

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The September 17, 2013 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Chairman Mark Bender.

The Chair announced that Item 1. Beachland Avenue has asked for an extension and will not be heard tonight.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MOMENT OF SILENCE

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Jeanne Cervin, Ben Gettinger, John Grant, Edward Mead, Vice Chairman; Dan Rindos; Michael Casey, Joseph DellaMonica, Tom Nichol, Mark Bender, Chairman.

Staff: David Sulkis, City Planner; Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk

**C. PUBLIC HEARING – Close by 9/24/2013; expires on 11/28/2013
(Postponed from September 3, 2013 agenda)**

1. **55 BEACHLAND AVENUE (ZONE R-5)** Petition of Warren Field, Jr. for Special Permit and Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to construct a single family residence with grading in the flood plain on Map 38, Block 557, Parcel 11, of which Molly Land Company is the owner. (Extension Requested)

PUBLIC HEARINGS – Close by 10/22/2013; expires on 12/26/2013

2. **147-149 HILLSIDE AVENUE (ZONE R-5)** Petition of Gernot Bruckner for Special Permit and Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to construct a new single family residence on Map 49, Block 795, Parcel 81, of which Elizabeth Anderson is the owner.

Rick Raymond, Project Manager, Anthony Giordano & Assoc, West Haven. Also present is Gernot Bruckner, Architect/Designer of the house, as well as the homeowners, Mr. and Mrs. Anderson. The application is for a Special Permit and Coastal Area Management Review. The property is within 25 feet of the high tide line. The property size is 3,115 SF. On July 9, 2013, variances were received for a side setback and lot coverage. This home was damaged by two hurricanes. Proposing to demolish the existing dwelling with a 1500 SF footprint and replace it with approximately 1,150 SF footprint. The footprint of the house on the site has been reduced approximately 9%. There are larger setbacks now than the previous house had. The lot coverage has been increased by 2% because of the decks and the concrete pavers that are being put in for the driveway. Raingardens have been added on both sides of the house under the downspouts. No additional runoff on the site. A fence will be installed around the perimeter of the property. At the LI Sound a 6' high chain link fence with sand bags to collect and/or stop any debris during the demolition of the house and the construction of the new house.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The adjacent properties at 143-145 have recently been completed. That house has been raised on concrete piers. The opposite piece of the property at 151 Hillside Avenue is vacant. The house was destroyed by both storms. The proposed activity is very consistent with the CAM application, as many projects have been going on throughout Milford. The new house will meet all FEMA regulations.

Mr. Sulkis: A benefit of this application is the house that was on the property was a duplex and will now be a single family residence.

Chairman Bender: Noted the public hearing procedure. Anyone in favor of the application? (No response). Anyone opposed to the application? (No response).

Ms. Cervin: There are two rain gardens. Was a permeable surface under the house considered?

Mr. Raymond: Parking will be under the house. There are concrete pavers which do allow some infiltration in the driveway.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

Ms. Cervin: Made a motion to approve Petition of Gernot Bruckner for Special Permit and Coastal Area Management Site Plan Review approval to construct a new single family residence on Map 49, Block 795, Parcel 81, of which Elizabeth Anderson is the owner.

Mr. DellaMonica: Second.

Chairman Bender: Noted that if the chain link fence goes onto the adjacent property, permission from the owner must be obtained, preferably in writing.

Mr. Raymond: Agreed.

All members voted in favor.

1. **141-159, 146 Merwin Avenue (ZONE R-7.5)** – Petition of Daniel Migliore for Special Permit and Site Plan Review approval to construct six units of affordable housing , in an existing building, under CGS 8-30g on Map 59, Block 739, Parcel 2, of which Milwood Properties, LLC is the owner.

Kevin Curseaden, Esq. 26 Cherry Street, Milford, representing the applicant. Also present is Ray Oliver, the project's architect and Dan Migliore, the applicant's representative. Corrected the wording of the ad in that 30% of the six units or two units, will be affordable. Under CGS 8-30g, at least 30% of the proposed units must be affordable housing opportunity units and that is what is being proposed. Of the two affordable units at 15% each, which must be affordable for 40 years for families earning 80% or less and the other 15% must be affordable to families of 60% or less of the median income of Milford. This was filed over a year ago and this will most likely

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

change. He spoke with Tom Ivers about the application to make sure the applicant was current with the Affordability Act. Tom had some comments from August 2012 which said a few things need to be cleaned up in the Affordability Plan that are minor, which will be no issued for the applicant to do. This will be done in conjunction with Mr. Ivers and in looking at the 2013 numbers and depending on when the units are actually leased. The numbers will shift a little bit but the actual formula and the percentages will stay the same.

Ray Oliver, Architect, 3 Lafayette Street, Project Architect. Representing Millwood Properties with the application for this affordable housing for 6 units; two of which are affordable.

The site is on Merwin Avenue. The Beach House Restaurant is located on the corner and this building is directly behind it. It is an old building that has been there probably since the 1920's. It was a garage and has been through several different uses over the years. The building is presently vacant. The site is gravel and undeveloped. It is used to support the restaurant with parking. When the owner wanted to develop this building into apartments, they met with the City Planner who suggested that additional parking be made available. The owner owns three residential lots across the street; one of which he will allow for parking to support the apartments, and to not further congest the parking that supports the restaurant. The proposed project would be to pave the parking lot to provide new landscaping around the perimert; new curbs and walks along the perimeter. There will be new lighting and a new dumpster enclosure, generally developing the property to a better condition then it is at the present time.

The property across the street is a residential lot. Six parking spaces will be provided if required. That property is bounded by some wetlands and a wetlands application has been filed. MaryRose Palumbo, the wetlands officer suggested making a few improvements in the plan which would be to have a curb so it does not drain onto the wetlands; to install a split rail fence to keep people from throwing any debris onto the wetland area and to provide plantings. The planting on that side will be London Plane trees and some smaller yew kind of plants. The plantings on the main part of the site will be London Plane trees on the street plantings and then some service berries that are smaller.

The property is in the flood hazard zone. When the application was made originally the flood hazard elevation was Elevation 10. Since then it has gone to Elevation 11, but the building is above elevation levels, so it is not an issue with FEMA regulations. The building is also in a CAM zone, so a CAM report was done and submitted to John Gaucher of the State DEEP. John Gaucher had no problems with the application. His only concern was that the site drainage be done properly. The project engineer, Nancy Levesque has developed an entire site drainage scheme, so it would drain the entire parking lot and the roof of the building into a set of galleries that would be below the parking lot. The catch basins would have hooded outlets to pick up any oils or any other sediments and the high level overflow would go to the State highway system on the State roadway.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

The building is approximately 6000 SF. It will stay the same size as it presently is on the site. Six units will be on the ground floor with lofts above on five of the units. The outside of the building will remain stucco with traditional windows that will be replaced from what is there now. The roof is a metal roof in a rust red color. There would be some skylights installed in that roof to enliven the character of the units. The dumpster would be constructed out of a block wall and stucco, so it matches the character of the buildings across the street at Villa Rosa or the Poli complex. All the utilities would be underground. The air-conditioning units would be on the lower part of the roof. Primarily there are a couple on the end of the building facing the dumpster side.

The Police report had a number of comments. One of their main concerns was there had been an original driveway on Mark Street. Mark Street is a one-way street. They wanted that driveway closed off as a safety concern, which has been done. Their other concern was the residents parking across the street. They suggested designating the six spaces that are facing the building on this end of the building (shown via the displayed site plan) as the parking spaces for the residential units. The applicant is happy to do that and not develop the parking, if the Board chooses.

The lighting scheme has been submitted and complies with all the standards. There will be a pole light and then the rest of the lighting will be off the building itself. Basically all the issues expressed by the City departments and commissions have been addressed.

Mr. Sulkis: The site plan shows an outdoor patio at the restaurant, which Mr. Curseaden stated was not part of this plan or application.

Mr. Curseaden: Affirmed the outside patio was not part of this application.

Mr. Sulkis: He explained the logic for having the residential parking across the street: If you want that parking the expansion of parking for a commercial use in a residential is not done. It is prohibited. The thought was if there is more parking than is required, because it is a residential zone, that lot would be solely for the residential use that is on this parcel.

Chairman Bender: What is the parking at this time for the restaurant? Is anything waived or do they have what they need?

Mr. Sulkis: It is pre-existing non-conforming.

Chairman Bender: Right now the restaurant uses the lot for additional parking. If this project was to move forward there would be some signage there indicating it is for the six residents.

Mr. Curseaden: The applicant is trying to alleviate the parking on the street from the neighborhood, but it is a residential building lot and they do not want to lose that use in the future either. It is a difficult mix.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Chairman Bender: Asked about lighting in the lot where the residents would be parking. Is there a lighting plan?

Mr. Curseaden: There is no lighting in that lot.

Ms. Cervin: Re parking. She understands there are options, but there are nine spaces that are required to the side of the building, not across the street?

Mr. Oliver: There are six spaces on the end of the building that would be designated for the residential units.

Ms. Cervin: The other three would be for the restaurant right across the way with signage designating the parking.

Mr. Oliver: Yes.

Chairman Bender: What is shown on the site plan for the parking lot would not be done?

Mr. Oliver: It was proposed and in the course of going back and forth with the police department, they suggested that parking not be used. That the spaces be designated on site for the residential units. It is still part of the application and he thinks it is at the discretion of the Board whether it would help to alleviate any issues.

Chairman Bender: He knows that lot is being used by the restaurant. If the Board does not do this and they say park on the side of the building, which would be preferred for the residents, there will be more cars over there that the restaurant is using. That is the reality of it.

Mr. Oliver: That would be an enforcement issue and the owner would have to address that.

Mr. Nichol: Asked if there would be a buffered area between the potential apartments and the parking lot for the restaurant, so as not to see headlights shining through the windows.

Mr. Oliver: There is not enough room for a buffer. The building is existing and there is no additional space for a buffer per se.

Mr. Nichol: Noted that some of the uprights have been hit. What would prevent a car from rolling through the apartment building?

Mr. Oliver: There is a curb at that edge and there are columns along that side.

Chairman Bender: Noted Mr. Oliver mentioned this was an old building that had previous uses. He remembers this property has been before this board a few times and gotten denied. Asked if the uses were prior to the denials?

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Mr. Curseaden: Believes the building was built in the 20's. The use is prior to the denials. There is a history of applications and other different actions with respect to this building. It has not been used since there had been work done on it and the Board denied the application for the proposed use. It has been sitting vacant since then.

Chairman Bender: The work was done illegally, correct?

Mr. Curseaden: Stated he did not know the answer to that question. He was not involved in that. He thinks it was in 2004. He remembers being in the audience at the time and there has been retribution against the owner for doing work and then coming in after the fact to get it approved. That was almost ten years ago and this is a separate and new application.

Chairman Bender: Stated he has been on the board for six years and this property has come before the Board two times. Not aware of anything prior to that.

Ms. Cervin: Remembers there being an issue with the neighbors and ice forming on the metal roof and ice falling, creating a danger to children living there.

Chairman Bender: They brought in a video of the way the roof had been done. Things were sliding off and because the property was so close the snow/ice runoff was going into their yard.

Mr. Curseaden: The owner might have done it for safety reasons. Mr. Migliore could answer that question more directly. He did not see the video but was informed of it recently as part of this application and that it was a concern and changes would be made to the roof to prevent it from happening again.

Mr. DellaMonica: Appears this application is being packaged in a different box to present it again. The Police Department recommended that the spaces belong in the parking lot for the residential parking. So taking those spaces the restaurant is now forced to take six potential customers and have them park across the street, which makes no sense to him. If they cannot do the correct measures for parking at the site, they are going to have to come up with a different plan. He does not understand how they will create a different commercial issue across the street in a residential area by putting a residential six unit complex in there.

Mr. Curseaden: The way the 8-30g statute is interpreted and written is the fact that the local zoning regulations do not have to be adhered to. So typically a certain number of parking spaces have to be provided but none have to be provided per unit. What the applicant is trying to do in conjunction with the application is to satisfy what the safety concerns were by former Sgt. Sharoh before he retired and the Police Commission. It's really two separate issues. He is not disregarding Mr. Della Monica's concerns about it, however, under the Affordable Housing Statute, with the residential housing, parking or no parking could be put there. There are a limited number of spaces on the site. If it is not across the street and because it is a residential lot, then it will be on Merwin Avenue.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Chairman Bender: Stated the issues cannot outweigh the affordable housing that will be provided. Right now there will only be one at 80 and one at 60. The Board has the right to find out what the issues are and to make sure the issues are not bigger than the affordable housing that is being provided.

Mr. Curseaden: Agreed and stated it was his intention to explain how the six parking spaces were determined.

Chairman Bender: Believes that those six spots being given to the residents only creates another problem for the restaurant.

Mr. Rindos: Is parking available on the two side streets? Mark Street is one of the streets.

Mr. Curseaden: Had not checked to see if there were no parking signs on Abigail or Mark Street.

Chairman Bender: There are no parking signs on those streets.

Mr. Curseaden: That leaves Merwin Avenue as the only street allowed for parking if the residential lot cannot be used and there is no parking on Mark or Abigail Streets.

Mr. Mead: Asked about the number of bedrooms and would the loft area be considered a bedroom, which in that case, would require more parking.

Mr. Curseaden: Typically, that would be correct, but under 8-30g that rule does not apply.

Mr. Oliver: The lofts are open completely to the living area below and there is no closet upstairs. The intention of use would be for an office area.

Mr. Mead: Asked why one of the units did not contain a loft.

Mr. Oliver: That was the break point for the gallonage for the Sewer Commission.

Mr. DellaMonica: Went back to the issue of walking across the street for parking either by the residents or restaurant patrons, asking is it more safe for 6 residents to walk across the street as opposed to the safety of 6 restaurant patrons walking across the street.

He believes there should be an increased barrier on the curb that sits behind the restaurant parking. He has seen people back up and if there is a front door 25 feet from where the car is parked, that could be dangerous and that should be addressed.

Chairman Bender: Because the restaurant is a commercial use, the residential lot across the street cannot be designated for commercial parking.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Mr. Sulkis: Typically if you have a commercial use in a commercial use that abuts a residential zone you cannot have any of the parking for the commercial in the residential. The unusual situation here is that you have a pre-existing nonconforming commercial in a residential zone. You would not want to increase the nonconformity to expand the commercial parking elsewhere in the zone.

Asked the Board to keep in mind that the recommendation from the Police Department is just that, it is a recommendation. The Board does not have to follow that recommendation.

Ms. Cervin: Tree commission made a suggestion about changes to the placement of some trees.

Mr. Oliver: This plan has been through the departments quite a few times. He believes the present landscape plan addresses those issues. He is not sure the Tree Commission reviewed it the second time around. He knows the street trees were included which had not been included before.

Chairman Bender: Reviewed the Public Hearing rules. He asked if there was anyone in favor of the application: (No response). Asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to the application.

John Bergin, 18 Mark Street. Lives directly across the street. All he sees is juggling as to where cars will be parked. Is it commercial or residential? There are not enough spaces now to accommodate the restaurant, which is at full capacity. Adding landscaping would diminish even more parking. Ever since the restaurant was redone it has never been paved. There is gravel all over. Cars coming down Mark Street cut through the back of the restaurant between these two buildings at excessive speed. Gravel gets thrown around. About 6 years ago they were going to put in six commercial units. Now they want to put in six residential units. Employees park across the street. For any resident to live in this structure and then walk across Merwin Avenue, it is a heavily traveled road. There is a cross-walk in the front of the restaurant. That would be the only place to take across. There is no parking on Mark Street. There is parking on Abigail Street around the corner.

Rebuttal:

Mr. Curseaden: No comments to Mr. Bergin's remarks. Mr. Migliore would be willing to eliminate the parking across the street.

Dan Migliore, Hamden, CT. The applicant is similarly distressed about the condition of the parking lot. The property has been under a Cease and Desist order to not make any further improvements to the site since 2004. They are anxious to improve the parking lot and upon approval it will be done. The applicant will do what the Board chooses with regard to the lot across the street. This has been part of an ongoing discussion with Planning and Zoning. David Sulkis has suggested that to relieve some

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

of the issues of further parking on the site, and because it is a residential use across the street to use that lot. However, if the Board recognizes that as a hazard the applicant is prepared to not further that use and if there is concern about the restaurant parking, or the restaurant employees or patrons in that lot, it was offered for some relief on Merwin Avenue, because it is crowded on busy nights. If the Board wants that foreclosed, there will be no further parking at that lot for the employees or for the patrons.

Mr. Sulkis: Located the Tree Commission's report from a year ago and read it. He is not sure if the Tree Commission has seen the most recent plan. A condition of approval could be made if the Board approves the project.

Mr. Curseaden: Noted there are two separate properties involved.

Mr. Oliver: Showed on the site plan where the lots are. It was determined that there is no parking for the restaurant.

Chair man Bender: I don't know, for some reason I feel like more information is needed. It is what it is in general. We have the Affordability Plan. I know there were some comments on the summary that more was needed. Did we get that? On the summary there was a statement about the "requires the compliant Affordability and Fair Housing Plan".

Mr. Sulkis: Did not have an updated memo from Mr. Ivers saying that those requirements have been met.

The Chair asked Mr. Curseaden if he was aware of that.

Mr. Curseaden: Yes, he spoke to Mr. Ivers about that today and he referred him to his August 2012 letter and his comments were that those were just kind of typographical errors or minor revisions that needed to be addressed. He had a couple of questions in that letter. Mr. Curseaden looked at the plan based on those questions and he did not revise the plan or answer that tonight, but there were some wording questions and some other things.

The other thing to remember is that these lots are two separate lots. He wanted to highlight that, even though it is part of the application, people associate the lot as one lot with the restaurant use, but it is actually two separate lots.

Chairman Bender: He asked if there was a site plan that actually shows the lines of the two lots.

Mr. Oliver: The survey drawing shows the property line directly behind the restaurant building.

Chairman Bender: Is that the property line for the residential units?

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Mr. Oliver: Correct. This property is 23,000 SF, which is a little over a half-acre and then the restaurant is on the corner.

Chairman Bender: So the restaurant parking is on the other property?

Mr. Oliver: Correct.

Chairman Bender: So the restaurant has no parking. That's a pretty good nonconformance.

Mr. Sulkis: To clarify, in previous discussions with the applicant, this has always been viewed as being merged for the reasons that you have just pointed out that that lot has been used for parking for the restaurant as well and that lot contains the grease trap for the restaurant. So, through use, the lots are merged.

Chairman Bender: Or the restaurant does not have a grease trap now.

Mr. Curseaden: There are two different ways to look at it. Either the properties are merged, which is the first he has heard that there has been an official ruling that the properties are merged but that's another issue. If the properties are merged then the 8-30g applies to the entire space, so in either respect, the parking on the lot is met with respect to the residential application.

Chairman Bender: If it is acknowledged that the grease trap is on the other property, it's getting complicated but – there are issues as far as who is on first and which property is which, but they seem to be, whether they are or not, they are tied.

Mr. Curseaden: The point he is trying to make is with respect to merger, that is where the lot line is. It does not have anything to do with the zoning of the property or the 8-30g application.

Mr. Sulkis: Agreed with Mr. Curseaden regarding the 8-30g. Really it's the use of that building.

Chairman Bender: So an 8-30g just wipes out that grease trap. It's irrelevant.

Mr. Sulkis: No. The restaurant is not covered under 8-30g. It can be on the same property but the restaurant -- since they took the patio off of the table – they are not asking for any relief from anything from the restaurant because the restaurant is a preexisting nonconforming use.

Chairman Bender: It seems a little convoluted. Once you throw an 8-30g there that just clarifies and cleans up everything, doesn't it? He is leaning towards getting an opinion on this only because of the complexity and legality side of it.

Ms. Cervin: Confused. An opinion on? The merged lot?

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Chairman Bender: The merged, unmerged, which part does the Board actually look at as an 8-30g. Is it the whole property? Is it just the borderline?

Ms. Cervin: Asked if this was a discussion for after the public hearing or does there need to be some clarity about merged lots.

Chairman Bender: He does not have the expertise to know the laws, rules and regulations on that. That is his concern.

Mr. Rindos: 8-30g can be denied because of safety problems or issues that may come up from a lack of parking, traffic on the roadways, people crossing streets to find parking. Maybe that is something the Board should look into a little more.

Chairman Bender: That comes down to "It should be attached to safety and health". He will ask the City Attorney's office to look at it and give an opinion on it to make sure that the Board is not missing anything. He would feel comfortable since it is an 8-30g and obviously a more sensitive application and I just want to make sure that the Board is doing its due diligence. Other than that, he did not see any other questions that were unanswered.

The hearing will be left open for the City Attorney's opinion on the application. The question will be general as the application relates to Section 8-30g.

F. REGULATION CHANGES – Update - Rear Lots

Nothing new to report.

G. REGULATION SUBCOMMITTEE – Update

Chairman Bender: October 1st will begin the next round of proposed text regulation changes to be reviewed. He has been contacted many times about looking into a definition for "family". He wants that to be on top of the list. Believes there can be more clarity in the definition. Will look at what other towns have been doing.

H. LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Casey: The Board of Aldermen approved the sale of the firehouse to the Borough of Woodmont.

Mr. Mead: The Police Commission approved the traffic studies for two more affordable housing applications. 489 North Street traffic report was approved for a subdivision.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (8/20/2013 AND 9/3/2013)

Mr. Grant made a motion to approve the Minutes of 8/20/2013 and 9/2/2013.

Mr. Gettinger: Second.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

All members voted in favor of approval of two meeting date Minutes.

Chairman Bender: Asked to add an item to the agenda: Discussion of the Moratorium on Medical Marijuana Dispensaries under a 2/3 vote by the Board. (The proposed Moratorium was distributed to the Board members)

Mr. Rindos: Made a motion to discuss a Moratorium on Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Products.

Mr. Casey: Second.

All members voted in favor of adding the Moratorium on Medical Marijuana Dispensaries and Products to the agenda.

Board members discussed the manner in which a Moratorium should be considered by the Board. Would it be considered a regulation change, thereby making it difficult to rescind as opposed to a 2/3 Board vote? This might be the situation if there were new board members in January who were not in favor of the moratorium.

Mr. Gettinger: Thought there should be a mechanism to rescind the moratorium without having to go through the hurdles of a regulation change.

Chairman Bender: Using the word moratorium is actually a regulation change, so it would require a regulation change to take it out.

Mr. Sulkis: Agreed and stated every board is bound by the actions of the previous board. The process is always the same.

Mr. Gettinger: Thought a year is too long. Did not see why it would take a year to get regulations in place that would satisfy this Board's concern. He did not want to use a moratorium as a way to put people's personal beliefs that may or may not be before the use of medical marijuana, just to stall it for a year. Thought 2-3 months is all that would be needed to get the regulations in place that the Board would be happy with.

Chairman Bender: Believed the question was how many months would the Board need to get the information regarding the regulation. If the information is obtained before 12 months that's fine.

Mr. Willis: Agreed with Mr. Gettinger and thought this was more based on personal beliefs than being careful about knowing what the regulations are.

Ms. Cervin: Thought the Board would have to go to Legal in the process of moving forward on this. Asked if there was any point in having Legal take a look at this before the Board moves forward.

Chairman Bender: Legal has seen what he proposed. Mr. Sulkis is aware of what other towns have done with this issue.

**MINUTES FOR THREE (3) PUBLIC HEARING
BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2013; AT 7:30 P.M.
AT THE CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET**

Mr. Sulkis: This proposed language will be vetted just like any other language change in the zoning regulations. The City Attorney's office has it; the Council of Governments will review it. It is very similar to something that was proposed for another town.

The purpose of the moratorium is to give the Board some breathing space to see what is going to be coming down from the State. It is brand new legislation. The regulations that they are coming up with based on the legislation have not been fully formed yet. Do not know how the State will be regulating things and what is coming.

Mr. Rindos: Made a motion that the Board start the process of adopting the proposed moratorium and bring it to a public hearing.

Mr. Grant. Second.

Chairman Bender: At this time the date is not specific. Whenever it gets voted on that part would get filled in. Right now the moratorium would be for 12 months.

A vote was taken: Messrs. Bender, Mead, Rindos, Casey, Nichol and DellaMonica voted in favor of beginning the process of adopting a twelve month Moratorium on Medical Marijuana Dispensaries. Ms. Cervin, Messrs. Willis, Gettinger and Grant voted against the motion. The motion passed to move forward in the process of adopting the Moratorium on Medical Marijuana Dispensaries.

J. CHAIR'S REPORT - None

K. STAFF REPORT – None

Mr. Mead made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Grant seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk