

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
June 8, 2015 Meeting Minutes

These minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting.

Commission Members Present: Vincent Zimnoch, Alan Gannuscio, Jim Szepanski, and Alexa Brengi

Commission Members Absent: Mike Forschino, Cindy Cooper (Alternate), and Pat Sayers (Alternate)

Town Staff Present: Jennifer Rodriguez (Town Planner), and Dana Steele (Town Engineer)

I. Call to Order

Chairman Zimnoch called the meeting to order at 7:09 pm.

II. Roll Call

Commission roll call was taken.

III. Approval of Minutes from the May 11, 2015 Regular Meeting

Mr. Szepanski pointed out that the May 11, 2015 minutes indicated a 6-0 approval vote for the site plan application for C&S Grocers when it should have been a 5-0 approval.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the May 11, 2015 minutes *as amended*.

IV. Public Hearings (none)

V. Reviews (none)

VI. Action on Closed Public Hearing Items (none)

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion with Commission and Staff (none)

B. Action Items (none)

VIII. New Business

A. Public Input (none)

B. Receive New Applications

i. Special use permit with site plan review for 9 Schoephoester Road for fuel station, mixed use building, and outdoor eating area

The commission discussed who was going to be present for the July 13 meeting.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a public hearing for the special use permit and site plan review for 9 Schoephoester Road for fuel station, mixed use building, and outdoor eating area for the meeting on July 13, 2015.

C. Informal Discussions

(Modification of Approved Site, 6 Choice Road, Carite of Connecticut)

Attorney Thomas Fahey, representing the applicant, John Barberino; and Guy Hesketh, Licensed Professional Engineer with Hesketh and Associates, addressed the commission. Attorney Fahey noted that in the fall the applicant requested staff approval for a freight terminal. Part of this facility will be used to store his automobile parts. He will also be doing minor detailing and minor dent pullouts, but nothing that would require a DMV license. There is a major need for this service, and an opportunity has come up to do this for his own vehicles as well as for Avis or Hertz. Mr. Barberino would like to increase the size of the building so half can be used for storage and the other half could be used for Mr. Fix-It (dent removal project).

Mr. Hesketh briefly discussed the site plan. They are looking to expand the building to 6,800 square feet total. The number of employees would increase from three to six, so the parking area was increased. The septic system would be slightly larger and would be located on the north side of the building. The impervious coverage on the site remains essentially the same. From a hydrologic perspective, there is no significant change to what they are proposing on the site. To reiterate, the major changes are an increase in the size of the building, relocation of the parking, and taking the septic field from the south side and positioning it on the north side of the building. Mr. Hesketh indicated on the map where the new rail siting would be. Attorney Fahey pointed out that they are looking for administrative approval so they have a lead time in getting the storage building.

Mr. Steele commented that the new rail spur has been moved closer to the entrance drive and asked if this will block the driveway so cars can't get in and out when vehicles are being loaded and unloaded. Mr. Hesketh replied that it will be tight there for two-way traffic, but there would be enough room for one-way traffic. Attorney Fahey added that this is not open to the public, and there would be tens of cars going through, not hundreds, so this would not be a problem. Mr. Steele asked if trucks would be going through, and Attorney Fahey responded that possibly pickup trucks

needing repairs would come through, but at this time not car carrier trucks. Mr. Steele asked what a box truck would need to do in order to access the site and exit, and Mr. Hesketh replied that it would have to back into the site.

Mr. Szepanski asked how many bays/garage doors there will be. Mr. Hesketh replied that two are being proposed and said he would share with staff where the door locations will be. Mr. Szepanski asked if Mr. Wizard will be a tenant. Attorney Fahey replied that Mr. Barberino has hired these people, and they will be part of his operation. Mr. Szepanski asked how many cars can fit in the building. Mr. Hesketh replied probably six or seven cars. Attorney Fahey mentioned that the cars don't have to stay there very long because the repairs are done very quickly. Mr. Szepanski said that he is very concerned about this being a very tight area and the ability for getting a fire truck in there.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that it might be useful to have a discussion about the uses that are permitted in the industrial zone, and in Industrial 3, repair and minor servicing is not permitted. Since this may be delegated to staff and in order to give staff and the applicant guidance, the conversation should be had to the extent that this is accessory to the current use that is approved.

Attorney Fahey asked how all the businesses could operate on King Spring Road, which is an industrial area. Ms. Rodriguez replied that they must be things that are already approved. He commented that they got their approval for King Spring Road a few years ago. Mr. Steele pointed out that repair garages are allowed in I-1 and I-2, and this is I-3, and he thinks those are on King Spring Road under that regulation. Attorney Fahey commented that 85% of the repair places in operation on Spring Street are there by variances in business zones. He repeated that Mr. Barberino's operation does not require any motor vehicle license whatsoever, and they just got a special permit approval for a business that they indicated on the record that would have vehicles and parts for automobiles and there would be detailing and this type of preparatory things done in this original building. He continued, "That site plan is from November of this year. Are you telling us now that we can't do that? It doesn't make any sense. The only thing that has changed is the size of the building." Ms. Rodriguez: "That's not what I said. I just think the conversation should happen so that it's on the record when..." Attorney Fahey: "Well, I'm saying that the conversation has already happened at our last meeting." Mr. Steele: "What has changed with regard to the use of this property from the last application?" Attorney Fahey: "Not every vehicle is going to be John's. The same activity that was going on with John's vehicles we're also going to do with some other vehicles if we can get a contract with Avis or Hertz." Mr. Steele: "Do you recall the conversation at that time what we concluded was the use? Does it fall under--looking at the use table—allowed under I-3 is 'furnishing of any service such as cleaning, repairing, cold storage, bottling and distributing, including freight terminals, railroad yards, truck terminals, and transfer stations'?" Attorney Fahey: "It would be accessory to that because when you're in a freight terminal, if you have a vehicle in a freight terminal, you can do something that doesn't require a license like a body shop or something

like that which has a whole different regulatory criteria as part of your operation.” Mr. Steele: “It does under that description talk about repairing.” Attorney Fahey: “That’s what I’m assuming it was. The use table is the same as the one in October when we came here.” Ms. Rodriguez: “The conversation just a little while ago was talking about half storage and half this new use, so I’m not trying to be instigating in any sense. I just think that the conversation needs to happen because you are asking for that administrative approval. When it comes to the office I would like this conversation to have been had.” Mr. Szepanski: “Are we saying taking dents out of your door for other than your own vehicles, say under contract to Hertz, to pick a name, does not require a motor vehicle license to do that?” Attorney Fahey: “That’s absolutely correct.” Mr. Gannuscio: “I see this all as an accessory service type use.” Mr. Steele: “If that’s the consensus, then there’s no issue for staff.” Attorney Fahey: “What you read, Dana, is a very broad description...” Mr. Steele: “This might be an important clarification, what’s the difference between repairing here versus a repair garage, and maybe the DMV license is the distinction.” Attorney Fahey: “If we needed a DMV license, I would agree that that would be a major change, but we don’t, and that’s because of the nature of...technology has made this process so simple.”

There was a brief discussion regarding spray painting and replacing bumpers.

Chairman Zimnoch: “What’s happening here is the building is getting expanded. The reason why the building is doubling its size is now there’s going to be additional repair done, and that repair is something like Mr. Dent, and so that’s why the building is growing in size. That repair work is going to be done not only for the applicant’s cars but also for other businesses.” Attorney Fahey: “But not retail.” Chairman Zimnoch: “So what we need to consider is whether that is an accessory use of this particular...” Mr. Steele: “Or falls under the description of repair that is specifically listed or allowed under that zone. We had this discussion when dealing with the businesses on Spring Street. That was in the Business-1 zone, and the regulation allows minor servicing. We had that discussion on what constitutes ‘minor servicing.’ Some of those applications were no DMV permit required, but then they came back and they wanted a DMV permit, but we still concluded that it was minor because it didn’t involve a full-fledged repair garage. So I think the way it was treated in the past is, the minor repairs, even with a DMV permit, if it’s retail, that’s in the Business-1. If it’s a full repair garage, it’s in the I-1 and I-2. We’re kind of creating a third category with this in saying that it’s not for retail and it’s also minor.” Chairman Zimnoch: “I think that’s basically how we’ve viewed it before and that’s basically how I’m considering it.”

Attorney Fahey: “Just to make sure Jim’s question is answered, if they have to put a new bumper on, they will have to paint it in that facility.” Szepanski: “Without a spray booth or with a spray booth?” Fahey: “Whatever you can have without having to get a license.” Hesketh: “I would imagine if you do spray in there you have to meet some minimum air quality for OSHA requirements... We can certainly find that out and report to staff.” To reiterate, Hesketh: “From what John has indicated, the

intent is to have vehicles that come in off lease that need minor repair...A few hours of work, then out the door...This is clean up the cars and get them out the door.” Mr. Gannuscio: “I see this summarized as the same way. There’s just some details on some of the process that needs to be discussed with staff. This is something, given the initial approval for this, that is just an expansion of the building, and it’s fine for administrative approval.” Zimnoch: “And I think it’s fine for this particular location because it doesn’t require additional licensing from Motor Vehicle for this kind of work. We’ve classified repairs that needed motor vehicle licensing as minor, and I would certainly view this as minor.”

Mr. Steele commented about the turnaround and the truck access. He said his understanding was that the turnaround was part of the site plan and that there wouldn’t be trucks backing into this. Since this is a staff review, he would like to talk to the police and fire and see how they feel about this. His thinking is that the turnaround should be required as part of this approval, not being something in the future, unless there will only be pickup trucks. Mr. Hesketh responded that Mr. Barberino is not looking at big vehicle/truck deliveries, but he would like to get the information and work it out with staff. Mr. Steele is saying, as a caveat to explain, as part of staff review, he’s going to consult with police and fire, and the conclusion may be that they are not going to permit a situation where trucks have to back in off of Choice Road. So either there won’t be those trucks or the turnaround will be installed. Mr. Steele asked if they are still in the process of obtaining the Rights Required for that turnaround. Mr. Hesketh replied that that negotiation has been opened. Mr. Steele clarified for the commission that the applicant needs permission to cross the tracks to get to the turnaround. There is a condition that they can’t cross the tracks until they get that right. Mr. Hesketh commented that he thinks there is adequate space there that they can provide for a K-turn maneuver that would be safe. Mr. Steele summarized that staff will work out the truck access problem. If police and fire are not comfortable, then some conditions will be applied regarding the size of trucks that are allowed.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission leaves for administrative review any modifications of the already approved site plan for 6 Choice Road, with consideration for the concerns that have been raised this evening.

OTHER: 70 King Spring Road

Mr. Gannuscio asked Joe Calsetta if he had something he wanted to bring up. Mr. Calsetta replied that a friend of his just went to the ZBA to get a Light Repairer license, and the question is, does he also have to come to this commission to go through a site plan review, which is a very expensive process with the application fees and making copies. He wants to do other things associated with repairing wheels or the suspension of a car. He won’t be doing anything larger--it’s the same customer base. Mr. Calsetta confirmed that this is not major repair but minor repair, as major repair is taking motors out and replacing them and minor repair is unbolting

brake pads, adjusting alignments. Mr. Calsetta thought this could be done administratively because it is not a new business. Chairman Zimnoch asked what has changed physically. Mr. Calsetta replied that nothing has changed--it's the same size building with the same parking.

Chairman Zimnoch asked Ms. Rodriguez if she wanted to comment on this. She stated that it has gone through the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA). The state requires that there be a public hearing process. The statutes require that it goes to the ZBA. We've still got on our zoning regulations that the PZC review the site plan and special use permit. This is an existing site and the use is being changed somewhat. She said it was tough on her end to give guidance to the applicant on how to navigate through this because there is that redundancy in the process. What you do when you have your special use permit is if there were concerns there then you could have conditions of approval. Chairman Zimnoch remarked that it is already approved. Ms. Rodriguez replied that it is, and it's an existing site. Chairman Zimnoch asked about potential issues. Two that were mentioned are noise and no screening. The traffic, however, would probably be similar.

Mr. Gannuscio commented that it sounds like just a modification of a use since he already has all of the equipment already on the site. Mr. Calsetta said he would like to be able to do car alignments, so it's just a continuation of the repair process of the broken or bent wheel. Mr. Steele remarked that in some situations adding another service increases your business and therefore the traffic, but in this case he does not see an increase in traffic, especially since King Spring Road is a cul-de-sac, or a dead-end road. If it was in an area of congestion or concern, you might have to look at it differently. Chairman Zimnoch stated that this is why the procedure is set up this way so if the ZBA approves this use, then it still comes back for a site plan review where the PZC has an opportunity to review potential noise and traffic problems and then tries to mitigate those with requirements. He added, "That's the reason it's set up this way, but in this particular case, I just don't see this. The use is contained within the building." Mr. Gannuscio commented that this is a logical extension. Mr. Steele asked, "Do you think that the commission can make a determination tonight that the use is the same as what is already approved, and that no application is required?" In other words, is any application needed at all? Mr. Gannuscio replied, "I would say 'no,' because this is a continuing operation based on the representation that it's the equipment that's already on site. This would just be allowing what's there to be used for what it's intended to be used for. It's a service that would normally be a part of this type of function." Chairman Zimnoch stated, "I don't see the benefit of additional process here. What else are we going to find out? I don't see any additional discoveries being made in the process, so...I don't see the need for an application."

Mr. Szepanski commented, "If we go that route, we're saying we're not going to comply with state statutes, right?" Ms. Rodriguez pointed out, "The state statute requires just the ZBA." Mr. Szepanski said, "But our procedures say..." Mr. Steele interjected, "...if there's a change in use or a new use." To clarify: Mr. Calsetta's friend went to the ZBA because he couldn't get the repair license unless he went to the ZBA. He did not have a repair license before going to the ZBA because he doesn't need one for what he presently does. As Chairman Zimnoch put it, "This is a very minor change in the service level that he is providing. He is providing just one additional little thing, but that little addition in the service that he is providing now requires a DMV license...and that triggers our process." Mr. Szepanski stated, "But you could argue that

it's also a major change because he's operating without a license now, so this is his opportunity to get a license, so it is a change. Had he had a repair license and he wanted to go one step further from minor to major, you could see the similarities and maybe not require it. But this is something that..." Mr. Steele: "The special permit process would allow you to talk about hours of operation and things like that." Mr. Szepanski: "We don't have the applicant here, we have a representative here. I'm sure Joe has given us the straight and skinny, I don't doubt that one bit, but..."

Mr. Calsetta went on to say: "Be that as it may, may I observe, as someone who has attended these planning and zoning meetings for 35 years and who has accomplished a lot of real estate development in the Town of Windsor Locks and continues to do so to this very day, that I understand why that regulation is in your planning and zoning regulations, but I don't think it's in there to be the Be All and End All of what you do. I think that there should be some leeway, and maybe you should look at your regulations to allow your staff, if you have staff in their professionalism, to make decisions like this and do this on an administrative basis, or to say, 'no, hey you're doing a major repair, you've got to do a site plan review...' I do think that we need to be a little bit more cognizant of the fact that Joe Citizen that walks in the door and tries to do something with the government nowadays...has a hard time doing it. He has a hard time wading through all these regulations and all these rules that are constantly changing nowadays. Your own regulations, you have upgraded them. They were awful for many years, but it's there for a fail-safe purpose, but I don't think it's there to stop a guy from aligning a car since he's already fixing wheels."

Ms. Brengi commented, "We've had other people come up here that are just making a one-step change, and we've made them re-apply and come up here, and I don't know if this is going to open a door where you let this person do it without coming before you. It's not like he already has a license and he's just changing it a little bit, he's going from having nothing to something. Is it a specific license where he's only going to be allowed to do this, or does this open it up to be a minor repair shop?" Mr. Calsetta replied, "There's a major repair shop next door and a major repair shop next door to that, and an auto body store across the street, and as I've just said moments ago, why don't you empower your staff to make these kinds of determinations on their own so they aren't opening a can of worms and having people come in and say, 'Johnny gets to play with matches, mommy, why can't I?' because that's basically what you're saying....I think you have a staff—let your staff do their job. It will make your process more efficient so you can spend your time looking at much larger issues than a lug nut on a car."

Ms. Rodriguez pointed out the difference she is seeing from a staff perspective. "We were just looking at the category that the PZC might look at is Repair Garages and Shops, including welding. It lists many things, and minor servicing would be included in that. That is permitted in the Industrial-1 zone by special use permit. This site with the use that it had, which was more of a minor servicing...so what's being requested is for the purposes of the PZC, in the same category. For the ZBA, that change in license would trigger the statutory public hearing. So the question now is, regardless of the license change, is the use itself changing according to your commission under your regulations." Mr. Steele: "So you don't think that adding of a license necessarily means a change in use, is what you're saying." Chairman Zimnoch: "Ms. Brengi brought up a good point because there is a change—it's a business that doesn't require a license

now. The change requires a DMV license, and although the applicant is only making a minor change to that use, not using the full scope of the entitlements under this new license. So what's being proposed and what has already been approved by ZBA seems minor, but the point that you made, as I understood, is that the license does entitle that applicant now a much greater use of the plan (?), and that is the only concern I would have in this. But what is being proposed now I view as a very minor change."

Mr. Gannuscio: "I agree. I see this as a different scenario from what we had on Spring Street behind The Cuttery. Here, it's something that is there, it's on-site, it can't be used, he's gotten the okay from ZBA to go ahead to get what he needs to do this logical extension of what's already being done there....I don't see this as any type of major intensification." Chairman Zimnoch: "The potential is there, perhaps, if the applicant were to really expand the use based on the new licensing. That's perhaps the only concern." Ms. Rodriguez: "It might be good to look at those sections, talk about clarifying those sections."

Mr. Steele: "The purpose of the special permit process is to evaluate if any of the neighbors are going to be impacted by this, and if this will provide for an orderly development of the district, and you gather information and hear what potential concerns are and then you can impose conditions to limit hours of operation." Chairman Zimnoch: "That special use process in this particular case has been bypassed and went right to ZBA and has been approved." Mr. Steele: "There is an existing use. I don't know if there was a special permit. It might have been approved as a site plan at the time. Maybe a determination was made that it didn't need a special permit. We're not sure, we'd have to look that up, but it already exists, so the question is, is he changing it." Mr. Steele asked Mr. Calsetta if the use has been there for quite a while. Mr. Calsetta: "He has been there 15 or 20 years. I think he pre-dates the regulations that you're using. All those uses have been up there. We had a hard time finding a site plan. There is no filed approved site plan for that area except for that one sheet that we did find that we used for ZBA." Mr. Gannuscio: "It seems to me that for as long as this has been in existence, I can't ever remember any kind of complaint."

Mr. Szepanski: "Under the license that he's going to get now, it's going to be more intense than what he's planning on doing with the front end alignment machine, right?" Mr. Calsetta: "The license would certainly allow something like that, yes. To use your definition of intense, it will be more intense." Mr. Szepanski: "...or larger scope." Mr. Calsetta: "Yes." Mr. Szepanski: "So the potential is if it gets approved without a special use and a public hearing, he's going to get a different type of license which will allow him to do more than he really wants to do, and he's going to be allowed to do it." Mr. Calsetta: "What harm would that be? His license would still be less than the rest of the licenses that surround him." Mr. Szepanski: "I don't think that's really important. It's what's going to happen at that particular facility and what impact it may have and does the public have a right to comment on the new request that the PZC approved the site plan and special use for." Mr. Calsetta: "Getting back to the original issue that I had here tonight. Why don't you empower your staff to do these small things that don't rise to the occasion of actually being significant."

Mr. Gannuscio: "Let's put it this way. What questions do you have that you want to see answered that you're not getting answers for through this presentation tonight?" Chairman Zimnoch: "and the second question is, what conditions would you be imposing on this applicant? What are the concerns?" Mr. Gannuscio: "Are there issues, items, or questions that you would like to have as a record?" Ms. Rodriguez: "Do you mean, for example, have there been neighbors who have complained about...I don't think in 10 years I have ever been called about this property. The direction I would like is really for the applicant to know which steps to take, given that we have to some extent a redundant process. I agree that we need to look at these regulations, because they do tend to keep coming up over the last year, especially, but they're in place now." Chairman Zimnoch: "It seems redundant, but it's not, because it causes this kind of review, and as long as we can move on and delegate it to staff, that's fine. But if we review past ZBA approval that this change will potentially cause some concerns and we have questions, then we invoke our right to do a full site plan review. I'm understanding why it was set up like that, and I'm comfortable with that, and as long as we can waive the need for the site plan review in this particular case, and the special use has already been approved in a way, so that's redundant, I think. So with that change, do we require any site changes to mitigate whatever this additional use is going to..." Mr. Gannuscio: "Again, those are answers that you're going to get from him picking up the phone and talking to you. Have the applicant pick up the phone and call." Mr. Calsetta: "I think there needs to be some tweeking here....I don't know how you can actually limit the scope of a license that's issued by the DMV." Chairman Zimnoch: "That's not the issue. The issue is whether the use will create potential problems." Mr. Calsetta: "Was the intent of that clause in your zoning regulations to get to this point tonight, or was it to protect the public?" Chairman Zimnoch: "It's to protect the public, so each application has to be reviewed, and that's what we're doing now." Mr. Calsetta: "So if you have an application that is blatantly not detrimental to the public, isn't there a way that that can be determined without having the public to spend an inordinate amount of time and money?"

Chairman Zimnoch: "Let's find out what we want to do. I'm fine with what I've heard tonight, and I don't think I'm going to discover anything new." Mr. Gannuscio: "I don't see this being, in theory, anything different than what we just did on 6 Choice Road, and if need be, if there comes a time, then a Cease and Desist goes out, but I don't see this as being any kind of thing that's going to lead to that. It's a logical extension to something that's existed without complaint, as far as I know." Mr. Szepanski: "I still have some concerns that we're circumventing the system, but I'm not stupid, I understand. He's not going to expand this even though he has the right to do it with a new license. He probably could have done the work without applying for a license because I don't think anybody would have turned him in. There are repair shops in Windsor Locks that have been here for years that are not licensed out of homes. There's a body shop in town on a residential property that's not licensed, so he could have gotten away with it, so I don't think it's a big deal." Mr. Calsetta: "Alan made a very good point. You do have tools, you do have weapons in your quiver, you have the Cease and Desist. You have a lot of things that you can do when something happens, but it's all a matter of, do you have the personnel to enforce those types of things?" Ms. Brengi: "If everybody's comfortable with staff, then that's fine with me." Chairman Zimnoch: "Is staff comfortable with staff?" Ms. Rodriguez: "Yes, we're good."

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that any change in service/operation at 70 King Spring Road as a result of this ZBA permit allowance be referred to staff for any Planning and Zoning concerns.

D. Action Items: Resolution for Approval (Pursuant to Section 8-24 of the C.G.S.)

i. Infrastructure Improvement Project: \$1,150,000

Chairman Zimnoch introduced the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Windsor Locks approves the following project pursuant to Sections 8-24 and 8-22 of the Connecticut General Statutes, and Charter Sections 701 and 704:

Infrastructure improvements consisting of: (i) sanitary sewer installation and replacement along Wicklow Street between North Street and Whiton Street; (ii) drainage and flood control and erosion control improvements in the area of Dibble Brook running through Tracey Circle; (iii) reclaiming, grading, and resurfacing portions of John Street between Elm Street and Stevens Street, Roberts Street between John Street and Southwest Avenue, all of Stevens Street, all of Helena Lane, Highland Road between Reed Avenue and North Street, Arlington Road, between Highland Avenue and North Street, all of Marshall Road, and Wicklow Street between North Street and Whiton Street; and (iv) sidewalk installation and repair along all of Marshall Road and along Reed Avenue between Highland Street and Dale Street.

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Gannuscio) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves this resolution regarding infrastructure improvements, pursuant to Sections 8-24 and 8-22 of the Connecticut General Statutes, and Charter Sections 701 and 704.

Mr. Gannuscio wanted it noted that a portion of this project affects his brother's house (the portion regarding Roberts Street and John Street), but he doesn't see this as anything that would lead to any kind of conflict of interest on his part because he has no ownership interest in that house or property.

ii. ADA Improvements to Windsor Locks High School: \$375,000

RESOLVED, that the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Windsor Locks approves the ADA improvements to Windsor Locks High School in the amount of \$375,000, pursuant to Sections 8-24 and 8-22 of the Connecticut General Statutes, and Charter Sections 701 and 704.

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Gannuscio) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves this resolution regarding ADA improvements to Windsor Locks High School in the amount of \$375,000, pursuant to Sections 8-24 and 8-22 of the Connecticut General Statutes, and Charter Sections 701 and 704.

IX. Communications and Bills (none)

X. Adjournment

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourns the June 8, 2015 meeting at 8:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Seymour
Recording Secretary