subdivision that was approved a number of years ago but for whatever reason the plans got filed without a performance bond being posted and there really wasn't much we could do about it. The horse was out of the barn, but luckily, as it turns out, the buyers of these lots, their respective attorneys have advised these buyers not to close until a bond is posted by the developer for the remainder of the work, so that is what the memo says. I included the breakdown of outstanding, still to be completed items that was done by the engineering department. The bottom line is \$56,808.27 and I'm rounding it up to \$57,000 and so my recommendation is that the Commission approve the bond amount of \$57,000 and there is a draft motion attached to it also.

Chairman Hall: We can move this to Old Business. Anybody have any questions on this? Are you familiar with Packard's Way. It's off Maple Hill Avenue, has been under construction now for several years, they're coming into the home stretch at this point I guess.

Craig Minor: Yes, the binder course is down.

Chairman Hall: I was going to say, they are going to try to get that road in before the weather gets too bad. Do I have a recommendation on this to move it to Old Business so we can act on it tonight.

Commissioner Aieta moved to add the performance bond for Packard's Way to Old Business. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anest. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion with six voting YES.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

Performance Bond
Packer's Way Residential Subdivision

Maple Hill Avenue
Donna DiMauro applicant

I move to approve the performance bond for Packard's Way Residential Subdivision in the amount of \$57,000.

CONDITIONS:

The bond shall be in the form of cash, check, passbook or a letter of credit only.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leggo. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with six voting YES.

IX. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING

None

X. TOWN PLANNER REPORT

A. Town Planner Report for December 11, 2013.

Craig Minor: All right, Zoning Enforcement Issues raised at previous TPZ Meetings, I said that I would check out the sign, I forgot, I'm sorry Madam Chairman, sorry about that, I will try very hard to look at that.....

Chairman Hall: That's all right, it was down this week, I don't know where it went, it completely disappeared.

Craig Minor: It was gone?

Chairman Hall: Well the posts are there but the sign is gone, quite a saga.

Craig Minor: Old Performance Bonds, a little progress on a lot of these; the first one, the 46 Commerce Court, I got a letter from the owner saying that it is in receivership, that's interesting because technically, I'm not a lawyer, but as I understand it, the money, the \$6,000 still belongs to the applicant, but if the property now belongs to somebody else, or is in the process of belonging to somebody else, this is going to be really tricky to get this work to be done, which is now only eleven years overdue. So, I haven't talked to the owner, or the receivership party and I was told who that is, and I will contact the bank or the attorney or whoever it is and try to come up with a way to get this work done, because there is still a fair amount of landscaping and parking that was not completed even though it's been eleven years.

The bar, I haven't made much progress, the owner said that he would work with us to modify the site plan and he was going to contact a surveyor but he did not do that. I will keep on him on that.

Fountain Pointe, the owner said that he would work on the outstanding items. I sent him an e-mail back on November 25th, I did not get a reply from him, I will follow up on that.

Global Granite, nothing new on that.

LA Fitness, nothing new

Zag Machine, I haven't contacted the individual, although Andy Brecher tells me that he is in New Britain and I can find him there.

The house on 95 Waverly Drive, the owner, as I have been reporting in the past, has contacted his neighbor about buying that little strip of land, and the owner came into the office a couple of weeks ago, I might have even reported this at our last meeting, to talk to me but I was tied up and he left and didn't come back, and I don't have his phone number, so this is continuing to drag on, but the owner did tell me that his neighbor is willing to sell him the strip of land for some amount of money.

Newington Professional Center, nothing new to report on that.

The IHOP Restaurant, we talked about that at the last meeting, we'll wait until spring and then consider what additional plantings might be appropriate.

The Target on Richard Street, at the last meeting I was told that it was a big Sycamore tree that was to be preserved, and I believe I saw the tree in question. It's on the north side of the site, on the right hand side as you come in. I looked at it a week or two ago, no leaves obviously, but it looked healthy, I mean, you could see little buds at the end of the branches which dead trees tend not to have.

Chairman Hall: It's had leaves every year since.

Craig Minor: If the Commission, who is more familiar with this than I am, is comfortable with releasing the money now and not waiting until the spring, obviously I'm fine with that also if that is what the Commission wants to do.

Commissioner Aieta: There were some evergreens that died on the Richard Street portion and I don't know if they pulled them out and never replaced them?

Chairman Hall: The border that goes the whole length of the building?

Commissioner Aieta: Maybe, can we use that, use some of this money for that, or ask them to replace those?

Craig Minor: I can leverage it.

Commissioner Aieta: Please, because there were a bunch of them that died and I believe that they pulled them out and never replaced them.

Craig Minor: Okay, arborvitae?

Chairman Hall: White pines.

Craig Minor: Okay, and they are on the Richard Street.....

Chairman Hall: Yes, the north side of the building, the whole back of the building.

Commissioner Aieta: You can check the site plan and see what's required.

Craig Minor: Premier Development, 148 Maple Hill Avenue, okay, it took me a while to figure this out because it was the wrong name and the wrong address but now I see it was a Pat Snow house, and I've asked the engineering department to go out and confirm that the grading and driveway were installed correctly.

Number 31, Morecko, I still don't know what that is. We don't have any files on it, Ed Meehan didn't remember what it was, the folks in finance don't know what it was, so, I don't know, it will continue to be there.

Rockledge Drive, I sent letters to all of the homeowners because we have this \$10,000 that is supposed to be from trees, and actually I have heard back from three of them saying yes, they would like trees, so my game plan, subject to your approval, is see how many homeowners would like trees, and whatever that number is, hopefully it is a low number, I'll basically buy \$10,000 worth of trees and install them. I'm not going to waste money, but on the other hand if I have \$10,000 to spend and let's say I only need to buy six or eight trees, I'll buy the best six or eight trees that I can find for that money, installed, planted, staked, the

whole nine yards. Obviously not until the spring, so I have a couple of months to work with the home owners to find who wants trees.

Newington Junction, the TOD committee will be meeting on Tuesday the 17th, at 11:30. That time was most convenient for the chairman, so that is when the committee will be meeting.

Low Impact Development, obviously just got a presentation on it.

Revision to the sign regulations, we haven't done anything on that because of the election and I'll be, and now that we have a Chairman, I'll resume working on that, or getting the subcommittee working on the sign regulations.

That's my report.

XI. COMMUNICATIONS

None

XII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (for items not listed on the Agenda, speakers limited to two minutes)

None

XIII. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Aieta: Just a follow up on the item that we talked about at our last meeting, the electrical charging stations for automobiles. We don't have it, it's not in the regulations, I looked, can't find it, but I did want to bring to your attention Section 2., Section 1.2.1, these regulations are intended to state the uses of land and/or buildings and structures which are permitted within the town. Uses not stated are not permitted. I can't find it in here, so apparently it is not permitted, so I think we had better schedule, or come up with some way, put in the regulations to regulate them, because you already have some in town. You have them at the Best Market, I don't know how you are handling that. They're just using them, or does it work, or.....

Craig Minor: First of all, I agree with you completely, it's on my to do list to come up with some regulations to deal with electrical charging stations as you suggested last time. You're right, I will do that. As far as the one at Best Market, they did it without checking with me. I went out there for the grand opening, and there is this lovely charging station. What's done is done, but you are right, we do need regulations because there are different kinds of charging stations. There is a lot of technology that goes into them that I'm going to have to become familiar with. There are different purposes of charging stations, I think we talked about this before. There are charging stations for employees, there are charging stations for the general public, they need to be regulated differently. Does a charging statement count as one of the provided parking spaces, it might be yes, but these are the kinds of things that we need to talk about and have qualified in the regulations. So yes, that is on my list of things to come back to you with.

Chairman Hall: Do you think we should have a subcommittee to work with Craig, or do you want Craig to come up with the.....

Commissioner Aieta: There must be other towns that have charging stations.

Chairman Hall: Well, there should be because they are beginning to pop up and will continue.

Commissioner Aieta: You could check some other towns and see if they have them, and get their regulations and.....

Chairman Hall: And just modify them. That's fine.

Craig Minor: Okay, I'll do that.

Commissioner Aieta: Just one other thing I would like to bring up. You talked about the Newington Electric thing, I brought it up last meeting, what precipitates an applicant to come before the Commission, and Craig said there are certain things that trigger when a site plan is required to come to the Commission. One of the things that was stated in the minutes is that there is off site parking, he's going to have off-site parking for his trucks, right?

Craig Minor: He has told me that he plans on doing that yes.

Commissioner Aieta: He has between twenty-five to thirty trucks, and if leaves the trucks there, that means there are twenty-five, thirty cars that are coming. There are not that many parking places on the site, so under changes of use and site design, which is Section 5.3.9 G, it says one of the things that triggers a site plan review by this Commission is parking. If he has off street parking, under Section 6.1.1.C is the standard for parking, off-site parking may be permitted on land owned or under a long term lease controlled by the owner of the principal use to which the parking is an accessory when approved by the Commission. Off-site parking spaces shall be within a radius of 600 feet walking distance to a public entrance.....so for him to use off-site parking, it has to be approved by this Commission, and he has to determine to us that the parcel that he is using, he has a long term lease, or some kind of arrangement with the owner of the property, not the manager like we have seen in some instances, those people say, well, I talked to the manager of the store, well, the manager does not happen to be the land owner, or the property owner. I think these instances will require a site plan for that particular piece of property.

Craig Minor: The last one that you brought up, about the off-site parking, yes that absolutely requires Commission approval, but it doesn't require site plan approval. That's in the section under parking, so, now to get your permission, he is going to have to submit a site plan that shows the parking yes, but it doesn't require site plan approval, but he definitely requires your approval, and I will follow up on that.

Commissioner Aieta: At the same time we can find out what he is doing with the drainage on the property, and we can find out about the electrical charging station that he has there. I don't believe that there is enough parking on that site for his use and the pizza place that is there.

Craig Minor: You're right.

Commissioner Aieta: I know the number of trucks that he has, he has twenty-five trucks. I'm sure he doesn't let these guys take the trucks home, so if you are driving a car to work, that's fifty parking spaces, there's not enough parking spaces on that site. He indicated to you that there is off-street parking that he wanted to use the furniture store parking but he has to prove to us that he has some kind of, we don't want to find out someday that he's parking all over the streets and, which he is doing now in the industrial park because he didn't have enough parking at that site.

Chairman Hall: So you will follow up on that, Craig?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Commissioner Sobieski: Craig, on the charging, I know Blue Back Square has those, West Hartford has it, so you might want to look there.

Craig Minor: Good, thanks.

Commissioner Aieta: I'm sure they have them regulated.

Chairman Hall: They actually have a couple. They have some in the grocery parking lots too, around town.

Commissioner Sobieski: My brother-in-law has an electric car and he has used the station at Blue Back Square, so I know it's there.

Commissioner Aieta: The problem with, it's not a problem, but it takes up a parking space so we have to take that into consideration, and we should have regulations because we are going to get them in town. It's just right that it states some where in our regulations that people are allowed to have charging stations.

Chairman Hall: They will be here. Anyone else?
Did anyone see or go to the Council meeting last night? They were talking about economic development and there were ten proposed sites or areas that could be ripe for development and Mr. Brecher gave a very good overview on it, and I wondered if you would be interested in having him come to us in either January or early February and give us an overview as well, because there are several that are going to end up in our lap. They weren't all going to, but most of them would and I think it would be interesting to hear. It's not going to happen next week, it's not going to happen next month, but this overview I thought was fascinating, and I think we should all be informed about it.

Commissioner Aieta: It looks like we are going to have a light agenda, we didn't put anything on it.

Chairman Hall: But it's only December 11th, so anything can happen, our next meeting isn't until our January meeting, so.....but if you would be kind enough to check with Andy and find out what his schedule is, and then get him in on one of our nights, he had a power point, I think you would be surprised, we say that the town is ninety-five percent developed, it seems that about every month or so, we hear about a new development. I'd like to know well in advance, instead of oh, by the way, it's coming in two months.

Craig Minor: Definitely.

XIV. CLOSING REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN

Chairman Hall: Also, I would like to wish everyone a Happy Holiday season. This will be the last time that we will meet before January. I want to welcome Bob Serra to the table, and Kenny, congratulations for a full membership now, and as I said at the beginning of the meeting, I am very honored to be here and I look forward to having a very successful tenure with all of us together with all of the things that we are going to have on our table. From what I hear, we're going to have some interesting things next year, so fasten your seat belts.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Sobieski moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commission Anest. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Norine Addis,
Recording Secretary