

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

June 10, 2019 Meeting Minutes

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

Commission Members Present: Alan Gannuscio, Vincent Zimnoch, Jim Szepanski, Doug Wilson (Alternate), and Peggy Sayers (Alternate)

Commission Members Absent: Alexa Brengi, and Cindy Cooper

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

I. Call to Order

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

II. Roll Call

Commission roll call was taken. Chairman Gannuscio seated Peggy Sayers for Cindy Cooper and Doug Wilson for Alexa Brengi.

III. Approval of Minutes from the May 13, 2019 Regular Meeting

Approval of the minutes of the May 13, 2019 regular meeting was postponed to the next meeting on July 8, 2019.

IV. Public Hearings

A. Amendment to Zoning Regulations for Multi-Family Special Development

Chairman Gannuscio stated that this public hearing will be postponed to July 8, 2019 because the amendment text was not available to review in the Town Clerk's office.

B. Special Use Permit with Site Plan Review for sale and/or rental of used motor vehicles at 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike (property owner Passport Acres, LLC, John Barberino MBR MGR)

Mr. Szepanski read the rules for conducting a public hearing.

The Recording Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the *Journal Inquirer* on May 29, 2019 and June 5, 2019.

Guy Hesketh, Licensed Engineer with F.A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc. of 3 Creamery Brook, East Granby, and representing Carite of Connecticut, LLC, addressed the commission. The applicant submitted and had an application approved in the spring of 2016 for the current Carite operation. The site plan, prepared by Close, Jensen, & Miller in 2016, shows the parcels, which included 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike and 499 and 501 North Street. As part of that application, they prepared a site plan for

development of the 499/501 North Street parcel, and as part of a master approval, they got approval for future car storage on the 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike parcel, which is the subject parcel. In addition to that, they conducted a master drainage study which included the ultimate developed condition of both parcels. Those two parcels were developed to share the stormwater runoff to go into an area of proposed stormwater detention basin located on the southeast corner of the current Carite parcel, 499/501 North Street. As part of that approval, it included what was the assumption of the maximum impervious area of the subject parcel, at 75%. As you're looking at this application, keep in mind that their proposal, for a stormwater management perspective, respects the original approval for the two lots as far as stormwater management is concerned. Prior to the approval, there were a few other approvals that were granted as part of that application, including in September 2001 a variance that was granted that allowed rentals and sales of motor vehicles as a conditional use on both parcels at 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike and 499/501 North Street. This was granted to the Hertz Corporation, so based on that variance, which runs with the land, it allows this particular use as a permitted use on this parcel. On June 6, 2016 the Zoning Board of Appeals issued a variance certification for the used motor vehicles dealer's license, which included a location approval for both parcels. Prior to this application, proper procedures were taken in implementing the actions by the ZBA to allow this particular use on this parcel.

The applicant is looking to develop the 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike parcel as a mirror image to the existing Carite parcel. There have been a few applications to modify the existing site plan to allow the assemblage or construction of additional buildings. They are proposing the construction of a 5,000 square foot building, a mirror image of what is there now but with the main entrance on the eastern side. They are also proposing construction of two smaller outbuildings, 14 x 30 feet, probably being used for some type of storage. They are also proposing in the area to the east of the building and the small area to the west 30 dedicated employee/customer parking spaces. The additional spaces on the site are being referred to as inventory storage spaces, the inventory being the used vehicles that will be for sale that will be displayed in these parking spaces. In front of the building there will be inventory pick-up spaces. When you buy a vehicle and you take delivery of it, the spaces here are a little wider, allowing you to walk around and inspect the vehicle. The entire area of the parking and the storage area will be paved.

Mr. Hesketh pointed out that a zoning data table was provided in the plans showing that all bulk requirements for this parcel have been met. The previously approved maximum impervious area is up to 75%, and they are at 73.6%. This includes a portion of the existing parcel to the south which has areas paved. There is an easement in the land records with a deed to the property that shows this as an access easement, and they intend to leave this in place as it is. Their operations will start just north of that. In the north part of the site to the west of the building they have included six electrical vehicle charging stations. Market trends are gearing towards more electric vehicles, so they will have an option for customers, employees, and future electric vehicles being sold. They are proposing along the southern border and

the border that abuts Ella Grasso Turnpike a five-foot high white vinyl fence. They are proposing a sign on the western façade of the building exactly like the existing Carite sign which will face Ella Grasso Turnpike. This will be under a separate application.

For landscaping, they are proposing a berm along North Street and the same types of plantings that consist of deciduous and evergreen plantings and then some trees along Ella Grasso Turnpike and some trees along some landscape islands along the eastern side. The regulations require a ten-foot wide landscape buffer to adjacent parcels. Instead of a long continuous island, they are proposing breaks in the island that line up with the inventory storage space isles so that vehicles can pass through from one operations area in the east to the operations area in the west. They intend to keep the parcels separate, so they will provide an access easement along the driveway to allow clear access.

They have provided a GR-1 Grading and Utilities Plan for the grading and drainage. The site is relatively flat, and they will maintain it that way. There is an existing drain pipe that provides for future drainage from the parcel. When the site plan was originally approved in 2016 they left on the western side of that 499/501 parcel a catch basin that has a 36-inch pipe that exits that catch basin. The reason for the larger pipe is so future connections can be made to the parcel that's located to the west, so they will tie into that storm drain system. One-third of the parcel will drain towards a new catch basin located on the eastern boundary and the rest will drain towards the catch basin in the center. There will be a couple of 24-inch pipes which are designed to meet the 25-year storm requirement per the zoning requirements. There is also a small catch basin located in the parking area and a couple of yard drains on the two ends of the building. All the runoff from the site with the exception of the existing drive will drain into the existing stormwater retention or infiltration system, which was designed to be a retention and infiltration system. They meet all the low impact requirements.

The site utilities are all located on North Street, and include gas, sanitary, sewer, electric, and telephone. They will connect into the sanitary sewer system that flows into Bradley Airport. The flow for this is nominal, with only a couple of bathrooms on the site. For Soil Erosion and Sediment Control the regulations require that they meet DEEP requirements, which they have met. They've included in their plan a construction exit next to the primary access for the vehicle storage area, a silt fence erosion control on either side of the berm, an erosion control blanket that will be placed on the berm to reduce the flow of sediments, a temporary soil stock pile area, and an inlet protection sediment silt sack.

The Site Lighting Plan is almost identical to the lighting plan of the existing Carite operation, which includes two light fixtures on 14-foot poles that are used around the perimeter and 18-foot poles for the middle of the vehicle storage area. There are two types of bases that are used on the poles. The bases in the center of the parking lot are four feet tall and are moveable. The ones around the perimeter are the standard

18-inch diameter concrete light bases that are buried in the ground and are permanent fixtures. The lighting plan contains details such as the location of all the light poles and the general configuration of how the lights are pointed. The plan is indicating some readings of four footcandles, on average, but around the perimeter there would be 0.0 footcandles. The light fixtures are forward throwing, which means they shine out.

Mr. Szepanski had some questions for Mr. Hesketh, which he answered. There will be no additional curb cuts on Route 75 and North Street. They are proposing using an existing curb cut on North Street for the operation. Mr. Szepanski asked if the designated snow removal storage area (about 100 feet by 30 feet) would be big enough. Mr. Hesketh answered, "It depends on the size of the storm, but in reality, no." The plowing operations will typically pile snow around the perimeter of the site, but some areas where vehicles are typically stored may be required for snow storage. If there is a heavy snow storm, there will be a dedicated area of the site that will be utilized for snow stock piling. The two new buildings will be for storage. Fueling is all done off site.

Mr. Wilson asked why the mobile lights would need to be moved. Mr. Hesketh replied that it would be just for reconfiguration and flexibility if they were to do something different than what's there now. For example, if another type of vehicle were to be sold there such as a pickup truck it would be larger than the cars being sold there and they may need to reconfigure something. Mr. Wilson pointed out that this would change the light distribution, which would mean the light distribution that is approved is not really guaranteed. Mr. Hesketh responded that the commission could make a condition that if they were to change they would have to come back for a site plan modification. On the existing facility, those lights haven't moved since they were installed, so this would just be for flexibility, and the intention is to leave them where they are, and if they need to be moved in future years, that would require a modification to the site plan. Mr. Wilson asked about the moveable bases. The moveable bases would be powered down.

Mr. Wilson pointed out that without a separate driveway for this parcel, they are making this parcel absolutely dependent on the adjacent parcel. Mr. Hesketh agreed: In order to build this site, they would need to grant an access easement along the drive of the existing site. There was a brief discussion about the possibility of the parcel becoming divisible in the future if the same owner did not own both parcels. If one parcel were to be sold, in order for the easement to be extinguished, a modification to the site plan would be required. Mr. Wilson asked, "Is that a contingency you want to plan on in terms of locating the building, because right now if you were to do a new driveway and this became a divisive property, a separate property, if your main entrance to the building is on the east side and your main parking for customers is just to the east of that, there is no space for a driveway beyond that." Mr. Hesketh agreed that this would be a risk they would be taking. Mr. Wilson added that the main stormwater control is really on the other parcel, making this parcel reliant on the other, asking if there will then be drainage use cross

easements as well. Mr. Hesketh replied that he believes the original intent of the original approval included this, but they would have to have the attorneys look at this. Mr. Wilson cautioned that it works for now because currently there is the same owner on both sides of the line, but if you don't answer the question and one piece changes hands, then you have one owner using another owner's property, which is not an acceptable situation. Mr. Hesketh said the prudent thing to do would be to make this a condition of approval. Mr. Wilson: I would think it has to chase all the way out to North Street, the overflow. Mr. Hesketh: This could probably be handled with verbiage—rights to access, rights to drain. Mr. Wilson: To make it flexible. That basin retention and detention, at what level year storm does that actually hit its overflow and go to North Street? Mr. Hesketh: I don't know. My understanding is that when it was originally approved all that was considered and designed to meet the town requirements and that is largely kept below the 75% impervious area. It would be a valid assumption that it was properly sized. Mr. Wilson: What are you doing for the water quality of the first inch? Mr. Hesketh: That would be handled by the detention basin itself, so we're assuming that the water quality for that would be handled by the existing detention basin. It's a pretty large basin.

Ms. Sayers commented on the unsatisfactory outcome and long term problem of the Old County Road berm and asked what the purpose of the berm is at this site. Mr. Hesketh replied that the berm that is there now was part of the approval that was for the original site plan. They maintained the berm and just reconfigured it so it would match the berm on the existing Carite facility. It's about four feet high with some plantings, so it does provide screening. Ms. Sayers mentioned the sandy soil which is not conducive to good landscaping. Mr. Hesketh believes that they scraped the berm and put the best top soils down. Mr. Barberino called it an "undulating berm." Mr. Hesketh stated that the intent is to mimic what's on the other side. Ms. Sayers asked if there are any plans to combine the two parcels. Mr. Hesketh replied that he believes the applicant wants to keep the two parcels separate. Ms. Sayers commented that there is no mention of sidewalks and feels there is a real need for sidewalks on Route 75. Mr. Hesketh responded that they are asking for a deferral of sidewalk construction. They did leave a place on the plan for sidewalks. When they were laying out the location for the fence they made sure landscaping would not impede any future construction of a sidewalk.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Dana Steele, Town Engineer, for his comments. Mr. Steele stated that he received draft plans for this application on Thursday and the final plans just this Monday morning and therefore did not have enough time to review these plans in detail or to get a report to the commission as he usually does. He did spend 20 minutes on the phone with Mr. Hesketh and would be comfortable with a condition stating "final plans and calculations would be subject to review and approval by the Town Engineer." He has been looking at these plans and does have a number of comments and suggested conditions to make.

Mr. Steele stated that regulations require a ten-foot setback for pavement from a side property line. In this case we have a side property line that's being used in connection with the adjacent use, so you have numerous driveways breaking that plane in a sense, and the islands they're providing are basically on average ten feet and sometimes less than ten feet. These uses as they stand now are very similar, having the same owner, so this makes sense for them. However, if at some time the uses change, the commission could address this issue when the change of use comes in with a site plan modification. It seems like a reasonable interpretation of the regulation, if the commission is comfortable with it.

There should be a condition of approval that a cross easement will be provided subject to the review of the Town Attorney. Mr. Steele added that he would be happy to review this as well. This would be to provide access as well as sewer and storm drains. It probably would be best if there were an easement going through the site all the way out to North Street, to provide the most protection and flexibility for the potential future owner of this site.

Mr. Steele commented about the layout of the site. As you come in from the site driveway, your first opportunity to turn right into the site, you turn into a dead end parking area, so if all the spaces are full, the only way to get out is to back out. This is not ideal. This is a small parking lot so a driver may possibly be able to look into the lot to see if there's an empty space to know whether to pull in or not, so this might not be an issue. However, it would not be that difficult to reconfigure this so a driver can pull in and take a left to get into the rest of the site, which would be a better layout.

Mr. Steele stated that the plan does not show a gate at the entrance. Mr. Hesketh explained that there is no gate, just the fence on either side. The new fence would end up at the berm itself, but on North Street there would be no fence, just the berm. The fence terminates at the berm on North Street. The fence does go along Route 75 but not North because of the berm. The fence on the western perimeter of the existing facility will be eliminated. Mr. Steele summarized: There is no gate; there is a vinyl fence proposal along Route 75 and along the southern boundary, and there will be no fence between the two parcels.

Mr. Steele suggested having a standard condition of approval that an E&S bond estimate be submitted for his review and an as-built survey be submitted prior to a Certificate of Occupancy (CO).

The layout plan on the zoning table mentions parking lot landscaping, with a requirement of 15% and 15.7% provided, but he would like to request that a diagram of how this was calculated be submitted. There was a brief discussion with Mr. Hesketh about how this was calculated. Mr. Steele stated that typically the aisles would be included in that calculation, so by not including it you don't need as much landscaping. And they are only providing this in the areas that are for customers and employees. The majority of this site has no landscaping, although there is some along

the boundary between the properties. Mr. Hesketh said the intent on the landscaping is if you view it from either North Street or Ella Grasso Turnpike you see street trees, the buffer, and the fence. You will also see some landscaping in the customer entry area. The intention is to have the customers and employees see the landscaping. Mr. Steele concluded by saying that he was looking for direction from the commission as to how they interpret their regulations for a calculated map with regard to the drive aisles, whether they need to be included or not. This is somewhat of a unique situation because you are surrounded by other parking that is using the drive aisles also, which, according to the applicant's interpretation, is not included in their calculation. The perimeter is a separate requirement, in addition to the landscaping plan.

The lighting plan mentions that the average foot candle is four, but the maximum foot candle appears to be about 12.9. The regulations say six is the maximum, but you can go over that by special permit. Since this is a special permit application you could consider the approval of the higher foot candle level as part of this application. Regarding pole height, the regulations require 14, but you can have a higher height by special permit. The pole height is not actually the length of the pole itself but the total height above the surface, so in this case you have a concrete base, you have a pole, and then it looks like the fixture itself adds another foot to the height. Therefore, it looks like these heights are 18 to 22 feet. Mr. Hesketh stated that the base is 36 inches (3 feet), plus 18, plus another 13½ inches, so you're looking at less than 22 feet for the center poles, and the other ones around the perimeter are four feet lower. The idea was to keep both sites uniform as far as color, intensity, and configuration of lighting. Mr. Steele clarified, "I'm just pointing out these dimensional things so you [the commission] know as you're approving it that's what you're approving. The intensity is up to 12.9 and height is up to 22 and a few inches." He also pointed out to Mr. Hesketh that there was a discrepancy on the plan that needs to be clarified. The detail says it's a 7-foot base but on the lighting plan it says 8.5.

Mr. Steele confirmed that there would be no repairs, just sales at this site. There are no floor drains or oil/water separators and therefore no washing of vehicles. He suggested making "no washing of vehicles" a condition of approval.

The WPCA has not weighed in yet. This is a unique site because this sewer system does not go to the Windsor Locks sewer treatment plant but goes to MBC and to the airport. Mr. Steele reminded the applicant that they still need WPCA approval for this sewer connection.

A question was asked about the moveable light poles, so this might be a good condition to say if the light poles are moved then a site plan modification will be required.

A question was asked about the storm drain system on the adjacent lot. Mr. Steele is fairly certain it was at least a 50-year storm, which is our town requirement. This basin does have a substantial amount of capacity, and at the time it was sized for an entire buildout of both of these parcels. Mr. Steele stated he believes they have met the requirements for treatment of water as well as for retention. He asked if the building is going to use roof drains. Mr. Hesketh replied that the setup will be the same as the existing building with downspouts on the corners. Mr. Steele expressed concern about the front corners. Mr. Hesketh said there are no gutters but the water splashes onto the stone in front. There is a three-foot wide stone mulch around the perimeter of the building on one side and the roof itself doesn't have downspouts on it but it actually hits the stone mulch and gets infiltrated into the sandy soil bed. On the back side it's paved, and the water would hit the pavement and then flow into the grass area into two yard drains. Mr. Hesketh confirmed with Mr. Barberino that there have not been any issues with roof runoff.

Mr. Steele stated that a deferral or requirement of sidewalks would be up to the commission and should be a condition of approval. Chairman Gannuscio asked how far the sidewalk goes now. Mr. Steele replied that it goes to Spring Street right now. Part of the thinking is that there are sidewalks on Spring Street currently so going to Spring Street provides connectivity to Spring Street. There were talks about bringing the sidewalks further down Spring Street to continue that but they ran out of money. They believe this is a logical completion point for sidewalks. Past North Street there have been deferrals in the past up to Industrial Road, King Spring Road, and Choice Road. With deferrals, we get an agreement from the property owner that goes on the land records stating that when the commission decides that the sidewalks need to be put in they will be put in at that time, and if the property owner doesn't respond, then the property can be lien-ed for the cost of the sidewalk. Mr. Steele concluded, "A sidewalk deferral would be consistent with what the commission has been doing in this area."

Jennifer Rodriguez, Town Planner, discussed her report dated June 10, 2019. Under Section 5, Lighting, there is a small change: fixtures up to 22 feet, not 18 feet, were requested by the applicant. Favorable comments from both the Fire Marshall and the Police Chief were received on June 10, 2019 and were read into the record.

Mr. Barberino commented that the public hearing signs are not strong enough to put and stay in the ground. He also mentioned that there are big changes coming into the car industry where you can have cars now for five or nine days. The proposed charging stations will be not just for Carite employees but also for the public to use. He was asked if there would be 24/7 access to these charging stations and if there would be a security system. He responded that he still needs to figure everything out.

At this time Chairman Gannuscio opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in favor of this application. Gary Merrigan, 560 Halfway House Road, and Joe Calsetta, 121 Orchard Hill Road, spoke in favor of this application. The floor was then opened up for comments in opposition. There were none.

Mr. Steele pointed out that regarding the lighting for 312 Ella Grasso Turnpike, the residence that is across the street is more than 50 feet away, and the lights that are being put in that are closest to that meet the regulations for height. The ones that are higher are further away from the residence. Ms. Rodriguez wanted to mention that she didn't exclude "car rental" in her report; she wanted to be sure that this was something that the applicant wanted to do. On the Description of Request on the application, it does say "special use permit for sale and/or rental of used motor vehicles. She would add "vehicle storage" as well. Mr. Hesketh suggested adding "leasing" to the language (sales, rental, or leasing of used motor vehicles).

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission closes the public hearing on the special use permit and site plan review for the sale, rental, and leasing of used motor vehicles and the accessory use of charging stations at 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike.

CHAIRMAN GANNUSCIO CALLED A SHORT BREAK FROM 8:38 to 8:47.

At this point Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Steele presented Chairman Gannuscio with conditions of approval for this application for purposes of discussion by commission members. Chairman Gannuscio proceeded to read the proposed conditions of approval which were then discussed by the commission.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Sayers) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the special use permit for 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike for the sale, rental, and leasing of used motor vehicles and the construction of charging stations *with the following conditions*: (1) Outbuildings are for storage only. (2) If light poles are moved, a site plan modification shall be required. (3) Access cross easements, drainage rights to North Street, and sewer easements are required prior to a Certificate of Occupancy, and are subject to approval of the Town Attorney. (4) Final plans and drainage calculations are subject to approval of the Town Engineer. (5) An Erosion and Sedimentation (E&S) bond acceptable to the Town Engineer shall be provided prior to the start of construction. (6) An as-built survey shall be provided prior to a Certificate of Occupancy. (7) WPCA approval is required prior to connection and a Certificate of Occupancy. (8) A sidewalk deferral agreement shall be filed in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney prior to a Certificate of Occupancy. (9) No repair, detailing, or washing of vehicles on the site. (10) A set of renderings of structures intended to mirror the neighboring property's structures to the east shall be submitted to staff. (11) Sign details submitted at a later date shall be submitted to staff for review.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the site plan for 321 Ella Grasso Turnpike for the sale, rental, and leasing of used motor vehicles and the construction of charging stations with the previously stated conditions also being applicable to the site plan.

(VIII. New Business)

C. Informal Discussions

i. Smyth Buses/545 Spring Street

John Law, 4 Juniper Court, Broad Brook, addressed the commission. He is the manager for Smyth Bus Company and is here tonight because the owner could not be at the meeting. They are looking to buy the property on Spring Street (545 Spring Street, the old day care center) to house the school buses because the Public Works Director doesn't want the buses parked at DPW anymore. The property is zoned B-1. Right now the town requires 22 to 24 buses. There is plenty of room on the side and in the back for the drivers to park their cars, but there is also room in the front. They would rent out some of the office spaces to businesses, and Smyth Bus would also have an office space there. Ms. Sayers pointed out that that building is all open now. She also asked where the bus drivers would park if spaces were rented out. Ms. Rodriguez stated that there is bus parking in the back. She commented that the purpose of tonight's discussion was to determine if the use is permissible. Regulation 402 permits "taxi, limousine, livery operations including parking, queuing, dispatching, and related operations involving two or more vehicles." This matches that to a T except that buses are not listed here, but this company is parking, queuing, and dispatching. For that reason she asked him to come to the meeting since they would not want to go through the whole application if buses were not going to be permitted. Chairman Gannuscio felt this is a similar use of transportation and sees this as an equivalent use of what's in the regulations. Mr. Szepanski noted that this would be a more intense use. Mr. Law pointed out that the buses would be leaving at different times in the morning, starting at 6:30 to 7 or 7:15. Some drivers take the buses home and some take them back to the yard. Chairman Gannuscio stated that this is all preliminary but at this point the commission sees the similarity in use. He asked about lighting in the back of the building. Mr. Law thought there were some lights but they would put up more lights and security cameras and probably a fence in back. Mr. Steele asked if the area in the back that they're looking to expand is zoned the same as the front piece. Mr. Law responded that it is all B-1. Since they already have a concept plan, Mr. Steele suggested setting up a meeting with him and Ms. Rodriguez to go over this plan to give them an idea of what to expect in terms of cost of developing the property and what expenses there might be. Staff may be looking for some upgrades to the front parking lot for the existing storm drainage and new storm drainage in the back. Mr. Steele reminded Mr. Law that they would still have to come back to this commission with a site plan to get approval and that the answer from the commission is that this seems to fit and they can move forward. Mr. Wilson cautioned Mr. Law: "From the property line there are some cross easements, but it looks like some of the pavement isn't really matching up, and you want to be careful if you think you have access to the east side of the building, the islands seem to be cutting you off and if you're following the arrows out you're on another person's property, and it

doesn't show a cross easement there now." Mr. Law said they need to find out what all the easements are for. He added that they would like to put in a double-walled above ground fuel tank for diesel. Chairman Gannuscio suggested to Mr. Law that he find out if the water is Connecticut Water or if it is well water. He then summarized that the consensus is yes, and they should take advantage of staff in terms of what they see as potential issues and costs. Mr. Law said they would move forward then.

V. **Reviews** (none)

VI. **Action on Closed Public Hearing Items** (none)

VII. **Old Business**

A. **Discussion with Commission and Staff**

- i. **Zone Change Regulations to Section 1105.2**
- ii. **Density in Main Street Overlay Zone**

Chairman Gannuscio would like Items VII A (i) and (ii) to be carried forward to the next meeting on July 8, 2019.

B. **Action Items** (none)

VIII. **New Business**

A. **Public Input** (none)

B. **Receive New Applications** (none)

D. **Action Items** (none)

IX. **Communications and Bills**

Chairman Gannuscio asked for approval from the commission for a bill for \$1,237.50 for legal representation for the month of May from Attorney David Sherwood for Pool Table Magic.

It was **MOVED** (Sayers) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves a payment of \$1,237.50 to Attorney David Sherwood for legal fees.

OTHER

Ms. Rodriguez stated that sidewalks will be going in on Wednesday on Route 75. There will be new signals with a timer that lets you know how many more seconds you have to cross with a dedicated time when no one is moving, and new painted crosswalks.

X. Adjournment

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourns the June 10, 2019 meeting at 9:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Seymour
Recording Secretary