

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
August 12, 2019 Meeting Minutes

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

Commission Members Present: Alan Gannuscio, Jim Szepanski, Alexa Brengi, Cindy Cooper, Doug Wilson (Alternate), and Peggy Sayers (Alternate)

Commission Members Absent: Vincent Zimnoch

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

I. Call to Order

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm.

II. Roll Call

Commission roll call was taken.

III. Approval of Minutes from the July 8, 2019 Regular Meeting

It was **MOVED** (Szepanski) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 3-0; Brengi Abstaining) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the minutes of the July 8, 2019 regular meeting.

IV. Public Hearings

A. CONTINUED FROM 7/8/19: Amendment to Zoning Regulations for Multi-Family Special Development

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

Chairman Gannuscio confirmed with the Recording Secretary that no new legal notice was published in the *Journal Inquirer* for this hearing.

Chairman Gannuscio pointed out that at the July meeting Ms. Brengi was not present and asked if she wanted to stay seated for this hearing. She replied that she tried to read through the minutes to catch up but was unable to, as the minutes were quite extensive, but she is okay with Mr. Wilson being seated for her for this first hearing. Chairman Gannuscio then seated Doug Wilson for Alexa Brengi and Peggy Sayers for Vincent Zimnoch.

Chris Smith, Land Use Attorney with Alter Pearson, LLC in Glastonbury, and representing the applicant, M&L Development Corporation, addressed the commission. He introduced Gary and Dan Merrigan and Daryl LeFebvre of M&L Development. Attorney Smith summarized the five proposed changes to the text amendments to the Multi-Family Special Development (MFSD) zoning regulations that were discussed at length at the July 8, 2019 Planning and Zoning meeting: (1) a

slight increase of density; (2) a decrease in the minimum front yard from 50 feet to 40 feet; (3) an increase in building coverage from 20% to 30%; (4) landscape requirements concerning some canopy trees; and (5) a provision for a Fee in Lieu alternative relative to the Recreation Space and Open Space requirements governing Multi-Family Uses. Attorney Smith reiterated that the purpose of the text amendments is to address smaller scale multi-family site developments here in Windsor Locks. In the Town Planner's report, she referenced a minimum of three acres but not to exceed five, so these requirements really apply to a smaller development on a smaller parcel of land. This would provide some flexibility for those smaller scale multi-family developments utilizing the MFSD zoning regulations.

Attorney Smith stated that he felt there was a consensus among commission members at the last meeting that they felt favorably toward these various proposals, subject to the tweeking of the language by staff. The proposed tweeking involved the building coverage increase of the canopy provisions. Ms. Rodriguez recommended that the Fee in Lieu not apply to the Recreational Space requirement but only the Open Space requirement, and there would be a cap on the size of the parcel, not to exceed five acres. The alternative for the Fee in Lieu would be part of an application for a special permit under these text amendments, so the commission would have discretion relative to accepting them. They did meet with both Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Steele last week to go over some of the language that was discussed on July 8, and there was some additional tweeking of the text language which they agreed with.

Jennifer Rodriguez, Town Planner, discussed her revised report dated August 12, 2019. There are a handful of changes that are proposed.

Proposed change #1, Density. There were no revisions. If approved, *"5 dwelling units or 10 bedrooms per acre, whichever is less"* will be changed to *"8 dwellings or 20 bedrooms per acre, whichever is less."*

Proposed change #2, Front Yard. No changes. If approved, *"50 feet"* will be changed to *"40 feet."*

Proposed change #3, Building Coverage. Proposed language was to change *"20%"* to *"30%."* Staff recommended adding *"or 30% with footnote h."* Mr. Steele recommended amended language to this in his report, which will follow.

Proposed change #4, Subsection F.4. Landscaping and Buffers. Proposed language was: *"At least two (2) trees shall be planted or preserved per building. Where possible, trees shall be planted in between buildings and streets to create tree-lined streets. In situations where planting large canopy trees are problematic due to utilities or space, trees may be located in close proximity to each building, and may include low-growing ornamental trees which do not exceed 30 feet at mature growth."* After a good amount of discussion at the July 8 meeting, the applicant suggested this language: *"At least two (2) trees shall be planted or preserved per*

building. In situations where planting large canopy trees are problematic due to utilities or space, trees such as low-growing or ornamental trees which do not exceed 30 feet at mature growth may be located in close proximity to each building.” Ms. Rodriguez noted that sometimes having a canopy tree is problematic because it can grow very large and become disruptive to a sidewalk, a foundation, or a driveway. Therefore, she added another option for discussion, which reads as follows: ***“At least two (2) canopy trees shall be planted or preserved in between or in front of each building. In locations where planting canopy trees would be problematic due to utilities or space, the Commission may determine that low-growing or ornamental trees which do not exceed 30 feet at mature growth can be counted toward this requirement.”***

Proposed change #5, Subsection I, Recreation Space and Open Space. Proposed language by applicant was (added) Subsection I.3: *“As an alternative to the requirements provided in Sections 409 (I) (1) and 409 (I) (2), above, when a proposal involves a multi-family dwelling residential community, as provided by Section 404, that is proposed on property that: (a) has a minimum of 3 acres; and (b) is located within the MFSD zone district; the applicant may provide a fee in lieu of these requirements. The fee in lieu shall constitute a fee equal to ten (10) percent of the market value of the subject property, not including the value of any buildings or structures to be removed. This fee shall be paid into a fund established for the preservation or acquisition of open space.”* Language recommended by staff was: ***“As an alternative to the requirements provided in Section 409 (I) (2), above, when a proposal involves a multi-family dwelling residential community, as provided by Section 404, that is proposed on property that: (a) has a maximum of 5 acres; and (b) is located within the MFSD zone district; the applicant may provide a fee in lieu of these requirements. The fee in lieu shall constitute a fee equal to ten (10) percent of the market value of the subject property, not including the value of any buildings or structures to be removed. This fee shall be paid into a fund established for the preservation or acquisition of open space.”***

Ms. Rodriguez went on to say that an email was sent to the commission which contained a summary of properties that are vacant or have a lot with a single family house that’s on the larger side that a property owner might possibly divide or sell in the future for redevelopment. There are 26 properties, with some in the AIOZ, some in Industrial zones, some in Business 1 zones, and some in Residential zones. It totals about 280 acres.

Lastly, she commented that everyone would like to see canopy trees where you can fit them, but that can’t always be the case, so it was a matter of how to word that for the commission to be able to make that accommodation and count it toward the tree requirement.

Dana Steele, Town Engineer, stated that at the last meeting he had comments regarding low impact development (LID) on proposed change #3, Building Coverage. Ms. Rodriguez had suggested in her original report that the increase from 20% to

30% building coverage be allowed if LID was used. There was a discussion at the last meeting whether that should apply to the entire development or only to the change between what was in excess of the standard requirement of 20%. In response to that, he has provided some revised wording in an email to Ms. Rodriguez dated August 7, 2019, a copy of which was distributed to the commission this evening. He suggested wording that will clearly articulate what they are talking about regarding LID and what is required so that a developer reading the regulation will understand what needs to be done. In this case, it is specific to those units that exceed the 20%. This is wording that he believes is consistent with DEEP guidelines on what they are looking for. This requirement can be an additional expense to the developer, so one of their ideas was to make it incentive-based, which is exactly what this regulation is.

The following is the revised wording Mr. Steele suggested for the text amendment regarding increased lot coverage, from his email dated August 7, 2019: ***“30% lot coverage is allowed for developments utilizing Low Impact Development (LID) techniques for any units which exceed the normal 20% lot coverage requirement. LID includes the minimization of other impervious surfaces and treatment of runoff from all impervious surfaces with localized Best Management Practices (BMP’s) as described in the 2004 CT Stormwater Quality Manual as amended. BMP’s shall be utilized on a unit by unit basis rather than “end of pipe” treatments. BMP’s shall utilize infiltration unless soils are determined to be unsuitable for infiltration. The applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission in consultation with the Town Engineer that LID measures for the additional units have been implemented to the maximum extent practicable.”***

Attorney Smith stated, for the record, they have no objection to Ms. Rodriguez’s alternate suggestion for the canopy on the top of page three of the revised memo dated August 12, 2019. They have no objection to the modification concerning the Fee in Lieu alternative and no objection to Mr. Steele’s suggested language in the email dated August 7, 2019 that Mr. Steele just discussed. He agrees that this is consistent with what was discussed with the commission on July 8. He agrees with Mr. Steele’s suggestion for providing incentive. On the bottom of page two in Ms. Rodriguez’s revised report dated August 12, 2019, they agree with her comments that the commission reviewing Subsections F.1 and F.2 would be of great benefit. Attorney Smith concluded by thanking the commission for its time, and he respectfully submits that the proposed text amendments are consistent with the comprehensive plan and with the POCD and that the regulations, especially with the tweeking from the commission and staff, do not result in any adverse impact to public health and safety.

At this time Chairman Gannuscio opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in favor of this application. There were none. The floor was then opened up for comments in opposition. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Cooper) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission closes the public hearing on the amendment to zoning regulations for Multi-Family Special Development.

At this point in the meeting, Mr. Szepanski voiced his frustration about the inadequate microphone system. He called the situation “embarrassing” and said this has gone on for years and years. “We need to put something in our minutes to get our selectmen to do something about it. We’re sitting here embarrassed. This has gone on long enough.” For the record, “If they want a \$100 donation, I’ll give them a \$100 donation for some new mikes. Let’s do something about this!”

Chairman Gannuscio proceeded to go through the proposed text amendments. #1, DENSITY: Change Section 404 to allow 8 dwellings or 20 bedrooms per acre, whichever is less. Mr. Szepanski stated that that density bothers him; it’s a lot in a small area. Mr. Wilson stated he is not opposed to it; based on the other developments we have in town, it seems like a number that fits within a certain niche, and it seems appropriate. Ms. Sayers said she concurs with Mr. Wilson; we need to accommodate the changing needs of young people who no longer need big houses. Ms. Cooper is all right with this proposed amendment. Chairman Gannuscio stated that he doesn’t oppose this particular change in density, but after seeing the list of properties which could potentially make use of these text changes, he believes that at some point in time we are going to need a more comprehensive set of changes to our regulations. He thinks this is a reasonable change at this point in time.

#2, FRONT YARD REDUCTION FROM 50 TO 40 FEET. Mr. Szepanski stated it makes sense and he is not opposed to this. Mr. Wilson, Ms. Sayers, and Ms. Cooper are not opposed to this. Chairman Gannuscio stated in this packet as presented, he is not opposed to this.

#3, BUILDING COVERAGE. Chairman Gannuscio stated that the language change that has been put together by staff and the applicant, which includes LID language, covers the situation quite well. Mr. Szepanski, Mr. Wilson, Ms. Sayers, and Ms. Cooper are all okay with this change which includes LID language.

#4, TREES. Chairman Gannuscio stated that we’ve seen (outside of this application) the difficulty of going with a traditional canopy tree, which in some instances causes problems. There is the option of allowing canopy trees where they would work, and using ornamental trees as an alternative. No commission member had any issue with this proposed language.

#5, OPEN SPACE. Chairman Gannuscio stated he wanted to make it clear that the applicant could make a Fee in Lieu of Open Space. The text says they “*may provide a fee.*” However, they have to make the offer of providing a fee. It’s something that has to be offered. He suggested “may offer to provide a fee in lieu of.” Mr. Steele pointed out that if you have the word “offer” it changes it to suggest that they could NOT offer. Doesn’t the word “may” already make it clear that it’s optional?

Mr. Wilson suggested “may elect to offer” instead of “provide.” Mr. Steele believes “provide” is stronger than “offer.” There was a brief discussion regarding this wording. Mr. Steele suggested “propose” instead of “provide.” Chairman Gannuscio said it makes it more voluntary with the word *propose*. Ms. Rodriguez noted some small grammatical errors. *Has* should not be crossed out and *a* should be added to read *shall constitute a fee*. Chairman Gannuscio read the language again with these new text changes. ***“As an alternative to the requirements provided in Section 409(I)(2) above, when a proposal involves a multi-family dwelling residential community, as provided by Section 404, that is proposed on property that: (a) has a maximum of 5 acres; and (b) is located within the MFSD zone district; the applicant may propose a fee in lieu of these requirements. The fee in lieu shall constitute a fee equal to 10% of the market value of the subject property, not including the value of any buildings or structures to be removed. This fee shall be paid into a fund established for the preservation or acquisition of open space”.*** There were no issues with commission members with this language.

Mr. Steele wanted to be sure that the commission knows that Ms. Rodriguez wants to change the text in #3. In addition to Mr. Steele’s email, there is also a change to the text where they had proposed “20% to 30%” and she suggested “20% or 30%.”

Chairman Gannuscio asked if anyone wanted to get on the record any discussion about any of these text amendments. No one did.

It was **MOVED** (Sayers) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (5-1; Szepanski Opposing) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the changes to Section 404 Required Lot Area MFSD and RDRD, Density as indicated by Jennifer Rodriguez’s comments one through five in her report dated August 12, 2019 as well as Dana Steele’s comments dated August 7, 2019 relating to footnote h. Also included is the change to #5 as stated on the record, changing “provide” to “propose;” and in #4 the last option, as indicated in Jennifer Rodriguez’s memo dated August 12, 2019.

Chairman Gannuscio commented that he wants to note the amount of work that was put into this by staff and the applicant. This highlights the fact that more changes need to be done sooner rather than later in terms of footnotes that need to be changed or removed.

B. Special Use Permit/Site Plan Review for 8 North Main Street to convert home back to two-family home as originally constructed (property owner Virgenett Wiltshire)

The Recording Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the *Journal Inquirer* on July 31, 2019 and August 7, 2019.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that Ms. Brengi is now back on board (unseating Mr. Wilson), and Ms. Sayers remains seated for Mr. Zimnoch.

John Veit stated he is here tonight on behalf of Virgenett Wiltshire who lives in Maryland. He said he has been working with her with regard to some landscaping and is trying to help her through this process. She is asking for a waiver for the second fee. When they originally came to the commission, it was pointed out by the Town Engineer that the driving parking area was not sufficient to town code and that maybe they should pull off the agenda, which they did at that time. Mr. Wilson asked if the original application was withdrawn. Mr. Veit replied that it was. Mr. Wilson asked if this was at the commission's request. Chairman Gannuscio pointed out that it was because of numerous problems as it was presented. He went on to say that in his opinion, the fee should not be waived. Mr. Szepanski, Mr. Wilson, and Ms. Brengi agreed with this decision. The fee is \$310.00 and Mr. Veit stated he had a check with him tonight to submit to the commission.

Mr. Veit went on to state that they are going to go through the Building Official to get the driveway plan which was presented through the Town Engineer. Once they have that part of it met, they are looking to convert the house back to a two-family from a single family. If you look at the town card, it still says that it's a two-family unit but it's a single family home. When Ms. Wiltshire bought the property, she thought that it was a two-family home. The property is correctly set up as a two-family with exits for both units, two exits going in and out.

Jennifer Rodriguez, Town Planner, discussed her report dated July 11, 2019. No comments were received from the Police Chief or the Fire Marshal. In this instance, it's a two-family or less, so it's not considered a commercial property, and their response would be typical as it would for a single family home.

Dana Steele, Town Engineer, commented that the original application included a sketch showing improvements to the driveway, and it showed space for three cars stacked one after another, with one to the side, and the issue he saw with this is that someone would have to shuffle the cars around. It really needed two and two, not three and one, which would require changes to the plan and additional gravel surface area. He requested additional thickness to the gravel surface, and they have accommodated all these requests in the revised sketch. They are requesting a waiver of the site plan requirement. Your regulations do allow you to waive those requirements in certain situations, and staff felt this was appropriate in this case due to the limited nature of what was being proposed. His only concern is with regard to the setbacks from the property next door, which is the Barberino piece, which is not a residential use. There is a fence and plantings there, and the boundary is well defined, so he is comfortable with that if the commission is. Mr. Steele wondered if this needs a motion to waive this fee if the commission is in favor of this waiver. Ms. Rodriguez said this should be stated on the record.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if this is currently being used as a multi-family residence without it being approved as that use. Mr. Veit replied that it is. Chairman Gannuscio replied that this is in violation. Mr. Steele pointed out that they are trying to bring it into compliance. Ms. Rodriguez said that she believes there was a building

permit to convert it back to one; there was one family that was going to live there on their own and not rent out the second dwelling unit, but nothing was ever formally done. There is zoning approval for it to be one family, but to make it a formal and legitimate process to bring it back to two-family, even though the assessor's card wasn't updated, the zoning had technically changed. Ms. Sayers remarked that at this stage it would probably be a good idea to go through the process so it would be very clear going forward. Mr. Veit said he was able to go into the record from the building official ten years back, and it was written right on the card that the owner wanted to convert it in order to save insurance money. Ms. Wiltshire bought the house with hard money, and when she went to refinance it, they told her they could not refinance it because it was not showing as a single family. Responding to a question from Mr. Wilson, Ms. Rodriguez stated that there is no requirement in residential zones for impervious surface. Mr. Steele commented that a paved apron is required but the driveway can be gravel.

There was a brief discussion about the legality of giving approval to convert this house. Ms. Rodriguez stated that it appears the Building Office gave the approval to convert but no one ever did anything with the approval. Mr. Szepanski asked if this approval would ever expire and when the approval was given. Ms. Rodriguez replied that the building permit would probably expire, and if they were to convert it to a single family, they would have to reapply to make sure there were no building code changes. So if they converted it to a single family after six months, and the building code changes, they could be liable for a violation. Ms. Rodriguez was not sure when this approval was given, but she guessed it was several years ago. Mr. Szepanski asked how long it has been a two-family. Mr. Veit responded, "Forever." It was originally built as a two-family, then someone came in and said they wanted it as a single family. There were no requirements for them to actually change the building. Mr. Szepanski stated, "So nothing changed in the building; somebody else just moved in." Mr. Wilson added, "The one detriment I heard was that the new owner tried to refinance and was told that she doesn't have a two-family, you have a single family, so they're trying to put on record by this action that it IS two-family, and then that lender will free up that funding. That's all they're really trying to accomplish. Ms. Brengi noted, "And they're paying the fees, they're submitting the applications..." Mr. Szepanski stated, "I can live with that." Chairman Gannuscio asked if the driveway has already been changed or is going to be changed. Mr. Steele replied that it has been changed, and Ms. Rodriguez suggested a condition saying that prior to the CO somebody goes out to confirm that they did what they said they did.

At this time Chairman Gannuscio opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in opposition to this application. There were none. The floor was then opened up for comments in favor of this application. There were none.

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 8 North Main Street to convert home back to two-family home.

It was **MOVED** (Brenge) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the special use permit and site plan for 8 North Main Street to convert home back to two-family home with the condition that driveway improvements shall be completed and inspected by staff prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for a second home.

V. **Reviews** (none)

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

VII. **Old Business**

A. **Discussion with Commission and Staff**

i. **Density in Main Street Overlay Zone**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that she thinks the consensus the last time they talked about this was that the commission wanted to wait until a developer came forward. Chairman Gannuscio said he has no problem continuing this. He added, "Let's leave it be and see what happens."

B. **Action Items** (none)

VIII. **New Business**

A. **Public Input**

Doug Glazier, 167 Taft Lane, addressed the commission. He asked if the discussion about density in the MSOZ had taken place yet. Chairman Gannuscio said since we don't know who the developer is we don't know what the proposal would be, so they'll hold off for now. There is something in the regulations when it comes to this, which is 15 or 20 units per acre, but they had someone come in maybe four months ago on behalf of a potential developer who said that 40 or 50 was probably more realistic, so until we see if this all comes to fruition we'll wait to see if we can get some input. Mr. Glazier commented that the article in the JI was talking about replacing or demolishing the WL Commons, and then building two large units there with 140 to 170 apartments. Add that to the 160 apartments in the Montgomery Mill and the 100 at Governor's Station, and you have a total of almost 500 apartments. Where is the business growth that requires an expansion of apartments to the degree that's being planned? Growth comes when you have industry coming in that demands employment. In the 50's and 60's, Hamilton Standard employed thousands of people, and there was a need for an expansion of housing. But here, he does not see where there is an expansion going on requiring an influx of apartments. He does not see the need to have 500 apartments being built in Windsor Locks. You don't have anything visible that demands such a large influx of employment. Mr. Szepanski said that the answer is TOD: transit oriented development. They want

to get the train station, and they want to get people living in Windsor Locks, traveling to Hartford, New Haven, and up to Massachusetts. That's the big goal. Ms. Brengi added that the casino in East Windsor will be an attraction also. Chairman Gannuscio added that this whole process is being driven by the engineers and the different studies that have been done, and it's also being driven by the market. We are ahead of the curve regarding transportation.

Mr. Glazier pointed out that Windsor Locks is the most populated town in all the surrounding towns in this area. Windsor Locks is a nice suburban town, and as density population increases, you lose that suburbanite type of setting. Another concern he has is the plan to take down the Waterside Office Park. That office park complex is a gold mine in investment and marketing. They house all professional businesses. That complex has always been filled as far back as 40 years ago when it started, unlike WL Commons. Mr. Glazier became very concerned when he heard at a recent EIDC meeting that they were considering shutting down the lower portion of Church Street, because that is a prelude to the tearing down of Waterside Office Park. Chairman Gannuscio replied that this is DOT's proposal. The office park has already closed off that entrance on Church Street. Mr. Wilson stated that if you take Church Street out of the equation for that traffic signal, you will be able to get people across without having that timing issue, and you can move trains in and out of there a lot easier with the new train station. It's a phenomenally better solution.

Ms. Rodriguez explained that several years ago there was a study, and a planning and engineering firm was asked to show what the potential could be for 10, 20, 30 years down the road. A professional had an idea that they sketched on a map, and it showed potential for re-investment, and showed the office park that Mr. Glazier is talking about being at the end of its life and the property owner redeveloping, so it was just an idea. There's no plan to take that down. She's been in contact with the owner of the salon, and she's the one who requested that it be closed off because so many people come down Church Street, go through their parking lot, and go out to Main Street. Ms. Rodriguez said it was DOT's idea to block off Church Street. There is no plan. The town has no ownership or ability to anything there. It was really just an idea that was on a picture. Mr. Glazier thanked commission members for their time.

B. Receive New Applications (none)

C. Informal Discussions

Mr. Wilson commented that he has a thought he'd like to discuss. It seems that formulating the motions, especially when they get more complex, is a little bit of an issue. It's difficult to do on the fly. What he has seen on other commissions and with other towns, is that those motions are usually pre-written by staff, so little editorial edits could be scratched in, and when a member goes to make a motion and reads what the motion is, that language is all set out there. Therefore, you're not going to make a slip up when you try to do it on the fly and you're looking at staff notes, your

own notes, and anything else that you've put together. Ms. Brengi suggested having the chairman or vice chairman make the motions for the more complicated ones. Chairman Gannuscio pointed out that Town Attorneys over the years have advised that chairmen should not make motions. Mr. Szepanski commented (with all due respect to Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Steele) that it is very difficult and frustrating for him to receive and read reports the night of the meeting. He suggested having these by the close of business on Friday. He is a very analytic person, and he has to read it not when nine people are talking. We have to have these ahead of time. Chairman Gannuscio asked, "How are we going to clone Jen to get these?" Ms. Rodriguez replied that if she could have done it sooner, she would have. Mr. Szepanski noted, "I know that. I feel sorry for your workload." She explained that she met with the applicant last week, so it was changed again, although it was largely unchanged from a month ago. There were a few notes added today, and that's it. This application evolved, and it would have been good for the commission if she had typed it up differently with "this is what I think you should approve," but it left out all of that conversation and information that the commission still hadn't looked at. To take all of that out and give the commission what she thinks the commission should approve would not be appropriate. With a regular application, you can include conditions of approval in the motion, but with a regulation change, it's harder to do that because they're not conditions, it's actual verbiage that the commission hasn't decided on yet, but she will try to make sure staff is not adding anything that they don't have to until after the meeting.

Chairman Gannuscio suggested for large applications (such as WL Commons), after closing the hearing, instead of voting on it that night holding a special meeting so there's time to sort through everything and draft a motion. Ms. Brengi remarked that with large applications the motion shouldn't just be read it should be written out and looked at, even if it means taking a five or ten minute break or having a special meeting. Mr. Steele pointed out that it's appropriate at any time whenever the commission feels it hasn't had enough time to review a staff report or something the applicant has submitted to say you're not ready to make a decision. It doesn't mean you can't have the meeting or hearing or can't take testimony, but if you don't feel comfortable because you haven't had the time to review a report, then you shouldn't be acting on it. Chairman Gannuscio commented, "We've all seen the reaction from people when we don't decide it that night and they have to come back, but we have to resist reacting to that. We have to be able to take the time to spread out the decision process in certain cases." Mr. Wilson noted that if you start getting enough large applications you may have to start meeting twice a month. Mr. Szepanski stated, "I think we all agree that without Jen and Dana, this commission is nothing. Without you guys doing the research, we're nothing. You're very important to us." Mr. Wilson said he agrees with Ms. Rodriguez that with a change to the regulations, it would have been harder to write up a motion. He was thinking it would at least have the heading with what the motion starts with, then Option A, B, C, and then we cross off the ones we don't want and read the one we keep.

D. Action Items (none)

IX. **Communications and Bills** (none)

X. **Adjournment**

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourns the August 12, 2019 meeting at 9:26 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Debbie Seymour
Recording Secretary*