

NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting and Public Hearing

November 24, 2014

Chairman Cathleen Hall called the regular meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Conference Room at the Lucy Robbins Wells Library at 95 Cedar Street, Newington.

**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  
Commissioner Brian Andrzejewski - A  
Commissioner Anthony Claffey - A

Commissioners Absent

Staff Present

Craig Minor, Town Planner

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

No Changes

**III. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None

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

Gail Budrejko, 21 Isabelle Terrace: In October the Rocky Hill TPZ authorized a temporary halt to new multi-family housing proposals in areas that are zoned as mixed use development. The moratorium was designed to give the Commissioners more time to address standards on the size and scope of multi-family units that are permitted within local areas. In their regulations, multi-use developments were permitted in some commercial areas, however no standards existed for the type of multi-family housing allowed within those areas of multi-use development. That resulted in recent years of the construction of over 300 apartments and new condos in town, and this took the town by surprise, because it went against the community desire for compatible development and re-development in residential planning. The intent of this moratorium is to give the TPZ in Rocky Hill time to consider a plan for flexible density that will provide varied housing opportunities without overtaxing the town's infrastructure. Now, multi-family housing brings in less taxes than residential development does and consumes services, so maintaining a balance of commercial, industrial and residential zoning allowed the provision of services at a reasonable mill rate. I plead ignorance,

and I really don't know our zoning regulations, but given Newington's situation with the uncertainty and speculation about development along the Busway, if our zoning regulations are sorely lacking in any kind of standards, this might be a prudent action for this body to consider, and to look at this issue while reviewing the overall zoning regulations. And as a kind of a side comment, I walked in late, but I did hear the comment about the height issue. In my opinion one wrong doesn't make a right, and I think you need to consider how we want our town to look, and do we want a proliferation of multi-storied buildings. Just because it's allowed for one type of facility is not a good enough rationale to expand.

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

Jeff Zelek, 55 Welles Drive North: Our town was not developed around transit; our town began development in the 1600's and it's developed what they call organically. It's not a planned community, so it's important that we look back on our history and try to preserve some of that. When we had our public hearings about the Plan of Conservation and Development the message from the residents was: we really want to preserve our town for what it is, and we don't want it to become (inaudible.) With that said, I'd like you to consider an additional zone for historic properties. Albeit we don't have a lot of historic areas in this town, and they are small, but we do have some: the far end of North Main Street, the intersection of Main Street and Cedar; our town green in the center of town; and the Kellogg-Eddy house. Those small areas I think we should preserve and increase.

Small bit of Old Business: Madam Chair, we had discussed to be able to communicate through e-mail and those e-mail addresses are still not on line, if you could address that please? Also, when you are looking at your regulations, consider using some expert opinion. There was a conversation about some chickens, we've got swine, we've got aviary flu, swine flu, so consult with the health districts, don't be afraid to go outside of this room and get expert opinion on anything that you might be looking at. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you Jeff. Anyone else?

Gary Bolles, 28 Burdon Lane: I had a sent a letter to the Newington Town Planning and Zoning Commission, in regard to Petition 47-15, Review of the Zoning Regulations. I'd like to read into the record. "At your last meeting of 12 November 2014, you began discussion on the review of Zoning Regulations of items that the Town Planner felt needed to be "updated, clarified, or just plain fixed." Regarding Petition 47-14, under Staff Comments, I direct your attention to item #9. Section 4.4.6: Prohibits a principal building with 50' of a wetland. This is already adequately regulated by the Conservation Commission. In researching this, the Town Planner did not go far enough into the Newington Conservation Commission's regulations regarding this matter. There is absolutely NO provision in the Newington wetland regulations which prohibits a building within 50 feet of a wetland. This Section 4.4.6 needs to remain in your zoning regulations. This should not disappear from your purview.

Also, there has been some confusion as to what constitutes a valid submission of a letter to the Newington Town Planning and Zoning Commission or any other Governmental board of commission. According to the Town Manager's office, any communication can be mailed, e-mailed or hand delivered. Therefore, any of the above are considered acceptable forms of communication and must be shared with all commissioners or representatives of any board or commission. Failure to do so is a violation that will not be tolerated." Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you Gary. Anyone else?

John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue: I just want to agree strongly with what Jeff and Gail said. I agree with having a moratorium on that type of residential multi-family structure. I just think it's a good idea, and you see that another town did it, so it's not something that is unheard of, or unrealistic, it's very realistic. We're heading in a direction that we all are not really sure of and it's not paranoid or anything, it's not a phobia, or discrimination or anything, it's just a safe thing to do I think.

Also I'd like to talk about what Gary was just talking about, referring to the 50' buffer and the encroachment of a primary structure within 50 feet of a wetland. At the Conservation Commission meeting the other night, the engineer stated that it's already regulated by Wetlands, but that's not accurate because as your regulation is now, it's not allowed at all within fifty feet. It's a protective covenant and I don't see why it should be kicked over to the Conservation Commission. The primary structure is the house or the main building if it's commercial. I understand people consider ancillary buildings, pools or decks or sheds or things like that, that's within reason, but there is no reason to build a primary structure, a house, within fifty feet of a protected wetland. The last item, I just would like to know if Craig found out anything from the Town Attorney on the subdivision.

Craig Minor: We do not have an opinion yet. I can go into more detail during my report.

John Bachand: Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Anyone else wishing to speak?

Domenic Pane, 638 Church Street: I like the idea that you guys had about changing the underlying zone to dedicated open space. A few of the spaces are managed by the State so I don't think you have to worry about those, some of the areas that are PL, public land, you have to be very careful with those, because those are schools, and we need to make sure that we can add on here and there. Some of the PL's you can't just make dedicated open space. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

I would ask if you could read your regulation 7.5.1 which states, "on its own initiative or on a receipt of a written application to amend any portion of these regulations the Commission may amend the regulations or change the boundaries of the zones herein established after public hearing in accordance with the state statutes." I would appreciate it if you would review that and not make any amendments to your zoning regulations unless you have a public hearing so that you can get some public input. Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate it.

Chairman Hall: Thank you Dom. Anyone else?

Kathleen Marie Clark, 60 Grandview Drive: I'm a member of the Conservation Commission and I would just like to say that I would encourage you to keep the 50 foot regulation. The main reason is that what come before us repeatedly are people who did not make an application under the Inland Wetlands regulations but instead were turned in by their neighbors, and people who noticed that they were in violation. So therefore the more regulations that can keep people on the straight and narrow, I'm all for. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Anyone else wishing to speak?

## **V. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Aieta: On the point that Gail brought up about Rocky Hill, and their problems with multi-family housing in Industrial zones. In our Plan of Development, our 2020 Plan, we insisted on having statements that say that we would discourage, I think it's even stronger than discourage, that we would not perceive changing any of our commercial/industrial zones to residential zones. I think that, when we get into some of the other areas of the residential zones, we should look at

protecting those, because we have so very little left in commercial zones and industrial zones. Our grand list is basically stagnant, and whatever Industrial and Commercial areas that we can protect would be a good thing as far as keeping our grand list, having a little more room for our grand list. As far as a moratorium for the Town of Newington, I don't believe that we need a moratorium on this, we don't have that much space left, and we haven't seen an application for that type of housing in a number of years.

Chairman Hall: Anyone else?

## VI. MINUTES

### A. November 12, 2014

Commissioner Leggo moved to accept the minutes of the November 12, 2014 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YEA.

## VII. NEW BUSINESS

### A. Petition 45-14: Site Plan Modification at 100 Milk Lane (Saputo Foods) Saputo Dairy Foods USA, LLC, owner/applicant, Stan Bogdan, 100 Milk Lane, Newington CT contact.

Greg Hunt: I haven't really changed anything since I spoke to you last, the only thing that has changed is that I said at the last meeting that we were getting authorization approval from the Conservation Commission. The Conservation Commission has requested that we come in front of them and present it, and we are doing that, and they are going to receive the, our application at their December meeting.

Craig Minor: I sent this to you earlier today, you might not have seen it, but just some items that I think should be on the site plan, so if you want to go over the list, and then I mentioned at the end of the letter that I'm fine with you holding off on making these changes until you also make whatever changes the Wetlands Commission wants, but these are deficiencies that you need to address, and the Commissioners have that letter, so if you want to go over it.....

Greg Hunt: I don't see anything on here that's a major problem, I'd be happy to add any of the items on this list to my plan.

Chairman Hall: Should we read it so that people at home can hear it?

Craig Minor: Sure. I addressed this to Stan Bogdan, who is the applicant.

"Dear Mr. Bogdan, I have completed my review of the above referenced applicant and have the following comments.

1. Plot Plan
  - a. The site plan is lacking the A-2 certification (Section 5.3.4.C.1)
  - b. The site plan is missing the names of the adjacent property owners to the north (Section 5.3.4.8)
  - c. The site plan is missing the "data block" showing existing and proposed size, setbacks, lot coverage, etc. (Section 5.3.4.A.1)

- d. The site plan is missing the line showing a 50' offset from inland wetlands. It does show the hundred foot offset but it's also supposed to show the fifty foot offset.
- e. The detail on the top of Sheet 1 labeled "Detail Site Plan – Wastewater Pretreatment Facility" does not include the proposed 8" sanitary sewer line, which is shown on the "Overall Property Plan at the bottom of Sheet 1.

2. Storm Drainage:

- a. The proposed and existing sanitary and waste water lines do not have direction arrows (Section 5.3.4.5)
- b. The net increase in impervious cover is less than 600 s.f., so no "Low Impact Development" techniques are required.

Since TPZ cannot act on your application until after the Conservation Commission has acted, I have no objection to you waiting until you receive comments from the Conservation Commission before making these charges. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at..."

I included that note about Low Impact Development just for the record, so if anybody wonders why they didn't show LID, it's because the net increase is less than 600 sf. The Town Engineer was kind enough to send me a photo of what the existing building looks like, which I found helpful to visualize what their project is going to look like.

Chairman Hall: Any questions?

Commissioner Aieta: For the applicant, you agree to provide all of this on the site plan?

Greg Hunt: Yes.

Commissioner Sobieski: At the last meeting I believe Mike brought up, what happens if this tank ruptures? I'm still concerned if this tank ruptures and this material seeps into the ground, eventually seeps into the water system. The only other tanks that I've ever seen around the State of Connecticut are the embankments around storage tanks in case they rupture.

Greg Hunt: The waste water at this plant is more like what you rinse out a milk jug. It's not thick oil. It is falling under the Fats and Grease, but it's not, it doesn't congeal like you would expect deep fryer grease or something like that to behave. The water that is going to be treated is in two large tanks right now that are going to remain. There's no containment there; DEEP is not requiring containment for the bath equipment itself. It's a stainless steel welded vessel. I won't say that it will never leak, but any smaller leaks will be contained within the floor drains and sent back into the system, the pump station that is there now. The sludge tank is a self-contained tank as are all the chemical storage tanks that are on the site, so really the only piece of equipment that is not contained is the actual treatment system itself and the various piping.

Commissioner Sobieski: Are there any other dairy processing plants like this within the state? Do they have the same system that you are putting in?

Greg Hunt: I don't believe that there are any in the state, no. Saputo does have one I believe in Wisconsin, or Kentucky. It's not a completely new system to them. I do know that they had to go out of state to see any systems nearby.

Commissioner Sobieski: Well, like I said, I'm concerned if this leaks into the land and into the water area there. I think you did say it would be contaminated for a while.

Greg Hunt: It's biodegradable. I can't say what the environmental impact would be; I'm really just a structural and site engineer on this project. The environmental engineer would probably be able to answer those questions a lot better than I can, but it's not required by DEEP. We're looking to them for the environmental guidance on this and they are not requiring it.

Commissioner Camillo: What happens if a truck backs into it? Are there any bollards or guard rails or fencing?

Greg Hunt: There will be, yes.

Commissioner Camillo: Right now?

Greg Hunt: I haven't found any, but we will.

Commissioner Camillo: You do have the tractor trailers backing up just to the east of this, the loading docks, and that is their blind side as they are backing up.

Greg Hunt: The only trucks that will be backing up near this will be delivery trucks for the specific building. The normal loading and unloading procedures are quite far away from this and you could see bollards out there, we'll try to throw a couple on the corners, near the garage doors.

Commissioner Aieta: Want to show those on the plan then?

Greg Hunt: Yes,

Chairman Hall: Anyone else? Now, Conservation will meet on the 9<sup>th</sup>?

Greg Hunt: I believe it's the 16<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Hall: That's after our next meeting, so we won't see you again until January.

Greg Hunt: I don't think they can approve it until January because they will just receive it in December.

Chairman Hall: Okay, thank you.

Craig Minor: We have all the time we need because the statute gives you extra time if it's going to Wetlands.

## **B. Bond Release:**

### **1. Victory Way (Victory Gardens)**

Craig Minor: I don't have a recommendation for you yet. I don't have anything from the Town Engineer on that. So it's carried over again.

**VIII. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Petition 46-14: Revisions for Section 6.11 (Sale, Rental, Service or Storage of Motor Vehicles)**

Craig Minor: I have taken the four phrases that were ruled illegal by the judge and put them in bold with a stripe through them. The four are (in the second paragraph): "but are not limited to," and again in the next paragraph, "are not limited to", and then in three places further down the regulations say, "the Commission reserves the right" to do a number of things which were struck by Judge Mottolese. Those are the changes that I am recommending. The Town Attorney presented when he came before you a couple of months ago that since you are making changes by order of the court, you don't need to do a public hearing. You need to do it in public, which you are doing, and you have discussed it now at several meetings in a row, so it's before you now to act on as you wish.

Commissioner Aieta: Why is this different from where we have changes in regulations and we have to have a public hearing?

Craig Minor: The Attorney said that because you are ordered by the judge to do this.

Commissioner Aieta: You are still making changes.....

Craig Minor: But that's why it is different, because you have been ordered by the court to do it.

Commissioner Aieta: I think we should have a public hearing to be consistent with everything else that we are doing. We are going through the regulations right now, the section of the regulations that said that if you are making changes to the regulations you must have a public hearing. To be consistent with that portion of the regulations I believe that this should have a public hearing.

Commissioner Camillo: Can we wait until we get to Section 6?

Chairman Hall: Well, there is no deadline on this. We thought we would take care of it because we were recommended by the attorney to do that.

Craig Minor: What I had been doing for months, and was criticized for it, was telling applicants that we are not going to enforce it because the judge told us not to.

Commissioner Camillo: As we get to this point in reviewing everything, we can change it again, so you can go on with business. We can review this again when we get to 6.11.

Craig Minor: You mean other things in 6.11.

Chairman Hall: There are going to be quite a few things, and the public will have a chance to speak on everything, and just because we (inaudible) something doesn't mean that that is going to be the end product. I mean, after public hearing it may be a whole different animal altogether. If we did this it would expedite the procedure in the Planning and Zoning office, and we've been told to do it.

Commissioner Leggo: That's just what I was going to say. I'm never against hearing what the public has to say on things, but if that is what we need to do, that's what we need to do. I'm not being negative about it; it can't change the outcome of what we do. If it's best to hear what the public has to say, that's fine, but it's being mandated by the judge and we've got to do what we've got to do.

Chairman Hall: These changes are simply taking out wording, the words to be struck, that's all we are doing. We are not changing the intent of the entire section.

Commissioner Leggo: I understand what Frank is saying, because it does say in our regulations that we should have a public hearing even though nothing can be accomplished by it. It does say in the regulations to have a public hearing.

Chairman Hall: We have to have thirty days notice for a public hearing, and I don't think we have thirty days until our next meeting.

Craig Minor: If you wanted to do it by the book, that would mean sending a copy of this to the regional planning agency thirty days before the hearing, and filing a copy with the Town Clerk prior to and then again after....

Commissioner Anest: I would like to see the changes that we have been ordered to do be done immediately, and then when we get to Section 6.11 there is going to be a tremendous amount of discussion regarding that Section. At that point we can go through it like we are going through everything else, but I think because this has been mandated by the court, we should take care of it now. According to the Town Attorney, Attorney Jack Bradley, we don't have to have a public hearing because this is a court order. It's not our own petition, and it's not a petition from somebody coming forward, but I think these changes would be made immediately.

Commissioner Sobieski: I agree with Carol. We can't have people coming into the Zoning office and apply for something and have the Planner, or somebody say, well, we're not going to enforce this portion. It doesn't sound right, it doesn't look right, so we make these temporary changes now, and then when we get to 6.11, the entire section, then we review it. We were ordered by the court to do it, we have to do it. I know the plaintiff's were up here, I know their attorneys were saying do this, do this, do this, and we have an opportunity to fix this on a temporary basis. I think that is what we should do.

Commissioner Aieta: To be consistent with the regulations I cannot vote for these changes, even though I know that they are right, but to be consistent with the regulations that state we should have a public hearing on changes to our regulations, I would abstain. I understand, I hear what you are saying, we have to make these changes because we were ordered by the court, but I still think that to be consistent with the regulations, I will not vote for it.

Commissioner Anest: I think maybe we should have in our regulations, when we get to it, a public hearing unless ordered by the court.

Chairman Hall: Under court order.

Commissioner Anest: Because now we are delaying it another 30 days or whatever, and maybe for other deliberations further along, this might happen again, I don't know.

Craig Minor: I would hope not, but you never know.

Chairman Hall: Okay, so what is your pleasure, move it forward? Seeing bobbing heads, we will move it forward.

Craig Minor: I don't have a draft motion for you.

Chairman Hall: We can do it in December.

Craig Minor: I'll have a draft motion.

Chairman Hall: We'll take care of it at that point, and that, by the way, is December 10<sup>th</sup>.

**IX. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING**

None

**X. TOWN PLANNER REPORT**

**A. Town Planner Report for November 24, 2014.**

Craig Minor: It's smaller than usual. Number One, Zoning Enforcement Issues Raised at Previous TPZ Meetings: "A written report on the 109 Goodale Drive situation is being prepared by ZEO Mike DAmato. It will be sent to you under separate cover, and if the Commission wants to we can discuss it during the "Town Planner Report" portion of the meeting." I believe Mike e-mailed it to you and then I also gave you paper copies, so it's up to the Commission if you want to discuss it.

Chairman Hall: First of all I want to thank Mike in getting it to us in such a timely manner. It was very helpful and we got it in plenty of time for this meeting and in case any of us wanted to drive by and see this, so it really answered a lot of questions. The chronology was very interesting.

Commissioner Aieta: Just a question. I was the one that was insistent that we look at this, because the way the woman came in and presented herself, I wanted to get to the bottom of this. It's obvious that the filling on the site is more than what she brought to this Commission. Where does it stand now, at this point? They have not submitted any revised plans?

Craig Minor: That's my understanding, yes.

Commissioner Aieta: For the public, the amount of fill that is being put on this property actually put the adjoining property owners in the hole, and part of the drainage would be draining onto other people's property. The change in elevation actually did damage to the people on both sides of her.

Chairman Hall: Any other comments?

Craig Minor: There has been some action since I last reported on this. The Fountain Pointe arbor vitae: the developer submitted a photo the other day showing the additional trees that we had asked for, and I think you voted to release the bond subject to him submitting evidence, so this won't come back to you again because I think you already did with that one condition.

Commissioner Serra: In addition to planting the new trees, he was also treating the other trees.

Craig Minor: That he did document. I have the receipt from the landscaping business to treat them for bagworm.

Commissioner Aieta: The planting season is actually over on October 15<sup>th</sup>, so do you want to wait until the spring to see if these things take? Seeing that he just did it.

Commissioner Serra: Those things are very temperamental.

Craig Minor: If that is your preference, I will tell him that you're going to hold off until the spring.

Commissioner Aieta: In the spring we can take a ride by, if they are still alive, we'll give him his money back.

Craig Minor: The trees on Rockledge: they are planted, and they look good. I've submitted the invoice for payment. Oh, I do need to ask you something. When I sent letters to all of the

homeowners notifying them that we have money to pay for trees if they want them, one of the homeowners contacted me and said that she was told by the developer that she had to plant two trees at her expense back when this subdivision was approved. She has asked if we can use some of this money to reimburse her for the trees that she was told by the developer that she had to plant. I'm sympathetic to her, but I didn't want to do it unilaterally, I wanted to run it by your first. I think it's reasonable, and I've haggled with her over the price. I'm recommending \$250.00 per tree for the two trees, so \$500.00. I'm not sure what she paid ten years ago for the trees but that's less than it would cost to buy trees now.

Commissioner Aieta: Are they the same species that we are planting?

Craig Minor: I've seen her trees, but I'm not sure what kind they are. They probably are not the same ones that our landscaper planted. That coincidence would be too nice, but I don't think they are.

Commissioner Serra: Are there other people there that can make the same claim?

Craig Minor: No one has. I was expecting people to call me when they saw their neighbors getting trees, and ask if they could come along even though they initially declined, but other than here, no, no one else has asked even after seeing others getting them.

Commissioner Sobieski: Craig, did we send letters to these people letting them know?

Craig Minor: Yes. Two letters. All right, sensing that the Commission doesn't have any objection to that, I'll do that. That's all I have for bonds.

Status of the Packard's Way opinion: the Town Attorney has determined that he personally has a conflict of interest in this matter, because he as an attorney represented one of the original property owners. Not Donna DiMauro, but the other property owner, Holly Kobayashi, and therefore he has taken his research and turned it over to a colleague, Attorney Mark Shipman, to bring it to the finish line. I asked Attorney Boorman how long he thought that would be, and he felt it would not be very long, a couple of weeks at the most. So, hopefully we will be getting a legal opinion soon from Attorney Shipman.

Commissioner Anest: Can you reach out to Attorney Shipman and see if we can have something by our December meeting?

Craig Minor: A report at least, if not the actual opinion? Yes.

Commissioner Anest: I think Mr. Bachand has been more than patient.

Chairman Hall: Any other questions for the Planner?

## **XI. COMMUNICATIONS**

### **A. Letter from Gary E. Bolles dated November 17, 2014.**

Chairman Hall: We did get the letter from Gary and Gary read it to us this evening as well, having to do with the fifty foot buffer for buildings near a wetlands.

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

Jeff Zelek, 55 Welles Drive North: Along the Berlin Turnpike you have zoning which regulates a setback area. I need the Planner to help me, I think it's a thirty-five foot green zone, is that what it is?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Jeff Zelek: And I believe that setback is from, not from the highway but from the right of way?

Craig Minor: It's the same thing. It's from the property line.

Jeff Zelek: Okay. Those setbacks do three very important things. First, one is obviously public safety; second is establishing this nice green zone; and the third thing, it increases property values along the Berlin Turnpike, which in turn is a good thing for us tax payers as it relieves the tax burden on the residents. I was just thinking, we have a new situation in town, we have this thing called the Busway. What are we going to do about setbacks for the Busway? I would like you all to give that some thought and perhaps consider it for your regulations. Thank you.

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

John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue: I was encouraged about what Commissioner Aieta said about the 2020 Plan prohibiting residential zone changes in Industrial areas. Along that Busway, changes would be to Planned Development, so they wouldn't be changes to residential, they would be changed to Planned Development and in Planned Development you get multi-family housing which is allowed I believe. So, I don't think it's unreasonable for a moratorium until everyone completely gets a good handle on things. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you John.

Jeff Zelek: I have a second opportunity. Regarding the Planned Development zones, I would ask if the Commissioners please look at your regulations and look at what it says is allowed in Planned Development. You recently changed 16 Fenn Road from Industrial Zone to Planned Development. Under Planned Development you're allowed to put in hotels and motels. Technically those are high density housing. We think of hotels and motels as short term occupancy, but there are certain areas in this town where we have those types of buildings have become long term residences, so please be very careful about the use of Planned Development. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Anyone else wishing to speak?

Gail Budrejko, 21 Isabelle Terrace: Again, I don't want to beat a dead horse, but the fact is that the Busway is something brand new and we have not had any proposals recently, but I think that once this thing gets going there is going to be developers inundating this town with proposals and applications. I still support a moratorium until we can get some kind of vision, some kind of handle. As Jeff alluded to, the setbacks, the number of stories, the density; there is just so much that this is an opportunity, we have to start now to start planning for what we want to see rather than let proposals drive what goes along the Busway. I think we could make a good start by giving at least a six month moratorium, six to twelve months, and see how the Busway goes. See who is riding it, see who is using it; I really think it would be beneficial. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you Gail. Anyone else?

John Bachand: Just to expand on that, since this Busway is so new, maybe a whole new zone, like you have certain zones just on the turnpike. Maybe just the area around the Busway could have specific zone requirements just for that one area. Thank you.

Chairman Hall: Thank you John. Anyone else?

**XIII. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None

**XIV. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

Chairman Hall: This week is Thanksgiving week and I wish everyone a Happy Thanksgiving. I think we are all particularly blessed, and what made me feel pretty good this week, I've been in and out of Town Hall several times and every time I've been in there it's been a crush of people coming in with food and turkeys and donations and that's what this town is all about. There's a need, we rush to fill it. We have a lot to be proud of and a lot to be thankful for in this Town and we'll see each other again on December 10<sup>th</sup>. We'll start at 6 o'clock, we're going to have the same homework, so you don't have a lot of extra, and again, the public is welcome at that 6 o'clock meeting and then we will have our regular meeting at 7:00. Have a good couple of weeks, and again, Happy Thanksgiving.

**XV. ADJOURN**

Commissioner Leggo moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Serra. The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Norine Addis,  
Recording Secretary