NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

Regular Meeting

August 26, 2020

Chairman Domenic Pane called the Zoom meeting of the Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

II. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES

RECEIVED FOR RECORD
IN NEWINGTON, CT
2020 SEP -1 AM 11:27
Town Clerk

Commissioners Present

Chairman Domenic Pane
Commissioner Anthony Claffey
Commissioner Michael Fox
Commissioner Garrett Havens
Commissioner David Lenares
Commissioner Stanley Sobieski
Commissioner Stephen Woods
Commissioner Thomas Gill-A
Commissioner Bryan Haggerty-A

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Hyman Braverman-A

Staff Present

Craig Minor, Town Planner

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairman Pane: I don't see any major changes Craig, correct?

Craig Minor: Just two procedural ones Mr. Chairman. I left off Item 4, Public Participation, and Item 10 Town Planner report, so I recommend that they be added.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (For items not listed on the agenda, each speaker limited to two minutes. Use the Zoom "Hand Raised" function.

Chairman Pane: Is there anyone from the public who would like to speak?

James Krupienski: At this time we have no public on the meeting Mr. Chairman.

V. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Sobieski: I have a question for the Town Planner and you, my understanding is that Andrew is being transferred, is that so?

Chairman Pane: I don't know about that.

Craig Minor: It's more complicated than that. I don't know if I'm at liberty to go into detail on that.

Chairman Pane: I don't think it's appropriate to go into that now. It doesn't affect us.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING

A. Petition 19-19: Proposed Plan of Conservation and Development 2020-2030 Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant, Continued from August 12, 2020.

Chairman Pane: I'll open it up to Commissioners if they have any questions or comments. We have left this public hearing open for a long time, and the only comment that I have is that it's basically a guide so everything in here is a guide and you don't have to follow it to a T. The transit area on Cedar Street, I have problems accepting that we turn over our industrial property all to residential property. In our last plan of development, we had language in there that prevented our industrial property from being turned into residential property and the piece on Cedar Street is probably the toughest site to get approved for housing because of the industrial waste over there. I mean, on Crest Pontiac it was only an auto dealer and you saw what they had to do to clean that property up. Imagine what they would have to do to clean up the industrial waste over on the other side.
I'm in favor of a transit area, a transit station, I'm in favor of that, but I'm wondering whether or not we can accomplish that with still our industrial property, without giving up our industrial property. I'm not expecting anybody to change anything, I wanted everybody to know how I felt on it. We talked about this quite a few times, and I'll open it up for discussion with everybody.

Commissioner Fox: I have to agree that it would not be in our best interest to convert industrial property to residential property, but as you said, this is a guide, and I think if there were any applications we can discuss it and of course if someone wanted to have residential property it might be a little harder to deny them, but I think we can still work around it. Thank you.

Chairman Pane: Thank you. Are there any other Commissioners that would like to speak?

Commissioner Sobieski: I also agree with you, I don't want to turn all of our industrial property into residential, however I believe with the transit station doesn't care whether we left this industrial or residential or whatever we did on it. I agree with Commissioner Fox and you that we don't want to change all of our industrial property.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Stanley. Are there any other comments from any other Commissioners?

Commissioner Claffey: You know, I hold all the concerns that you as the Chairman and the past Commissioners just spoke of, my fear of leaving it in there, and I know it's just a guideline, but there is a legal obligation of a guide line and your basis of saying no to a residential development when your guideline is saying it's okay to bring before us, I know there was, in that area of town, there's that plot of land, plus the plot of land across the street, that they spoke of, the north side and the south side, there's a lot of acreage. I'll go back to, we haven't even been able to build out the Fenn Road side of Cedar Street and my fear back to keeping the residential in there where it currently is a different zoning section, we as a Commission couldn't even come to an agreement across the street when a residential property more recently wanted to come in and put 80 units there on less than ten acres. I don't know how much residential we are going to get to come into a forty acre site that is one hundred percent industrial land now, could almost be a brownfield, I just don't know why then we would want to leave that open and take away a thriving area of our town center in the POCD where you would probably want to keep your town center. If you took, and a developer came in, that amount of acreage at the Cedar Street site would almost take your town center and destroy it to an extent. Putting residential on a, I'm thinking about it, and not hearing any opposition from our town council members who many times wanted to speak about it, but never came to us and gave us what they thought, but then two years ago, the town council was pushing for us to figure out a way for housing not to be across the street. I think you are kind of, the town

could be talking out of both sides of their cheeks. I don't think it's a prime location since there is manufacturing that is slowly developing on a smaller scale in many communities that abut Newington. So, I think it would be hard to allow someone to come in on a guideline and say we want to put housing and not really have a way to say no to them, and then we are back in the same potential lawsuit that we were in, with the site right across the street, so I think in the POCD I think we have to be more focal on the downtown area, and it seems over the many months and almost year that we have been at this, we forgot about the downtown, and we focused on the transit district because that State came and said, hey, we'll maybe put a train station there. The train station is not going to bring people to move into a forty acre area for housing. It's not going to be conducive to that, you won't get enough housing in there, so I think our focal point is to go back toward the center of town where there is housing already there, it's surrounded by single family homes and I just think as a community we missed that and have been focusing on the wrong quadrant of our town to push housing. I'm not in favor of the housing option there, I just think it would add a disaster to that area to be frank.

Chairman Pane: I agree with Commissioner Claffey that the town center has to be protected and I wouldn't want to try to create a second town center. I would like to open it up now.

Commissioner Woods: I'm probably in the minority here, I'm not in favor of taking all of our industrial land and turning it into residential but I think it's important for us to leave our options open. We have land that we need to develop so we can continue to grow our tax base. I think if we have learned anything over the last four or five years, we have not done a good job on that. We don't necessarily get to pick all of the time, what is going to move forward. We can work with developers but we don't know what specific projects will work in the open market and I just don't think we should limit ourselves. There is a fair amount of raw land in that area, that is undeveloped and it's, some of it is industrial, but if someone wanted to come with some sort of housing, I don't think we should be opposed to it, we should at least entertain it. That's just my two cents.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much, I agree with you to a certain point. That's why I'm not proposing any changes and I know there is raw land there, but I don't know, I've got to wonder whether some of that, and maybe time will tell, is economically feasible to even put housing because of the industrial waste over there, but I guess someday, if somebody is interested, that would be something that they would analyze. One of the other things that you could do over there is, you could create a small industrial park for small businesses. There are not many places for a small business to buy an acre and put up a six or seven thousand square foot building for a small business, so that is a possibility too. You have to remember, the transit people for the State of Connecticut said they didn't care whether there was housing or not, they just wanted to have the option of putting the transit there. I'm open to……

Commissioner Woods: Mr. Chairman, I'm not really focused on that particular piece, I'm actually thinking a little further west, across from the proposed train station, across from the existing bus station and all of that land, and maybe we could actually work a deal that if the State of Connecticut and Central Connecticut University is going to let that land go, that was the old 291 land, we have access to that through Newington to get to that land. There is a big parcel of land in there that could be, I don't think it is appropriate for housing, but maybe some housing could be in there, but it could make a great industrial park.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much Commissioner Woods.

Commissioner Lenares: Just to talk about what some of the other people were talking about, I kind of agree with what everyone is saying, and I don't think Commissioner Woods is in the minority at all. I echo some of the things, as well, and more importantly, not to be for or against any particular type of development in any particular zone, but more importantly, not to limit ourselves, in the future in what we could allow or deny, listen to, I think it's important to be specific in this plan which I think in parts it is, and we need something specific where we are big enough to allow options in the future, and like you said Mr.

Chairman, not necessarily in, or Mr. Woods rather, not necessarily in one particular area, but in all the areas going forward, so I think just to weigh in on the plan, and some comments from me, I think it's good, I think it's vague enough to have considerations in the future, but yet specific enough to have protections for the town, the town center and the residents going forward as Mr. Claffey had talked about as well.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much for your input Commissioner Lenares.

Commissioner Woods: One more point popped into my head, and this is unfortunate, but it is reality that we are dealing with, while we all value industrial land and it does bring obviously very good jobs along with it, unfortunately in the State of Connecticut it doesn't bring a good tax base. It used to and we coveted that because of that factor, but that is gone now, obviously, the State has, all of the personal property and the machinery is now tax exempt. So, we have several pieces of property in this town that they would be on the top ten list, and they start there, then they fall right off because all of their personal property is exempt, but we need to grow our tax base and we need to keep that in mind, and again, I'm not saying all should go to housing, that is not what I'm trying to get at, but we need to enhance our tax revenue. I understand Mr. Chairman that you are not against that, you only voiced a concern, and I share that with you, I'm not actually against you, but I'm just trying to make sure that we do the best we can, and I think we are on the same page. You want to leave it open, but you have some concerns, and I appreciate that.

Chairman Pane: I do think we are on the same page, I'm not suggesting any changes, I just wanted to bring my concerns to the table. Any other Commissioners like to comment on this? This is a public hearing. Is there anyone else James on from the public here.

James Krupienski: No public on for us Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pane: Okay, if there is no objection, I would entertain a motion to close Petition 19-19 and move it to Old Business for action.

Commissioner Fox moved Petition 19-19 be closed and moved to Old Business. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski.

Commissioner Claffey: I think the only discussion, maybe back to our Town Planner, that the POCD is a guideline in regards to, and focuses on that area of town that we were just discussing. Does anything in the POCD as we move forward and I know we have done this diligently, but no one brought it up, doesn't conflict with any other areas over there that would hinder what some of the Commissioners said, like Commissioner Woods, you know, would one side of the road be better than the other, or you deny me here, but you approve me over there, I mean, have we looked at all, I just want to make sure that we have looked at all, you know, a guideline is just a guidelines, but then it sometimes blows up in our face.

Craig Minor: As one of the other Commissioners mentioned, it is a guideline and you can use it at your discretion. The exact same project on one side of the street might not be a good thing for Newington on the opposite side of the same street. Every case is just different enough that the Commission in good faith said no to one developer but said yes to what looked like a similar developer a year later, that would stand up in court as long as it was in good faith, and there were legitimate reasons why the Commission said yes to one and no to the other.

Commissioner Claffey: I just really want to make sure we don't get into this dissertation and then we are back to what happened on that same road across the street from the property that we are trying to make more feasible to potential growth. That's all. Thank you.

Chairman Pane: We have a motion and a second. If there is no other discussion...the vote was unanimously in favor the motion, with seven voting YEA.

B. Petition 21-20: Zoning Text Amendment (Sec. 5.3; 6.1; 6.10; 6.15; 7.4; and 9.2) to revoke the Low Impact Development (LID) regulations. Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant.

Chairman Pane: Craig, would you like to give us a little report on this?

Craig Minor: This would basically delete all of the LID regulations that were adopted back in 2014. This basically turns the clock back on LID. It's a public hearing so I imagine that you will be hearing from the public on it. I do want to point out, as I said in my memo, that the CCROG regional planning commission was not in favor of it, because it does not comply with the regional plans in terms of environmental protection. It also conflicts with the soon to be former POCD which talks about protecting the natural environment. I don't know if the new POCD does it to that extent, but the current one does, and that is all in my memo, so it isn't anything the Commissioners haven't heard before or read in my memos. That's all I have Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pane: Naturally if this gets approved I don't know if we would adjust anything in our 2030 Plan if it references it. We can do that after a public hearing. Is there anybody, James from the public here that would like to speak?

James Krupienski: No one is logged on for the meeting Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much. Any Commissioners have any comments? You have to remember this is, besides an economic, it's the soils in Newington that are not conducive to percolating water at a very good rate. We have a lot of clay soils here in Newington so I think that if there is a site that happens to percolate well, be it a gravel pit or something, then the developer will naturally use some LID general guidelines for the development, but generally speaking, our soils are not, are all clay and just not a good mix for this type of regulation, and it's caused a lot of problems and a lot of expense to developers and I think without this we could possibly get some additional development.

Commissioner Claffey: One question for this petition specifically, Mr. Planner, hypothetically this gets removed later tonight, are there still, to be clear to let everyone know who might be watching this later, or watching this live now, there are still requirements in our zoning regulations and construction regulations that still deal with runoff, home runoff, your business runoff that are still in place like buffering between business and residential, and water can't be drained from your house, technically over the property of your neighbor, etc, etc., so we still have some form of, and I don't want to use the term LID, engineering practices to prevent some of this, not all of it because we know the reason why we are taking it out, the difficulty for some people in this general region of Newington to adhere to it, so are we good to say we still have engineering practices in place for subdivisions, businesses?

Craig Minor: Absolutely. This just turns the clock back to 2014, not 1914, this is going back to your father's storm water management.

Commissioner Claffey: Okay, I just want to make sure that it is clear that there are still things that developers have to adhere to, it's not that they can come in here like the wild west and do what they want.

Chairman Pane: Craig, just because we don't have the LID regulations if some reason a developer wants to use LID engineering practices on his site, nothing says that he can't do that.

Craig Minor: Correct.

Chairman Pane: Okay, thank you. Any other Commissioners have any comments? James, no public, right?

James Krupienski: No public, Mr. Woods has his hand up though.

Commissioner Woods: I agree with you one hundred percent, I think that this needs to be rescinded. I think that while it was very well intentioned, unfortunately it just don't work well in our community with the soils that we have so I think this unfortunately more of a burden to not only homeowners but also businesses.

Commissioner Haggery: Just for my information, what was occurring back in 2014 or even previous to put this in the regulations. Was there something happening to say, hey we have to make a change?

Chairman Pane: I believe there was a grant for $50,000 and we applied for the grant, we did some work over at Clem Lemire field and then we put the regulation together, is that correct, Craig?

Craig Minor: That's correct, there was money to develop and adopt these regs, so we did, and it seemed like a good idea at the time.

Commissioner Woods: It did, it seemed like a great idea at the time, but I think it has proved that it has caused more of a burden on our applicants than it has helped the environment.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Commissioner Woods. Commissioner Haggerty, does that answer your question?

Commissioner Haggerty: Yes, thank you.

Chairman Pane: Any other question from the Commissioners?

Commissioner Fox moved to close Petition 21-20 and move it to Old Business. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski.

Chairman Pane, zoom frozen

Vice-Chairman Claffey: We can move this to Old Business and act on it tonight?

Craig Minor: Yes. Mr. Claffey do you want to call for a vote for the motion that is on the floor?

The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YEA.

C. Petition 22-20: Subdivision Text Amendment (Sec. 2.0, 3.0, and 6.0: Low Impact Development Regulations) Newington TPZ Applicant.

Chairman Pane: I'll ask Craig to explain this second part.

Craig Minor: This is the subdivision side of the LID equation so now if this amendment is adopted subdivisions will not hae to comply with the LID subdivision regulations for the same reasons that the Commission looks like it is to adopt rescinding the LID, the zoning LID regulations.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Craig.

Commissioner Claffey: The only question I have on 22-20, we had a subdivision come in recently, I think it was Deming Farm, are they going to be under the old rule, or the new rule.

Craig Minor: Frankly, the staff saw the way that the wind was blowing when it reviewed Peckham Farm so we did not hold that applicant to the LID regulations.

Commissiner Claffey: Okay, so it went back to the standard engineering practices.

Craig Minor: Pretty much, yes.

Commissioner Claffey: Okay, thank you, just wanted to make sure. I didn't want to have an undo burden on them moving forward. Thank you. I have nothing else Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Pane: Any other questions from the Commissioners? Is there anyone from the public?

James Krupienski: No one on with us. Commissioner Claffey does have his hand raised.

Commissioner Claffey: One other question, was there anything brought back by the Town Council, no one said in the memo, or when it was sent to the Conservation Commission was there any conjecture, cause for alarm from them?

Chairman Pane: I don't believe that they have responded at all. Craig, have they?

Craig Minor: No, and this would have been the opportunity to do that, at this public hearing.

Commissioner Claffey: Just want to make sure we are covered on that angle. Thank you.

Commissioner Fox moved to close Petition 22-20 and move it to Old Business for action. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Claffey. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion with seven voting YEA.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Petition 24-20: Zoning Text Amendment (Sec. 3.22.1.C) regarding Commercial vehicles in residential zones. Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant.

Chairman Pane: I believe Commissioner Claffey has asked for our home business regulations to run in conjunction with this because they tie together.

Commissioner Claffey: Yes, that is correct. I think that both of these in a weird way, in a legal way, we are chanhing things that kind of should run parallel with each other. If we have them on the agenda, we have them back to back. I don't know the legality of discussing both together.

Chairman Pane: We wouldn't discuss them both together, but if they could both be on the agenda maybe Craig could add that to the agenda for the next meeting.

Craig Minor: There is no problem with you discussing them as one item under New Business, it's just when we get to a public hearing they should be separated.

Commissioner Claffey: One last question if I may Mr. Chairman, looking at this document after the Town Planner's memo dated August 13th, when you turn to the next page you see what I think is the new proposed to be discussed, points, my only concern is, in previous years we have run, when we have changed something, we have had the old language and the new language together. This is a little confusing. I know what some of the old language reads but I think when we are changing something this

drastic, we need to show what 3.22.1C.2 was the old definition and what we are thinking is the new definition. I think we need to see it visually, so everyone understands what we are talking about heavy duty earth moving equipment, where before we used to give a physical weight to it, or something like that, you know what I'm saying.

Chairman Pane: I think it's set up isn't it with bold and strike outs.

Craig Minor: Mr. Chairman, last month I did it that way, I gave you the strike outs and I also gave you what I call the clean version. Tonight I only gave you the clean but I will, next meeting I will give you, along with all of the strike outs that Commissioner Claffey is asking for, and the clean version together.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Craig.

Commissioner Claffey: I guess the continuation of that question is, do we want to discuss this at all, or do we want to wait, I think we need to discuss it a little bit. I know we discussed it two weeks ago on truck sizes and I know Commissioner Woods had mentioned that some truck weights had changed with different vehicles. I'm not fully vetted in certain weights, up to a F450 but not a 550, I think they make a 650, I mean those weights get to be pretty heavy. Do we want to discuss it a little bit? Do we want to give it ten minutes?

Chairman Pane: Absolutely, go right ahead. If you have any concerns on it, go right ahead and then Commissioner Woods has something after you finish.

James Krupienski: Befoe you start Mr. Chairman, would you like me to put last month's markups on the screen?

Chairman Pane: Certainly. Thank you. Go ahead Commissioner Claffey and then Commissioner Woods.

Commissioner Claffey: Most of this can all be wrapped into one as a discussion point, but I think the weight and size of certain vehicles I know in my neighborhood I know I open my door and I look at a plumber who lives across the street and he has a beautiful truck, I mean, he keeps it clean. I have a land surveyor diagonally across from me, has a regular passenger van with the name of the company. It's not obtrusive, the name of the company, it fits in his driveway and they both fit in the driveway, they don't park on the grass, I think my kind of hiccup with this is when we get to a size of vehicle and you know, the use of one vehicle for one commercial vehicle size can be drastically different than the other. How big are we going to get before it gets almost too obtrusive for our residents and neighbors to not have to open their doors to see a tri-axle in the driveway? Because under the rules the dual axle or tri-axle fits under the 15,000 pound weight. I don't know, I think, pick-up trucks and (inaudible), I mean we are a town of many small businesses that use their vehicles, I'm not opposed to that, not at all. I mean, I have a business with a vehicle, it's a commercial vehicle, but it looks like a regular car, but under your guidelines, it's a commercial vehicle. That's okay to have in my yard, but then it's almost okay a 18 wheeler, cab and chassis sitting in the front of the home, in the driveway. It's, I mean, how big are we going to get? How big to they get Commissioner Woods, I don't know.

Commissioner Woods: I think the intent a smaller dump truck, and unfortunately that smaller dump truck while it hasn't really grown in size, it has grown in weight capacity. Those truck now are at 17,500, that is the gross vehicle weight. So, I think if we are going to do this, if we don't make this 17,500, all we are going to do is buy us a lot of headaches. I also think again, Item 2, we then go ahead and define commercial vehicles and I think personally I think we kind of blow it there because then any commercial vehicle is any motorized vehicle used to carry, deliver, handle or transport goods in the conduct of business, profession, or trade. Commercial vehicles include, so that is of right, otherwise we are just

going to have more angry homeowners, and we are going to get angry homeowners anyway because to some people trucks are acceptable and to some people they are not. I think it's a good start, and again, I think the weight definitely has to go up and again, while I have a business myself, I drive a small little pickup truck. I don't drive any commercial vehicles home, none of my people drive commercial vehicles home, so there is no, I'm not gaining anything here, but I do understand the intent of this I believe. There are a lot of small businesses that operate in the Town of Newington, those vehicles do come home, and I don't think most neighbors object to that, and I think that we should make sure that we do allow that.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Commissioner Woods. Any other Commissioners have any comments?

Commissioner Claffey: Can I make a comment on the regulation in our packet, under commercial vehicles, number one, it says in the last sentence, it talks about vehicles shall be parked either in the driveway or on some other suitable paved area in the side or rear yard. Mr. Planner, do we have anything that would contradict, like it's okay for a commercial vehicle to park in the backyard, but a non-commercial vehicle like a passenger car, where people have three or four in their backyard, will that be a violation, will they contradict each other? I feel like sometimes, we go out as a ZEO who goes out and cites somebody for a vehicle parked, a regular vehicle, you know, four tires, sedan size, like a Honda Accord, and he gets cited for parking on the grass, and we've had a lot of debate over what is a suitable paved area. Stone, some people put a block under each tire, are we muddying the waters giving the ability to put two large 17,500 pound vehicles in somebody's back yard? Are we creating another nuisance other than just leaving them in the front of the house in the driveway?

Craig Minor: Currently the commercial vehicle actually, currently such vehicle may be parked on the lot, but shall not be parked in the front yard or in the street right of way. What that means is the plane of the house. Under the current rule that commercial vehicle, that pickup truck, cannot be anywhere in front of the house, even if it is in the driveway, which doesn't make any sense. So what I was trying to do is to come up with regulations that made it clear that a commercial vehicle could be in the driveway, in the side yard or in the rear yard as long it is on gravel, pavement or something, not dirt or mud. Now you raised a good (inaudible) point a minute ago about, well, what about our commercial vehicle regulations. Is this going to create some confusion as to how those are enforced, and I think the answer is yes, there will be some confusion, but I know the ZEO has been out in the past, enforcing people who violate our residential vehicle rules that say that the vehicle has to be operable and if someone has a car that doesn't work, you are not allowed to have it. So, he does cite those people for having an inoperable vehicle, but that is a different section of the rules than our commercial vehicle regulations. I think it is inevitable that there is going to be some confusion.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much Craig.

Commissioner Claffey: My biggest concern then is the ability to then, you know, I've heard things from people putting new driveways in that Newington is very strict on the five foot property line, when people want to widen their driveway to eliminate the parking on the grass, and if you look at like an R-12 neighborhood like mine, the driveways are tight. They are, some of them are just as wide as the typical car. So, I mean, are we opening ourselves up to having pavement throughout our homes, around potential homes and then even the regulation, which we removed out of the section on LID which we may remove later tonight, so it's like you pave your whole backyard, I don't think we have a lot coverage requirement in our town, so somebody could literally pave their whole backyard up to five feet on three sides. I just think that is not the nature of a residential neighborhood, but our town allows it because we don't have a lot coverage. A lot coverage is something that we don't have because whether you agree or disagree, it has a lot to do with the drainage problems. That is why some communities have lot coverage so the water has a place to go. I just think it is odd that someone might be able to park two 17,500 pound vehicles in the back yard. I don't know, I don't know what everyone else is feeling.

Craig Minor: You have to remember that the second vehicle has to be by special permit and the Commission can say no.

Commissioner Fox: Listening to Commissioner Claffey I think he answered my question, talking about, right now, commercial vehicles would be allowed in the front yard, as long as it is on pavement, side yard or back yard. I think Commissioner Claffey is right, if I had a truck that I wanted to have parked at my house, I would be able to put just a stone driveway in the backyard. I don't know, it's still kind of confusing.

Chairman Pane: That's why we are going to talk about it some more. Any other Commissioners have any comments?

Commissioner Gill: Have we ever had requirements as far as the vehicle needs to be registered and insured and in good operable condition?

Craig Minor: Yes, I think that the standard rule that all cars have to be operable would apply to this also.

Commissioner Claffey: Do we want to add something like that, like what Commissioner Gill just mentioned? To say like, let's take the pandemic. In my industry, I have two vehicles, but I know guys that took a lot of their vehicles off of the insurance and parked them at their house, and they are registered but they are not insured. What about somebody that says, well, I'm not going to operate, but I'm going to keep this big truck, and it's unregistered. Can we use the residential side of the parking thing that Andrew does that has to be registered? Can you use it laterally for a commercial vehicle, or should we put a subsection for registered, maybe not insured, but at least registered. You could have a registered vehicle and not have it like.....

Chairman Pane: If it's registered, it has to be insured.

Commissioner Claffey: But what I'm getting at is that there is value in adding something in as a commercial vehicle because a commercial vehicle is very different than a standard vehicle like, you know, most of the residents of our town have. Is there something we can pull from the other one to cite somebody for an unregistered commercial vehicle in their driveway, or no, Mr. Planner?

Craig Minor: Yes, we could, but I think your point is well taken so I made a note to myself to add that language in here just to be a belt and suspenders kind of thing.

Chairman Pane: Just a reminder, one of the reasons, that one of the whole reasons we're doing this is to clean up is because there has been a lot of commercial vehicle around the houses. We live in a blue collar town where there are a lot of small businesses and we're just trying to make it easier for the residents without hindering and without trying to ruin a neighborhood.

Commissioner Fox: Yes, I think Commissioner Claffey, no offense, but a vehicle is a vehicle and if a vehicle is parked on any property, commercial or residential if it is inoperable, or unregistered or not insured, they should be fined or whatever.

Commissioner Claffey: You could have an uninsured vehicle on your property, and still have it registered.

Commissioner Fox: Yes, agreed.

Commissioner Claffey: Your point exactly what a commercial.....

Commissioner Fox: I think we are making too much of that. A unregistered car on somebody's property is.....(Two people talking at once)

Commissiner Claffey: Some of the vehicles could fall under another guideline in the state.

Commissioner Fox: My point is, if they are not registered, some commercial vehicles, the larger tractor trailers are temporary, I mean, if that is the case, fine, but if it's not registered, it's not registered and it should not be there.

Chairman Pane: Do any other Commissioners have any comments? Craig, you are going to make a couple of adjustments and then we'll have this on the agenda for the next meeting and will you include the home business regulations too at the same time?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much. I think we have some work to do on that.

VIII. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING

Chairman Pane: There was a non-profit event on New Britain Avenue for the Methodist Church. I talked to several of the Commissioners and I asked Craig to do this administratively, so Craig, could you just fill us in on what is taking place.

Craig Minor: Since you told me that you wanted to do that, I will advise the applicant that.....

Chairman Pane: You haven't called the applicant yet?

Craig Minor: I have not.

Chairman Pane: Please call the applicant, I believe all of the Commissioners have no objection, I talked to several of the Commissioners. I'll open this up on the floor right now, and I wanted Craig to do this administratively to get it out of the way. I know I talked to Commissioner Fox, Commissioner Sobieski and Commissioner Woods. Is there any problem with Craig doing this administratively please?

Commissioner Sobieski: I have no problem.

Commissioner Claffey: Let me ask you, I don't read in here, I remember the Methodist Church, they're doing a drive-in movie night?

Craig Minor: Yes, James can you go to their application?

Commissioner Claffey: My only concern is, are we opening this up for other people to not even come here, i.e. the Chamber coming and presenting like, hey we are going to follow the rules, are we doing this for other reasons because of, it seems to me it's like, hey, Covid messed up our usual fund raiser, our silent auction, they hold I think they hold every October or November down in Hartford, and in lieu of that we want to do this here in town.

Chairman Pane: That is what they are doing, yes. Because of Covid, because they were in a hurry, I didn't see a problem with this, so I asked Craig to do this administratively and I would like him to talk to them tomorrow morning and just handle it and get it off our agenda. The chamber has been very good to the Town of Newington and I didn't see any problems with the cars parking at United Methodist, and I'm sure they are going to follow social distancing.

Commissioner Havens: I don't have a problem with it being handled administratively, I'm just more curious, what would be the special permit requirements that they would need to meet for something similar to this if somebody else was to try this?

Craig Minor: Technically, anyone that applies for a special permit has to comply with the entire chapter of special permit requirements. In most cases, a special permit applicant, the activity doesn't rise to the level where the Commission needs to go through the process of first determining whether there was a need for it, and I think there are five findings that you need to make which technically you should make in all cases when there is a special permit. Those requirement, in a case like this one, where they want to have a drive-in moving night, I don't, I wouldn't see the Commission having them go through as much of a process as say, an adult day care would have to go through, or some other activity that could potentially be a problem for that neighborhood.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Craig. Any other questions or comments? Nobody has a problem with Craig handling administratively. Craig, you will take care of that tomorrow?

Craig Minor: Yes.

I. OLD BUSINESS

Petition 19-19
Proposed New Plan of Conservation and Development
Town Plan and Zoning Commission Applicant

Commissioner Fox moved to approve effective August 29, 2020 the new Plan of Conservation and Development, Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant.

FINDINGS:

1. The Town Plan and Zoning Commission began working on the new Plan of Conservation and Development November 2018 and has conducted the development of the new POCD at various open meetings of the town Plan and Zoning Commission.
2. The proposed Plan of Conservation and Development addresses all of the requirements in Section 8-23 of the Connecticut General Statutes.
3. Substantial citizen input on priorities and strategies were obtained at a public information meeting held at the Newington High School August 29, 2019.
4. Draft Plan of Conservation and Development was the subject of a public information meeting held in the town hall auditorium on February 26, 2020.
5. The Capital Region Council of Governments submitted the following comments: "The staff of the Regional Planning Commission of the Capitol Regional Council Governments has reviewed this and finds no apparent conflicts with regional plans and policies, The (inaudible) management principles of the state Plan of Conservation and Development, Plans of Conservation and Development of other municipalities in the region or the concerns of neighboring towns. We commend the Town and encourage reducing (inaudible) as well as exploring shared regional services where appropriate. Staff also commends the incorporation of complete streets in the POCD and commits to working with Newington on regional bicycle planning efforts and adoption of a complete street policy."

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski. After a roll call of the members the motion passed unanimously with seven voting YEA.

Petition 21-20
Zoning Text Amendment (Sec. 5.3; 6.1; 6.10; 6.15; 7.4; and 9.2)
To revoke the Low Impact development (LID) regulations
Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant

Commissioner Havens moved to approve effective upon publication, Petition 21-20 Zoning Text Amendment (Sec. 5.3; 6.1; 6.10; 6.15; 7.4; and 9.2) to revoke the Low Impact development (LID) regulations Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant.

FINDINGS:

1. The Low Impact Development Regulations have a negative impact on economic development in Newington that is disproportional to their environmental benefit.
2. The Capitol Region Council of Governments submitted the following comments: The staff of the regional planning commission of the Capital Region Council of Governments has found no conflict with the concerns of neighboring towns. However, CRCOG does not support the removal of Low Impact Development Regulatory language since it entirely conflicts with multiple goals and policies of the Regional Plan of Conservation and Development that specifically call for encouragement of integration of such principles of local regulations. The conflicting CRCOG goals include, but are not limited to, revised zoning and subdivision regulations to address local and regional land use concerns; increase sustainable redevelopment and in fill development efforts; and growing development in harmony with natural resources. Additionally, this appears to conflict with the town's own POCD policies for natural resource strategy that was just submitted for review.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fox. After a roll call vote of the regular members, the motion was passed unanimously with seven voting YEA

Petition 22-20
Subdivision Text Amendment (Sec. 2.0; 3.0; and 6.0; Low Impact Development Regulation
Town Planning and Zoning, Applicant.

Commissioner Lenares moved to approve effective upon publication, Petition 22-20 Subdivision Text Amendment (Sec. 2.0; 3.0; and 6.0; Low Impact Development Regulation Town Plan and Zoning Commission, Applicant

FINDINGS:

1. The low impact development subdivision regulations have a negative impact on economic development in Newington that is disproportional to their environmental benefits.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sobieski. After a roll call vote of the regular members, the vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YEA.

IX. TOWN PLANNER REPORT

Craig Minor: The only item I have reported on are the performance bonds that we have been working on the past couple of month. The memo that I sent to the members this afternoon, the latest chart, we're down to just some six items. These were all discussed at the last meeting. A couple of them, I'll go through them.

The first one……

Chairman Pane: I was just going to say, the first one there is the old chain link fence that was never removed on Commerce Court. I couldn't find it, I drove over there and I didn't see anything wrong over there at all, so I'm not sure why we still have that.....

Craig Minor: Then it might have been removed since I was over there.

Chairman Pane: The next one is Willard Avenue, $2500 for a private home, developer never finished site work, ownership had changed. I went to this property with Commissioner Woods and everything looked okay, it didn't appear like the driveway was over to one side or the other and frankly Commissioner Woods and I, looking at their front yard there, we couldn't see any problem at all. Commissioner Woods, do I have that correct?

Commissioner Woods: You do Mr. Chairman. I agree with you. I think we should just return the money.

Chairman Pane: I think so too. Then, Waverly Drive, wrong location.....

Craig Minor: Pat Snow put the driveway like four feet, three feet from the property line, and you need five feet, and it was discovered at the time, and to make sure that either Pat or the homeowner fixed it by either literally moving it, or by buying a couple of feet from the neighbor which was suggested at the time, we took this $5,000 bond to have Pat Snow or the homeowner to fix it, but I guess $5,000 wasn't enough because it's been sitting there all these year with no correction to the problem.

Chairman Pane: I didn't go to that location yes, and maybe Commissioner Woods, over the next week, would like to check that one out with me and then we could report back to the Commission on that one. Is that all right with everyone? Commissioner Woods, is that okay?

Commissioner Woods: It's fine with me.

Commissioner Claffey: Who was the bond in name of?

Craig Minor: Premier Development, Pat Snow.

Commissioner Claffey: On Waverly Drive, is that still the same homeowner fourteen years later, or has the property changed hands?

Craig Minor: It is the same homeowner.

Commissioner Claffey: Thank you.

Chairman Pane: The next one is the Rockledge subdivision. There was extra money in there, $3,150.00 after the Town put some trees in there. I think we should return that to the developer even though, years ago he said keep it, I really think it should go back. I'll open it up to Commissioners comments, if anybody has a comment on that one?

Commissioner Woods: Mr. Chairman, I agree with you. If we were going to do something, we should have done it probably thirteen years ago, so we just kind of held onto the money, we're not really doing anything with it, so it doesn't seem to bother us that much either, I think it should be returned.

Chairman Pane: Very good, any other Commissioners have any comments? The next one is the Fenn Road Starbucks. Did staff check this one out in the last two weeks?

Craig Minor: Yes. We are still hold $9,919 because the final paving course of the access, what I will call the access road between Cedar and Myra Cohen Way, the final top course has not been put down yet which is fine, because it is still a work in progress. A hotel is going to be built someday, the other piece of vacant land will be built on so that is why the applicant has never put down the final course, which is fine, but that is why we are holding this bond.

Commissiner Claffey: That access road, is that just where the people turn in to their property, or that whole road back out to Cedar Street.

Chairman Pane: That $9,919 doesn't even begin to cover putting a second course on that roadway. Doesn't even come close. I would suggest that we return the $9, 919 to the developer because that access road is going to be when he comes in with the next development, that is when he is going to do the paving there.

Craig Minor: Right.

Chairman Pane: Any questions from the Commissioners?

Commissioner Claffey: Did the town code finish on the actual Starbucks parking lot and roadway?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Commissioner Woods: I agree with you Mr. Chairman, this money should be returned.

Commissioner Claffey: Let me play the devil's advocate. Are we bonded on another way for that company or right now that road wouldn't have a bond on it. What if it takes two years to get the developer to come, just a question?

Chairman Pane: It's a private access road, it's not a town road, it's a private access road, almost like within the development so when he gets the next building up, he has to put the second course down pretty much.

Commissioner Claffey: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Pane: So if there is no objection, I would entertain us voting on returning Peter Nero's $6,000, return 1460 Willard Avenue, $2500; and Rockledge Drive subdivision, $3150; and the Fenn road Starbucks, $9,919 and the Waverly Drive I'll inspect for next meeting. If there no objection, is everyone in agreement to returning those one, two, three, four items?

Commissioners: Yes

Chairman Pane: No one has an objection, Craig, would you take care of that? Then we will be down to two items.

Commissioner Lenares: One thing before you go forward. I know you don't need the pat on the back, and neither does Craig, but this list was significantly longer when we first started and it was tedious to listen to all this stuff, so kudos to you for going through this stuff and to Craig for getting rid of this stuff off our plate and getting this money back to the rightful owners.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Commissioner Lenares.

Commissioner Claffey: One question I have, what is up with the Costello Road? Give me an update on that one.

Craig Minor: It's an industrial building, I don't know what the status of it is at the moment, but they have not requested a bond reduction. I invited them to about a month or so ago, when this first came up, but I haven't heard from them.

Commissioner Claffey: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Pane: Do you have anything else, Craig?

Craig Minor: That's it.

Chairman Pane: I know that Craig talked to me today about, in an e-mail about sidewalks for Dakota property. Do you want to fill the Commission in on that?

Craig Minor: Yes. As I think most of the Commissioners recall, the affordable housing project on Cedar Street, opposite the, well, where Crest Pontiac used to be, was denied by TPZ mainly because there was no sidewalk, and if working people were going to be living in that complex and they were going to be taking CTFastrak to work, they need to get there, and there are no sidewalks, so it just seemed unsafe to the Commission. So it was denied for that reason. The applicants appealed to the courts, and, I'm going to paraphrase, what the judge did was, the judge overturned TPZ denial, because the judge, the bottom line is the judge overturned the denial but with the requirement that Dakota go back to DOT and one last time and make a good faith effort to get DOT to agree to allow Dakota, at Dakota's expense, to install a sidewalk along the north side of Cedar Street from the Dakota site to approximately the Fenn Road intersection. So, Dakota's engineers have been working with DOT and they have come up with a plan that they say that DOT has preliminarily approved, which goes as far as actually just the, what I'm calling the Starbucks road, the access way that connects Cedar Street with Myra Cohen Way that we were just talking about a minute ago. The Dakota's engineers have said that they will, that DOT will make a presentation to the Town about this proposal or this design, it will be during the day, and it will be virtual so I'm not sure how many Commissioners will be able to participate which is a little concerning to me because this is something that the Commissioners felt strongly about, so I think they should be involved in this presentation that DOT is going to make, but that's it, I just learned about this today, shared it with the Chairman and as it evolves I certainly will keep the Chairman informed.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Craig for filling us in on that. Please keep me informed of when that meeting is, during the day, I would like to attend that by Zoom or whatever it is and I'm not too concerned that we didn't have too much input. I understand, I think that the developer and the State have worked something out. From what I understand there is not enough room for a snow shelf and DOT is accepting that because of the difficulty of acquiring a snow shelf. I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the Commissioners and I will attend the meeting and update you when I get more information.

Commissioner Fox: I don't have a really good feeling about not being able to attend. I'd like to attend, I don't know if the rest of the Commission feels that way, but personally, I would like to attend that meeting virtually or not.

Chairman Pane: I don't know if we have much to say, it's just an updating meeting, but we will make sure that Craig sends you the same information that he sends me. He'll send it to all of the Commissioners in case anybody else wants to attend it also.

Commissioner Fox: I should hope that we would be able, but no offense to you or Craig or the DOT, but sometimes these things cause a little loss in the transmition, so you don't get everything.

Commissioner Claffey: Can I ask a question?

Commissioner Fox: Let me finish, but that's okay.

Commissioner Claffey: Sorry. We sat in executive session over this and I'd love to get the legal interpretation of where we can speak for or against this, because it sounded pretty confident in executive session that they were only obliged to keep Craig Minor abreast and keep him included in it. I don't recall him saying that we as a Commission could keep talking against or for it. I would love to.....

Chairman Pane: Commissioner Claffey, I think you are correct. We don't have any say on whether we are for it or against it, we asked them to try to get it and they were supposed to keep us abreast of things but they failed to do that, but that is why we are going to have a chance to listen to the State and the contractor.

Commissioner Claffey: Let me, I'm trying to make sure we're getting clear because you are muddying the waters here. We as a Commission were told in executive session that we could not speak, so how could we attend and say anything, to listen in yes, but it seems that everyone here is making a little assumption that they can go to this meeting and discuss it. I'm pretty sure we are cut off at the knees with that.

Chairman Pane: Yes, we don't have any discussion, I don't believe, on it.

Commissioner Claffey: I just want to make sure because we last spoke of this all in executive session and now we are speaking of it outside of executive session.

Chairman Pane: We're just talking about the sidewalk, we're not talking about anything that was in executive session or anything right now. I'm just bringing it to your attention that the sidewalks are being discussed. It was a very difficult thing for the developer to get the sidewalks, it's not the developers land, so the developer was technically only responsible for in front of his own property, but he did agree to set aside some money, and obviously the judge thought it was important just like we thought it was important to have sidewalks down to, down Cedar Street on the north side.

Commissioner Claffey: It's not a mandate though.

Chairman Pane: It's not a mandate, correct. Any other comments from the Commissioners?

X. COMMUNICATIONS

None

XI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (For items not listed on the agenda, Speakers limited to two minutes) Use the Zoom "Raise Hand" function.)

Carol Anest: I want to thank Andrew for picking up some of the signs, but the swimming pool sign is still on the town green, so if somebody can swing by and pick that up I'd appreciate it.

Chairman Pane: Okay, we'll pass that on, thank you.

XII. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Havens: Just to follow up with what you and Commissioner Claffey were discussing, the judge is not making them put in the sidewalk, the developer is doing this as a good faith effort, is that correct?

Chairman Pane: That's correct. The developer is not required to do it, you're right.

Commissioner Claffey: I don't want to leave here and then we hear tomorrow amongst the coffee shops that everyone says, oh my God, they are putting sidewalks in, I just want to make it clear that the Commission had a pretty tight lip on this because we were told by our Town Attorney.

Craig, can you send out, or maybe I missed it, an e-mail, the formulated new version of the new brewery/distillery regs so we can put it in our folders?

Craig Minor: What we usually do is after we have amended the regulations, Cindy sends a complete copy, but you're right, we haven't done that yet. How about if I send everybody what I call a clean version rather than give you an entire set of the regulations?

Commissioner Claffey: That's what I meant, just that section.

Craig Minor: Sure.

XIII. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Pane: We have been taking some steps in trying to improve things in our regulations and stuff, and one of the other things that has come up is should we, or should we not be approving restaurants by special exception, or do we remove the special exception and just have it approved by right, and also the outside dining. By removing the special exception on both those items, is it possible that could make it easier for restaurants to, and people who want outside dining to come in to us, knowing that by right they can do it and they are not going to get denied.

Commissioner Claffey: The one concern I have is if you remove that for restaurants, would that be able to go anywhere a restaurant could feasible meet the restaurant requirements Mr. Planner? Or, does that open it to like, oh, there's a strip mall opening and it wasn't a restaurant, I just want to go move a restaurant in there.

Craig Minor: To be honest, I wasn't sure what Chairman Pane's point was, I mean, yes, currently restaurants require a special permit, and if someone has a restaurant and wants outdoor dining pre Covid, they have to come to TPZ and get approval for that, but I wasn't sure what Chairman Pane's point was beyond that.

Chairman Pane: My point was to remove the special exceptions so that they don't have that thought that they could get denied, where if they come in and they comply with all of the other regulations, why should it be a special exception. I mean, we've never denied a restaurant that I ever have heard of, that has either come in or dining requirements. We've made them comply with the regulations, but we've never denied them, so I'm just trying to think of ways that we can make it a little easier for businesses basically.

Commissioner Fox: I agree it would make it easier, and I'm sure, and my concern is if it was by right, we would have no recourse if let's say they didn't want to use the proper venting system or something. We could put a stop to that and of course, and if you have to go through a special permit, we are not going to put a developer or a restaurant through the hoops, we're going to be as lenient as we can, but I feel that we still have to make sure that we have some kind of input.

Commissioner Claffey: I guess my question is, if you take out the special requirements, to sit before the Commission, you are not eliminating Mr. Planner, any other standard operating procedure like the parking site plan for new restaurants, and I'll use an example of where the restaurant right across from the CITGO gas station, which is not there, that pizza joint that lasted six or eight months. Where they came before

us and had a lot of issues in trying to get sufficient parking. If we take this special permit out, do we still save, can we make sure the business actually fits that area, or an area. I'm not for or against it, I just want to make sure we aren't pulling everything out so just carte blanche a person could walk in to Main Street and open a 30 seat restaurant, and we have no parking for him.

Chairman Pane: I'll let Craig answer, but we still would have to comply with 5.2 and the other regulations there, the parking regulations, they would still have to comply with everything else.

Craig Minor: If somebody wanted to open a restaurant, in an existing commercial building, then something that Andrew would do would be to make sure there is enough parking for this new restaurant before it could get approved. Now, I'm saying this slowly because there really is no mechanism for Andrew to be able to know that there is a new restaurant coming in because, if it doesn't have to get TPZ approval, usually, or very often, Andrew knows about new businesses because they need to get a building permit because they need to make some change to the building. That is how Andrew finds out about a lot of as of right new businesses that come in. So, that is the downside of allowing things to be as of right, we lose some control. That's true.

A new business, new construction, would have to come before you for site plan approval, but if someone wanted to open up a restaurant in one of those buildings on Market Square, I'm thinking out loud obviously, I think Andrew would be aware of that because restaurants, they have to make so many changes to the building, installation of the ovens and the hoods, and all of that, it's pretty unlikely that Andrew wouldn't get the heads up that a restaurant wanted to move in, and that would give him the opportunity to make sure there was enough parking, that it is in the right zone, etc.

Commissioner Claffey: One last question for Mr. Planner, or anyone else who might know the answer, any of our local communities have any requirements like we do, or are they all, hey, if you fit you get in type of thing?

Craig Minor: That's a good question. I actually put the question to my colleagues on our internet list a month or so ago, and I was surprised, there are a number of towns that do require special permits. Off the top of my head, I think in most cases those were vacation towns with outdoor seating where outdoor seating could become a problem, but I can certainly, if this idea has merit and the Commission wants to discuss it further, that can be part of my report, as to what other towns, how many other towns require a special permit for restaurants.

Chairman Pane: Thank you very much Craig. Councilor Budrejko, if you would like, you can speak now.

Gail Budrejko: I do recall the thought when you were having the discussion about the brewery and the micro pubs, when a couple of the residents indicated that they were concerned about.....

Chairman Pane: We have never denied a restaurant to come in, if they complied with the parking, if they complied in everything else, in the last thirty years, or longer, I have never seen us deny a restaurant and/or outside seating. Maybe we've controlled it, maybe we asked them to do things to comply with our regulations, but we've never denied one, and this was just an attempt to be a little more business friendly, so that if a restaurant, a good restaurant wanted to come into the town, they would know that we are allowing them, but they still have to comply with things. Where if it was by special exception, there is always that doubt that we may not allow them to come in, so it was a method to try to increase business in town.

Gail Budrejko: I just wanted to bring that up, that it was discussed before with the residents. Thank you.

Chairman Pane: Thank you.

Commissioner Havens: As far as what Councilor Budrejko was saying, even if we were to get rid of the special permit requirement, they would still have to meet everything, and, lost my train of thought, but something on the lines, that even if, whether we get rid of it or not, ultimately all of the other departments still have to do their due diligence and make sure that everything is correct. If we were to keep it, you said that we haven't denied anybody, but I'm in favor of keeping it personally, just for the simple fact that we can do our due diligence, we can have a hearing so that the public doesn't feel left out, if they have concerns regardless of what the restaurant is, what kind of restaurant, or where it's going to be.

Chairman Pane: Thank you Commissioner Havens for your comments, I appreciate them. Maybe the thing to do is to have all of the Commissioners think about this and then we can bring it up next time. There is nothing wrong, and I don't object to keeping it, I just wanted to throw it out there, it was one of the suggestions from Glenn, I believe, in our 2030 Plan.

Are there any other comments from Commissioners?

XIV. ADJOURN

Commissioner Fox moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commission Claffey.

Chairman Pane: I want to thank all of the Commissioners, we did, I think we did a good job on this, and I'll keep in informed if I hear anything else. Good night.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Norine Addis,
Recording Secretary