

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING REGULATION SUBCOMMITTEE HELD REMOTELY**  
**Tuesday, July 21, 2020 AT 6:30 P.M.**

A. **Call to Order** was at 6:30

B. **Roll Call:** B. Broesder, B. Kaligian, R. Satti, J. Quish/(STAFF) J. Griffith, D. Sulkis, M. Greene

C. Staff proposed issues:

- 1) 20-2 Article VII 7.2.10: Allowing administrative approval of minor amendments to a special permit. Special Permit Modification Language change per chair language.

Mr. Sulkis provided an overview of previous thresholds for determining whether a change could be approved administratively, namely that if the change represented 5% change to the plan, it might be considered to be below the notice of the board. Mr. Quish agreed with the concept, but wanted to leave room for an elected board to participate. Mr. Satti agreed with Mr. Quish. Mr. Broesder also agreed.

Mr. Satti motioned to amend as presented **Article VII Planning and Zoning Board, Section 7.2.10 Amendments**, per the version dated **January 9, 2020 (updated 7/10/20)**.

Mr. Broesder seconded.

Discussion: None.

The motion passed unanimously.

D. Committee requested review:

- 1) A discussion and review of Section 3.1.3.4: The keeping of Domesticated Poultry

Mr. Broesder said he had noticed more interest in keeping poultry around town. Mr. Sulkis and Mr. Harris noted that an update to the poultry regulation had been done around 2013. Mr. Harris said he researched other towns' regulations then to help reword the section. He also said the Planning and Zoning Office receives few complaints about poultry except for roosters. Mr. Broesder said he was mainly curious about how the regulations came to be and that he is satisfied with the language. Mr. Quish wondered about allowing chicken owners to sell eggs to neighbors on a very small scale, saying he had seen it done in Orange. Mr. Sulkis said minimum lot sizes in Orange are quite a bit larger than in many Milford zones. Mr. Satti said that without complaints, he has no concerns about poultry.

E. Approval of minutes from 6/16/20; approved unanimously.

F. Members suggestions for future consideration: Mr. Quish wanted to know if there is a way for the Planning and Zoning Board to restrict redundant submissions of the same application, similar to how the Zoning Board of Appeals is able to restrict them. He said he would like to see new applications have differences from previous ones. Mr. Harris said that per the statute, the ZBA can deny hearing the same application for a period of 6 months. He said he hasn't seen the same language in the statute that pertains to Planning and Zoning Boards and suggested that it should be researched. The group agreed to consult the City Attorney's Office. Mr. Satti said some statutes are ambiguous and that the PZ Board deals with more types of applications than the ZBA. Mr. Satti thought the 6-month hiatus might be too arbitrary; perhaps more complex projects might need to be held off even longer. Mr. Kaligian agreed with Mr. Satti. Mr. Broesder agreed, but said he was curious about other cities' use of this idea. Mr. Quish wondered if the regional regulations groups might be aware of such practices elsewhere and whether a "denial without prejudice" option could be given by the PZ Board. Mr. Sulkis said he will research this idea.

Mr. Quish asked that currently circulating items be put on the agenda with a status. Mr. Sulkis said 2 items were supposed to be circulated, he will check with Sue Lafond because they may be ready for the board to hear. Mr. Quish asked for a report of item status to be put in terms of if the items have been circulated, are circulating, or are finished.

Mr. Sulkis recalled the list by Mr. Grant and said this could be handled in that way.

Mr. Quish asked for member ideas. He said he personally thinks MCDD density thresholds might be addressed. Mr. Satti expressed a preference for creation of public hearings. Mr. Kaligian supported the idea of transparency. Mr. Broesder said large scale project should trigger a public hearing. Mr. Quish said research would be needed from staff. Mr. Sulkis said the quickest way to create a requirement is to add new Special Permit (SP) requirements to the regulations that feature a size threshold. He reviewed the requirements of the various types of hearings, whether public or not. He reminded the group that if a plan meets the regulations, the board must approve it. The group noted that SPs allow the board to ask for more information than Site Plan Reviews (SPRs), which don't, for example, require a traffic study. Mr. Harris reminded the group that a SP's uses must be explicitly named in the regulations.

G. Adjournment was at 7:14.