

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

The Chair called to order the meeting of the Planning and Zoning Board at 7:30 p.m.

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

B. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Frank Goodrich, Mark Bender, Janet Golden, Kathy Patterson, Kim Rose, Kevin Liddy, Susan Shaw, Greg Vetter, Victor Ferrante, Jeanne Cervin, Chair

Staff: David Sulkis, City Planner; Emmeline Harrigan, Assistant City Planner; Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk.

C. PUBLIC HEARING HELD 11/5/08; exp. 1/9/09

1. **232-256 MELBA STREET (ZONE BD)** Petition of Melba Realty, LLC for a Zone Change from BD to RMF-16 on Map 39, Block 542, Parcel 2 and easterly 45' of Parcel 38A, of which Melba Realty, LLC is the owner.
2. **232-256 MELBA STREET (ZONE BD)** Petition of Melba Realty, LLC for a Special Permit, Coastal area Management Site Plan Review and Site Plan Review to construct four multi-family residential buildings containing 16 total units on Map 39, Block 542, Parcel 2 and easterly 45' of Parcel 38A, of which Melba Realty, LLC is the owner.

The Chair: This is a zone change request. Six votes are needed for the passage of this application.

Mr. Goodrich: Missed the last meeting. Watched the MGAT televised meeting. Will participate tonight.

Mr. Liddy: Watched the Public Hearing of November 5, 2008 and will participate in the discussion.

Mme. Chair: There will be ten participating board members.

Ms. Shaw: This is an issue of density in the fourth district, which she represents. The Board had an application for a density waiver a few months ago, which the Board denied. Melba Avenue is in the vicinity of that application. Made a motion to deny the request for a zone change from BD to RMF-16.

Mr. Vetter: Second.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Goodrich: The zone across the street is also RMF. The zone behind the property is RMF. They are asking for a change to RMF, which is contiguous to the neighborhood properties. Not asking for a density bonus. Asking to move the zone line. Would be in favor of changing the zone.

Ms. Rose: This slice of property on Melba Street that is zoned commercial is important to be maintained in the surrounding neighborhood, which is residential. Should keep this area BD in the hope that the petitioner and lifelong residents of Milford would develop that property into something that is viable for the neighborhood.

Mme. Chair: Understands the issues, but hopes that presently, or sometime in the future that the commercial part of this property will be retained. It is consistent with the smart growth principles to have walkabout communities with commercial within the residential area. Believes that changing to the petitioned zone borders on spot zoning. Believes there are several other options available to the property owner should he wish to pursue the residential buildings. Will vote against approval.

Mr. Liddy: Does not see this property being developed any time soon commercially. Looking at the economics of the matter, property has been vacant for a long time. The longer it continues to be vacant the more degraded the area will become. This is not a convenient location for stores. The current proposal will help the tax rolls and create a small community in that particular area. Will vote for approval.

Mme. Chair: Clarified that the issue is not only commercial v. RMF. There are at least three other options that could be explored as possibilities other than commercial; the other options being R-12.5, R-10 and BD also offers some possibilities for residential use.

Mrs. Patterson: Would like to see this area maintained as a business district. There is new development, older residents, and a senior center behind that property. There are more people moving into the area, adding to the density. Against changing the zone.

Mrs. Golden: Once the zone is changed you just can't go back. Now there is the opportunity to explore other possibilities for this piece of land. Not in favor of changing the zone.

Ms. Shaw: Clarified that the Board was discussing the zone change to an RMF-16 zone, not RMF-12.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

A vote was taken to deny the application for a change of zone: Seven members voted in favor. Messrs, Goodrich, Bender and Liddy voted opposed to denial. The motion to deny passed.

Mr. Sulkis: Suggested the Board vote on the second application for a Special Permit and Site Plan Review because this application went in tandem with the other that the board just denied.

Mr. Vetter: Moved to deny the application for a Special Permit and Site Plan Review by Melba Realty, Inc. to construct four multi-family residences at 232-256 Melba Street.

Ms. Rose: Second.

Mr. Bender: Why would the board vote on something that cannot take place.

Mr. Sulkis: It makes it cleaner to take action on all the applications associated with the zone change.

A vote was taken: Eight members voted in favor to deny the application. Mr. Goodrich opposed denial. Mr. Ferrante abstained.

D. PUBLIC HEARING HELD 11/18/08; exp. 1/22/08

3. PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENTS

- a. Sec. 3.1.4.1 – SCHEDULE OF LOT AND BUILDING REQUIREMENTS FOR ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS** – Proposed regulation text change to remove the words “excluding basement”.

Mr. Goodrich: Wants to see which areas in the regulations would be affected by changing the wording “excluding basements”. Named all the residential areas where the definition of basement would apply. Making the change would affect every building in Milford, especially in the future where any building that this applies to would be nonconforming. This is being done for the shorefront. Discussed the ramifications of the height issue and what the ground floor area would be considered and that these matters would be open to interpretation.

Mme. Chair: Stated the matter was clear and not open to interpretation. 50% above ground would be a basement and 50% below would be a cellar. Most of the two story and three story homes in other districts of the City have cellars. It is very unusual to have a basement in a residential home. The definition of basement is very clear. The regulation that is being changed is clear. She defined how the stories were determined.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Sulkis: The big effect is on the residential zones. The other zones have different height and story requirements and they will not be affected by this regulation change. In an HDD zone the limit is 12 stories. The effect of the Board's proposed change would affect houses on the shoreline, with minimal impact elsewhere.

Mr. Liddy: Asked Mr. Sulkis for his opinion of the material Mr. Grant passed out to the Board at the public hearing.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated he would comment on something specific from the report, not on the report in general. Said he disagrees with a majority of what was said in the report and the testimony Mr. Grant gave, which he believed to be inaccurate.

Mr. Ferrante: Since becoming a board member the most complaints by the public has been about "four story houses on the beach". This is what the Board would like to eliminate. Understands the issue that if they make this change, the height requirement throughout the city for these residential zones is still 35 feet and the story limit, including the basement, is three stories.

Mr. Sulkis: Acknowledged this statement to be correct.

Mr. Ferrante: Since most projects on the beach do not have cellars, when 50 percent of the lowest level is above grade that is counted as a story. In most projects along the shore, the lowest level is on grade. It is called a basement because of the flow through requirements. Now this area will be counted as a story. They can still go up 35 feet but it will not be a four story building. Stated this is what he understands the regulation change will accomplish. In other residential zones they can still have a three-story condominium with parking on the lower level or a finished basement on the lowest level and two stories above. Will vote for the change.

Mr. Sulkis: During the public hearing he got the sense there was some testimony that attacked the Planning and Zoning office and how it interpreted the regulations, which he thought cast dispersion upon the office. The regulations are adhered to as they were written, which was done before he became the City Planner. It was alluded that the regulations have been interpreted differently since Mr. Sulkis' became City Planner.

Mme. Chair: Mr. Grant made the accusation. She reads it as staff following the regulations.

Mr. Goodrich: Asked about property in flood elevations.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Sulkis: Clarified the living space has to be above the flood elevation. Discussed how the space in the flood elevation could be used, i.e., garage, storage. Now that space will be counted as a story. Parking at the ground level will be allowed, but only two living areas above that level will be allowed, not three levels, as is currently allowed.

Mr. Liddy: Asked Mr. Sulkis if other shoreline communities were contacted to see how they deal with this situation.

Mr. Sulkis: The Board has to stick with what was discussed here. Has been compiling data from different towns. The public has spoken. Can't discuss what other areas have been doing after the regulation has been crafted.

Mr. Liddy: Stated additional information might be helpful to the Board in its decision making.

Mme. Chair: There had been a comparison made previously.

Mr. Sulkis: Many communities define basements and cellars the same way as Milford. The 35 foot height is fairly typical. Milford has always been consistent in maintaining the 35 foot height limitation which is a New England standard.

Mme. Chair: Did research on other municipalities and definitions, just to confirm that she was thinking clearly and to back up what she believed. Many municipalities concur with Milford with regard to stories, definition of basement, building height, etc. Feels confident the Board is doing something that is responsible.

Ms. Shaw: Most people spoke in favor of the changes that the Board has presented, which have been discussed over a long period of time. Mr. Sulkis has addressed Mr. Grant's issues and the change will have no effect on inland properties. Judging from the public's comments, the Board is headed in the right direction and the information it has is consistent and is urged to support.

Mr. Ferrante: Agreed with Ms. Shaw. Does not think this is the end of the issue. If the economy rebounds there will be larger houses within this definition. It is his belief that the Board needs to attack the issue on a more holistic approach. At this time is in favor of the change.

Mme. Chair: FEMA is changing their flood regulations. That will impact the shoreline tremendously in the next couple of years in terms of housing and insurance rates.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Asked to put in some quotes from the Plan of Conservation and Development, as they are congruent with what is recommended. Read the following:

Page 67 regarding infill; page 9 regarding shoreline; made note that the previous board made an effort to take action when they changed the way height was measured; page 16, design of the building.

Ms. Rose: Motion to approve section 3.1.4.1. proposed regulation text change to remove the words “excluding basement”.

Mr. Ferrante: Second.

Mr. Goodrich: Agrees with the intent of the change. Concerned that if someone along the beach in a flood elevation raises their house 3-4 feet, that is not by anyone’s definition a basement, but the Board could state it is a basement. Going up 8 or 9 feet could be considered a story. Believes this will be open to interpretation. The Board may be over zealous in its attempt to fix an error in the regulations.

Mme. Chair: It is clear how basement and cellar are defined and differentiated. By having two stories above, it is not probable that a house would be 35 feet. It might not be impossible, but it is improbable.

A vote was taken: 9 members voted in favor. Mr. Goodrich voted against the motion. The motion passed to approve the regulation text change.

b. **Sec 6.2.6 – RESTORATION** – Proposed regulation text change to eliminate the last sentence.

Mr. Goodrich: As staff explained to the Board previously, this will make the regulations consistent with the 50 percent.

Mr. Sulkis: This change will also make the regulations more consistent with other municipalities. Would also add two words to the title of this section, based on a lot of the testimony where there seemed to be confusion and arguments were made regarding semantics about restoration and how the office interprets that and whether it is a reconstruction or restoration. Suggested the words “or Reconstruct” be added to the title and that removes the ambiguity. One of the reasons to ask for this is because designers and builders in town pull permits to restore or to rehabilitate or reconstruct a portion of a house, which would not be quite 80 percent, which is currently what the regulations are. In a fairly recent case a permit was pulled for the rehab of a kitchen and some things on the first and second floor. It was very close to 80 percent. Upon inspection, the house was gone. The only thing left was the garage. Not only was the house gone, but

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

the foundation was gone. They contended that the garage comprised the necessary 20%. Also, the house was in a flood zone. They were trying to skirt the flood regulations by building an entirely new house without having to raise it. That would be dangerous to the homeowners as well as the adjoining neighbors. At this time they are in the process of designing a properly engineered property that will meet the flood regulations.

Mme. Chair: This change was submitted by Peter Crabtree to the Board in June 2008.

Ms. Shaw: Asked how this change would impact historic homes.

Ms. Harrigan: Pointed out under the definition "improvement, substantial", in the Regulations, homes that are on the National Register are excluded from this section.

Mr. Sulkis: Homes listed on the National Register are limited as to what can be done to them.

Ms. Harrigan: The exterior of the home could remain completely intact, even if interior changes are made, which is what the National Register protects for most structures.

Mme. Chair: Commented she researched six municipalities to see if Milford would be in line with them. They all have this regulation in place. Norwalk, Westport, New Canaan, West Haven, Fairfield and Stamford were reviewed. Three require 50% of market value and the other three require 50% of the structure. Asked Mr. Sulkis to clarify the difference and to make a case for structure over market value.

Mr. Sulkis: Milford has always done it by structure. Market values vary. In the example of adding a second floor, it is a 50% improvement. The same improvement, if based on cost, could be different depending on the location of the property (i.e., inland vs. shoreline, where shoreline is valued more highly).

Mr. Goodrich: Motion to approve the proposed text change in Sec. 6.2.6, making a change in the title to read "Restoration or Reconstruction".

Mr. Ferrante: Second.

Mme. Chair to Mr. Sulkis: Who decides the percentage? In the book it states a building inspector and/or the zoning enforcement officer. Are there any guidelines in place to determine the percentage of substantial improvement? How subjective is the determination?

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Sulkis: In construction, every project is different. In cases where there is a question, other departments' expertise is sought (i.e. Head of the building department, the assessor, etc.).

Ms. Rose: Clarified Mr. Grant is a plan reviewer for the City of Bridgeport.

A vote was taken. All members voted in favor. The motion passed unanimously.

- c PROPOSED ZONING REGULATION AMENDMENT – Section 3.21 (ZONE MCDD) and Sec. 5.3. – SIGN REGULATIONS** – Application of Milford Progress, Inc. for a zoning text change to Sign Regulations pertaining to the MCDD zone only and moving Appendix B to section 3.21.

Mr. Bender: Commented he read the documents submitted and thought it was not clear in what MPI was trying to accomplish. He cited as an example, page 11 on the proposed sign regulations changes.

Mme. Chair: Clarified that the bulk of the document copies the existing signage regulations. There are only five pages where they denote the changes they propose.

Mr. Liddy: Suggested this item be tabled until the Board has had time to digest the suggested changes.

Mme. Chair: Stated the Board has had enough time to review the material and should be able to have an informed discussion on the matter.

Ms. Shaw: This is a big project. Has spent a lot of time reviewing the information. These changes would be very important to the economic development of Downtown. The Mayor and other important people have come to talk about this issue and its importance. People spoke at the public hearing. As someone stated, "The devil is in the details". Understands what they are trying to accomplish but some of what they are suggesting does not correlate to the definitions, i.e. the definition of a wall sign.

This is another opportunity to take a closer look at such items as illumination, ground signs, etc. Would like the staff with the help of the Board review the signage regulations for future direction.

Mr. Ferrante: Not sure how this all fits into the City's signage regulations. Would like Staff look at the whole picture and give the Board more input on this. Would not like to pass these regulation changes precipitously.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mr. Bender: Cited different pages that he questioned; in particular, where it states that the zoning enforcement officer is the only person that can approve this. Questioned the fact that there is only a single source designated for approval. He also questioned maintenance of large billboards and the requirement of approval of tag sale signs.

Mr. Sulkis: Clarified that he and the Assistant City Planner, under the regulations, can also act as enforcers.

Mr. Sulkis read the portion of the current regulations that pertained to maintenance of billboards. This is a matter of public safety, especially those located downtown which are frequented by pedestrians.

The tag sale signs would apply where this is an ongoing activity.

Mme. Chair: Very complex submission. The signage regulations for the MCDD should be incorporated into the general regulations to be congruent.

The Chair read to the Board a list of specific questions that she had as she reviewed the proposed signage regulation material, which is as follows:

“Our intent as a Board in looking at regulations. I believe, is to bring accuracy, clarity and consistency, as much as possible. In my opinion we are very challenged with this proposal to reach that criteria.

“I am impressed with the effort that went into this submission and I certainly agree with the intent which I believe is an effort to create a higher quality and visually appealing streetscape by encouraging architectural congruence with signage. This intent I very much support. In December of '07, the Planning and Zoning Board approved a new regulation for Architectural Standards (sec. 5.16), which includes the MCDD with this same objective in mind and I so I fairly support that intent.

“I also believe incorporating Appendix B into the main body of the sign regs was certainly a good idea and hopefully will ... could prevent further confusion.

“However, what I would like to do is go through some of the specific questions that I have when I reviewed this material just to have it on record again to show some of my, anyway, consternation with this and some of it may be a repeat of what Ms. Shaw said. The first thing I would speak to was I felt this was presented in terms of the business district of Milford Center and not for all the MCDD, and I would like to have that delineated further and for us to be more aware as we go further with this, the impact that these regs may have on the outlying districts of MCDD outlying areas.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

“Second, I believe it is very important that we don’t approve something that promotes the economic advantage of one business, yet might be detrimental to another. I think Ms. Shaw was referring to that too, and this has to do with the requirement to have signs only on the first floor only. That may not be a bad idea, but I think there may be some things or ways to tweak that, so that one person isn’t favored over the other.

“Number three, I’m concerned about the subjective call on signage coordination with the architecture of the building. Should we require a special permit for a sign over a certain size, or find another way of evaluating this that does not rest on the subjective judgment call of one person?

“I’d like to call out an example: I imagine that whoever made the decision regarding the signs in front of the Chamber and the library thought they were appropriate. As far as I am concerned, I drive by them frequently and I think, wow, you know, who decided on that design? It’s certainly not congruent with the architecture of the buildings, and that’s just subjectivity. It’s my subjective call versus someone else’s subjective call. So, who makes that decision?

“The fourth thing is In 5.3.8.2, paragraph 2, regarding directory signs: It may not always be possible to place them adjacent to the main entrance. And there are no specifics about the type of intensity of illumination for directory signs...nor for that matter, illumination in general, which I believe, is quite important.

“In paragraph 4 of 5.3.8.2: The aggregate signage area excludes ground signs, leaving the possibility that the ground sign in addition to the allowable 25% window allowance and 15% of the total area of the building façade may in fact be in excess of what is wanted in terms of percentage. It’s not clear.

“In paragraph 6 of that same section deals with wall signs: There is a conflict in what is said here and what the definition of sign area.

“Other definitions problems: As pointed out by Mr. Grant...definition of GROUND FLOOR needs to be clarified to avoid confusion with definition for construction of a building.

“I would like to see more differentiation and clarity between DIRECTORY signs and DIRECTIONAL signs.

“I was also noting that...I am not sure if this is possible, but I would like in some way to differentiate NEON SIGNS and signs that appear to look like neon. Example the People’s Bank has quite a large sign that looks neon but is not. It is lit from the interior and I think in some way we would have to look at differentiating those things and clarifying what we would want.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

“And finally, I would like to see SIGN AGGREGATE clarified by stating what is excluded in the total amount, i.e., ground signs.

“So, in general I would say that this document has been very helpful in bringing to light some of the issues that are relevant to the entire city, along with differentiating possible sub districts where specific regulations should apply.

“I think we might have more problems if we approved this proposal now. I think it would precipitous and would like to suggest and support this idea that our staff use this document as the foundation in reviewing all of our sign regulations, using it as a touchstone for a full review.

“If staff agrees to this proposal, I believe we also should ask them to do this within a certain period of time, probably six months from January to July.

“That concludes my comments. Sorry that was so lengthy but I wanted to get that on the record.”

Mr. Goodrich: Very good comments. Mentioned in watching the tape of the public hearing, architectural appropriateness was mentioned many times. Did not think that the Board was qualified to determine that. He had other concerns and agreed that Staff would be the most qualified to review the proposed changes and their implications.

Ms. Rose: Made a motion to deny the proposed zoning regulation amendment sec. 3.21 Zone MCDD and sec. 5.3 Sign Regulations, with a directive to the staff to use this document as a basis for a review of the general sign regulations within a six month time frame.

Mrs. Golden: Second.

Mr. Vetter: Previously had a list of regulation changes. Have all those regulation changes been implemented? Asked if there were any other items that the Board wanted to prioritize to the staff before undertaking this large project.

Mme. Chair: There is a list and the process will be starting over again. It appears to take a year to bring these changes to fruition.

Mr. Vetter: Stated his thought was to prioritize.

A vote was taken. All members voted in favor of denial of the application for changes to the sign regulations. The motion carried unanimously.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mme. Chair: Asked Staff if they would comply with the Board's request.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated the Staff will proceed with acting on the Board's request as defined and will complete the project within the suggested time frame.

(A short recess was taken from 8:30 pm to 8:42 pm)

E. Sec. 3.17.4 – LOT AND BUILDING REQUIREMENTS – Proposed regulation text change to correct a printing error.

Mr. Sulkis: Not so much a printing error as a definition that led to nowhere. Adding 3.17.4 fixes that situation.

Ms. Shaw: Motion to approve the change as presented.

Mr. Goodrich: Second.

All members voted in favor.

e1. Sec. 3.20.2.13 – CDD5 – Special Uses – Add section to the CDD-5 regulations which will conform to the wording in the other CDD zones.

Mr. Sulkis: The regulations allow a liquor license to a restaurant or eating establishment of at least 2,000 sf. This regulation is in all the CDD zones except for CDD-5. This is a correction of that oversight.

Mr. Goodrich: Motion to approve the CDD-5 text change.

Ms. Rose: Second.

All members voted in favor.

e2. Sec. 4.1.1 to 4.1.1.8 – ACCESSORY BUILDINGS IN RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS. Proposed regulation text change in wording.

Mr. Bender: The public had an issue with this building versus structure.

Mr. Sulkis: Stated why this change is being proposed. Those who spoke against this change misinterpreted the intention. This proposed change was recommended by the City Attorney's office. It will enable the City to better enforce some problematic structures around the City. At this time the Department is not differentiating between a structure and other buildings.

Mr. Goodrich: Made a motion to approve the proposed text change to 4.1.1

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

structures or accessory buildings in residential districts.

Mr. Vetter: Second.

Mr. Liddy: Asked for clarification of Mr. Goodrich's motion.

Mr. Goodrich: Corrected his motion to include the entire text change from Sec. 4.1.1 to 4.1.1.8.

Mr. Vetter: Second.

All members voted in favor.

E4. DEFINITION OF BUILDING – Proposed text change of definition.

Mr. Sulkis: That change goes hand in hand with the previously approved text change.

Mr. Goodrich: Motion to approve the proposed text change.

Mr. Liddy: Second.

All members voted in favor.

E5. Sec. 5.4.1 – COMMERCIAL GARAGE – Proposed regulation text change in wording and elimination of sec. 5.4.1.1 and 5.4.1.2.

Mr. Sulkis: The State at one time required the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the location permits for automotive businesses. This procedure has been changed back to approval by the Planning and Zoning board. This change reflects the current state statute.

Ms. Rose: Motion to approve.

Mr. Goodrich: Second.

All members voted in favor.

E6. Sec. 7.3.5 (1) and (2) – SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS – Proposed regulation text change to add a section to include Public Hearing.

Mme. Chair: This change conforms the Special Exceptions section to that of Special Permits, wherein a public hearing is required for each application. The Board has always had this requirement but it was never spelled out in the Special

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Exceptions section. This change will correct the oversight.

Mr. Bender: Motion to approve the text change as presented.

Ms. Golden: Second.

All members voted in favor.

Mme. Chair: That concludes the proposed text regulation changes for this year.

E. LIAISON REPORTS

Mr. Goodrich: Attended the Board of Alderman meeting last night. The Boys and Girls Club of Lower Naugatuck Valley presented their proposal to the Board of Aldermen. They had some preliminary drawings. The Board of Aldermen approved it. Expects the Planning and Zoning Board will see these plans in the future.

F APPROVAL OF MINUTES – (11/18/08)

Mr. Bender: Motion to approve.

Mr. Ferrante: Second.

All members voted in favor of approving the minutes as recorded.

G CHAIR'S REPORT

Ms. Shaw: Distributed a copy of the Connecticut Post editorial regarding downtown development in Fairfield in association with LEEDs. Thought it was of interest to the Board.

Mme. Chair: Stated that one of the proposed regulation changes that had been tabled will be on the January agenda for a Public Hearing. There appeared to be a misunderstanding by the public as to what this was about. The definition has nothing to do with the 35 foot building height as two speakers mentioned. It has to do with turrets, cupolas and domes, which the Board has discussed on many occasions. These will be included in the exceptions to height requirements. The Board will receive copies of the proposed change before the January meeting.

Asked Mr. Sulkis to add definitions of turrets, cupolas and domes to Article XI – Definitions of the zoning regulations.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Mentioned there would be a DEP workshop tomorrow in case anyone could attend.

H. STAFF REPORT – None.

Mr. Bender: Made a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Goodrich: Second.

All members voted in favor of adjourning the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

* * *

The meeting was called back to order at 9:00 p.m. by the Chair in order to determine a date as to when the regulation changes will take effect.

Mr. Sulkis: Recommended the date December 31, 2008. The effective date would take place after the 15 day appeal period. With the holidays so close to this time, it gives a little cushion.

Mr. Ferrante: Made a motion that the regulation changes, which were passed by the Board at this evening's meeting all take effect on December 31, 2008, as recommended by Mr. Sulkis, provided the notice is published and the appeal period expires by that date.

Mrs. Patterson: Second.

All members voted in favor:

Mr. Bender: Motion to adjourn.

Ms. Rose: Second.

The meeting adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING BOARD
HELD TUESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2008; 7:30 P.M.
CITY HALL AUDITORIUM, 110 RIVER STREET, MILFORD**

Phyllis Leggett, Board Clerk