RECV'D: Office of the Town Clerk June 7,2016 10:50am

Planning and Zoning Commission Meeting
7:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 1, 2016
Lower Level Meeting Room, Durham Library

Minutes

1. **Call to order**
   Frank DeFelice called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

2. **Roll Call**
   In attendance: Alana Adams (7:43), Campbell Barrett, Lisa Davenport, Frank DeFelice, Dick Eriksen, Chris Flanagan, Dave Foley, Ed Fronc, and Joe Pasquale
   Absent: Dan Melnik, Jan Melnik, and Will Spooner
   Others in attendance: Geoff Colegrove, Attorney Dennis Ceneviva, Michael Battista, and about 65 members of the public.

3. **Seating of Alternates** – Ed Franc was seated for Dan Melnik. Campbell Barrett was seated for Jan Melnik.

4. **Amendments to Agenda** - None

5. **Approval of Agenda**
   MOTION BY DAVE FOLEY, SECONDED BY JOE PASQUALE TO APPROVE THE AGENDA AS PRESENTED. ALL AYE

6. **Public Comment**
   Richard Kaika, 999R New Haven Road was present to make a complaint against his neighbor David Goduti, 997 New Haven Road. He entered into the record video recordings, pictures, and a copy of Stipulation agreement.

   R. Kaika made reference to State Statute 22a-220a (d) (1) that requires any collector hauling solid waste generated by residential, business, commercial or other establishments, including, but not limited to, recyclables generated within the borders of a municipality, shall register annually in such municipality and disclose: (a) the name and address of the collector and the owner of such collection company; (b) the name of any other municipality in which such collector hauls such solid waste, including recyclables; (c) whether the hauling done by such collector is residential, commercial or other; (d) the types of waste hauled; (e) the anticipated location of any disposal facilities or end users receiving recyclable solid waste; and (f) any additional information that such municipality requires to ensure the health and safety of its residents. He noted that Mr. Goduti was registered with the State of CT using 997 New Haven Road (his home address) as his business and residence address and asked if he was in compliance with the town of Durham.

   R. Kaika continued by stating that the pictures and video show Mr. Goduti raising the dump bed of his garbage truck to empty water that had pooled in the body of the truck; this occurs within less than seventy-five feet of the well located at 999R New Haven Road and within twenty-five feet of a well

located at 997 New Haven Road. He stated that Mr. Goduti is also storing and dumping garbage at his residence in plastic containers.

R. Kaika stated in September 2015 he hired an Attorney to appeal the decision of the Durham Planning and Zoning Commission granting Mr. Goduti a home occupation permit in order to protect his family and property and made reference to the Stipulation Agreement dated February 22, 2016. He asked the commission to take action against Mr. Goduti stating the health and safety of his family and property are his main priority.

Geoff Colegrove addressed the requirement of registering with the town of Durham by stating that currently there is no town regulation for registering but noted that the Durham Middlefield Interlocal Agreement Advisory Board (DMIAAB) is considering proposed regulation. He noted that this was not within the Planning and Zoning Commissions jurisdiction. He felt this to be a compliance issue with the Department of Environmental Protection for dumping and storage of garbage and with the town of Durham for violation of a home occupation permit.

Campbell Barrett recommended G. Colegrove make a site walk of 997 New Haven Road and asked what the process would be.

G. Colegrove stated he would perform a site visit, collect information and if found in violation would issue a notice of violation with a fifteen day window to correct the violation. If the issue is not resolved within the fifteen days a cease and desist would be issued.

C. Barrett asked that the fifteen days be reduced to ten days. G. Colegrove agreed noting the time frame is not driven by any type of regulation.

Dave Foley questioned if a permit was required by the town for a tent style building on Mr. Goduti's property. G. Colegrove stated it would need to meet size and wind velocity requirements.

MOTION BY DICK ERIKSEN, SECONDED BY DAVE FOLEY TO ISSUE NOTICE OF VIOLATION RE: 997 NEW HAVEN ROAD, IF AFTER SITE VISIT A VIOLATION EXISTS. ALL AYE

MOTION BY DAVE FOLEY, SECONDED BY JOE PASQUALE TO ADJOURN REGULAR MEETING TO PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:00 P.M. ALL AYE

MOTION BY CHRIS FLANAGAN, SECONDED BY JOE PASQUALE TO OPEN THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 8:00 AT 8:00 P.M. ALL AYE

PUBLIC HEARING

Applicant/Owner:	Dennis Ceneviva/Graceful Bee Realty, LLC
Property Location:	Main Street
Proposed Activity:	Amend the following sections of the Durham Zoning Regulations: Section 02. for Restaurant-Fast Food with a Drive-Thru Service; and to add a new permitted use in Section 06.01 being Restaurant-"Fast Food" (with Drive-Thru Window Service as provided in Section 06.13) and a new section 06.13

which provides for 7 criteria a Restaurant-Fast Food with drive thru window service must meet.

In attendance: Alana Adams (7:43), Campbell Barrett, Lisa Davenport, Frank DeFelice, Dick Eriksen, Chris Flanagan, Dave Foley, Ed Fronc, and Joe Pasquale
Absent: Dan Melnik, Jan Melnik, and Will Spooner
Others in attendance: Geoff Colegrove, Attorney Dennis Ceneviva, Michael Battista, and about 65 members of the public

Seating of Alternates – Ed Franc was seated for Dan Melnik. Campbell Barrett was seated for Jan Melnik.

Geoff Colegrove read the legal notice published on May 19, 2016 and May 26, 2016 in the Middletown Press into the record.

Frank DeFelice presented information below regarding noticing of the public hearing:

- Planning & Zoning meeting of April 20th; Application with proposed text amendment and letter from Attorney Ceneviva were distributed to commission members. Meeting dates were set for formal application and public hearing.
- Legal notices; published in the Middletown Press May 19th and May 26th.
- Planning & Zoning meeting of May 18th; agenda item for formal presentation.

F. DeFelice asked the applicant/attorney if this was a new application (not prior). Applicant's council replied in the affirmative.

F. DeFelice asked Attorney Ceneviva if he was aware that he was to be at the May 18th meeting. Attorney Ceneviva stated he was out of town that week and noted he spoke with Jen Keogh to review the Public Notice and was not told he would be on the agenda. He also noted that he routinely makes presentations of this type at public hearings and in no way did he intend to disregard the meeting of May 18th.

Attorney Ceneviva then introduced himself and noted that he was representing Graceful Bee Realty, LLC and Mike Batista who owns several Duncan Donut franchises. He stated that the public hearing notice specified a property location of Main Street and because the proposed activity is not site specific. He talked about prior applications having issues with one of which was perceived as spot zoning and described how the current application was prepared. He stated that because of the breadth of this proposal, if passed, there would be several properties in Durham that this amendment could be applicable to. He then reviewed the proposed text amendments.

- Section 02. Definitions:
  02.18.01 Restaurant, "Fast Food"
  The retail sale of food to the general public for consumption on the premises, or where a significant portion of the consumption takes place or is designed to take place outside the confines of the building occupied for such use; and which is characterized by high volume of patronage, the promise of rapid service of meals, and a resulting short duration of stay and

rapid turnover; and including drive-thru service as an accessory use. See Section 06.12., "Drive-Thru Window Service".

- Section 06. Commercial Districts:
  06.01 Permitted Uses
  S 37. Restaurant, "Fast Food" (with Drive Thru Window Service as provided in Sec. 06.13)
- 06.13 Drive-Thru Window Service for a Restaurant, "Fast Food".
  a. Any such drive-thru window service may only be allowed on a parcel of at least 1.5 acres in lot area with a minimum of 170 feet of frontage; such drive-thru window service shall be located at least 150 feet from the front Property line;
  b. A minimum of fifteen (15) vehicle-stacking spaces shall be provided on site for such drive-thru window station, including the vehicle be serviced; where an order board and service window are proposed, such service aisle shall provide a minimum of 10 of the required stacking spaces before the order board;
  c. Stacking lanes shall be separate from internal traffic aisles and customer parking to allow traffic to circulate through the sire without entering the drive-thru window service aisle or being impeded;
  d. Stacking lanes shall be minimum of 10 feet wide, and each vehicle stacking space shall be minimum 19 feet in length;
  e. Stacking lanes shall be designed to minimize traffic congestion and to promote pedestrian safety;
  f. Drive thru window service lane is to be screened by appropriate landscaping from adjacent residential properties, if any; and
  g. Outdoor speakers at the order board shall be located a minimum of 50 feet from any residentially zoned and occupied property.

Attorney Ceneviva stated that the last seven items may already fall into the commission's special exception/special permit process. He noted that this amendment would allow for the opportunity of other applicants to make an application to the commission. He then passed out copies of several Connecticut towns zoning regulations as examples of how they treat similar uses.

Attorney Ceneviva stated that Michael Battista has a long history in Durham, over twenty years, operates two Dunkin Donuts, and is involved with charitable organizations. He noted it is not his intent to be contentious and is looking at this as an opportunity to grow, to turn around a vacant parcel, and felt that this will not happen without this text change.

Michael Battista echoed Attorney Ceneviva by stating that he has operated his Duncan Donut franchises in Durham for twenty years, enjoys and loves being in Durham. He is not interested in any way to change Durham and noted that he currently operates a national brand in the historic district. He talked about his thirty five years' experience in drive-thru's and how he applied this knowledge to the proposed zone text. He stated that he wants to do it correctly and is trying to do it in a way that would allow for growth, and allow others to do the same at the commission discretion. He stated it was not just about making money and talked about the strong connection he has to his guests and providing a convenience to all.

Attorney Ceneviva then submitted as part of the record, a listing of properties that he prepared. After review of the parcels it was determined that it was not possible for all to be developed under the criteria. G. Colegrove then submitted to the commissioners a summary of properties in commercial zones that he prepared, that met the proposed minimum area and frontage standards in the proposed text amendment; thirteen of these properties met the minimum acreage requirement of 1.5, nine met the minimum acreage requirement and the minimum frontage of 170 feet, one of the nine is owned by the town of Durham, and of the eight remaining parcels only two are vacant. He noted that at least three sites met the criteria a, c, and e on the list.

D. Foley made reference to stacking criteria equaling site design; if the first two criteria can be met, sight design could be done to meet the other criteria.

Chris Flanagan asked how they arrived at the 1.5 acres. Attorney Ceneviva stated that an engineering firm was hired with the direction to make the text broader, this was a basic layout, minimal size that would work with stacking.

D. Eriksen made reference to the April 18, 2016 letter from Attorney Ceneviva to G. Colegrove where is was requested that Attorney Byrne review the draft before the presentation to the commission and asked if this was done. F. DeFelice responded no, review would be done pending interest of the commission.

Attorney Ceneviva noted the commission's prior concern about making the text to narrow or broad and stated that courts give great deference to Planning and Zoning Commissions under specific special exception/special permits. He then introduced into the record three letters from residents who were in support of the text amendment.

L. Davenport asked what other towns Mr. Battista had drive-thru's in. Mr. Battista responded he had drive-thru's in Meriden, Cheshire, Middletown, Cromwell, Portland and East Hampton.

Joe Pasquale questioned the setback requirement of 150 feet for a service window. Attorney Ceneviva stated it was determined by the stacking distance and noted if the lot size was larger than proposed they could have all stacking in the rear. M. Battista stated the 150 feet was from the window to the road; addressing traffic to the road, you need distance after the window. An example would be if a car would be making a left hand turn from the window lane, and is stopped waiting to exit, you would need to create distance. He noted the average drive-thru serves 120 cars per hour and they try to get five cars distance from the speaker to the window.

J. Pasquale asked if this were to be used on parcels with multiple buildings and tenants, why the 170 foot frontage is an important number and also why the 1.5 acres was so important because it seems to limit other properties in the community. Attorney Ceneviva stated that a charge was given to an engineering company to give a layout on what would works; the main concern being to be as certain as possible that there be no offsite traffic concerns.

J. Pasquale stated that the criteria established had no safeguard for existing stacking lanes, no escape. He noted that in other communities this is a requirement and why was it not part of the amendment. Attorney Ceneviva stated that would be a site plan issue to establish the layout, and would have to be part of the application. He noted that special exceptions would give the commission authority.

J. Pasquale asked why there was no requirement for inside seating as it is being defined as fast food. Attorney Ceneviva stated there was no requirement for seating. J. Pasquale asked how they measure "rapid turnover". Attorney Ceneviva stated the burden would be on the applicant, not the commission and this was standard language for the definition of fast food.

J. Pasquale questioned if the stacking lane could start at the front property line; 285 feet, 150 feet from window. Attorney Ceneviva stated that special exception process would need to be utilized for each application for a drive-thru window.

F. DeFelice asked how they arrived at fifteen vehicle stacking. M. Battista stated this was based on Duncan Donuts requirement to achieve 12-14 spaces; 200 feet from the window to the road is State requirement, this proposal specifies a minimum of 285 feet total stacking (15 x 19 feet each).

There being no further inquiries the public comment session was opened.

Public Comment

Anthony Kearns stated he has lived in Durham for 19 years and another fast food restaurant is not necessary. He talked about the rural character of Durham and felt this would not add any benefit.

Diana McCain stated she loves drive-thru's and noted that the Duncan Donuts in town have been very sensitive occupants. She felt this not to be a good idea, noted current congestion on Main Street and the recent installation of a traffic light at Picket Lane. She felt this would create additional traffic on Main Street along with more accidents, and will have impact on the historic appeal of Main Street.

Steve Levy, speaking as a resident of town, stated that he reviewed certain relevant items in the draft Plan of Conservation and Development, noting that this provides guidance for the consideration of permitting a text amendment, such as being presented tonight. He cited the following sections, his comments in italics.

Chapter 1 Introduction

Page 10: "There is an overwhelming community concern for preserving the charm, rural ambiance, and character of Durham's unique Historic District." *The PoCD cites the HD as a defining factor in quality of life in Durham. Is this planned restaurant in the HD?*

Page 10: "Thoughtful, careful economic development that wisely expands the tax base in designated areas can appropriately complement Durham's overall revenue base." *Permitting a Drive-Thru restaurant is unlikely to add significantly to the tax base, particularly, if the use represents a repurposing of an existing building on Main Street in which the tax revenue would be limited to improvements and personal property.*

Chapter 3 Transportation

3.2.1 Arterials in Durham

Page 24: "The state roads, specifically Route 17, Route 68, Route 147, and Route 79, are arterial roads." .... "The primary responsibility of the road is to service major traffic movements." *Free, safe movement of traffic on Main Street has a major effect on quality of life and safety of residents of Durham.*

3.4.1 Level of Service (LOS)

Page 28: "The Level of Service is determined by the road's Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (V/C). A V/C Ratio of between 0.90 and 0.99 suggests a roadway is approaching capacity, whereas ratios of 1.00 or greater are roadways that are over-capacity." "Level of Service "F" is used to describe breakdown flow. Queues form in these locations and the traffic flow is characterized by stop-and-go waves."
As cited in the table on this page a V/C ratio greater than 1.0 receives a grade of F.
Main street traffic volume is already either at or beyond capacity. Added traffic complexity caused by entrance and exit to and from a drive-thru restaurant will exacerbate this deficiency.

3.4.2 Volume-to-Capacity Ratio (V/C).

The table on page 29 cites Route 17 from Route 79 to Route 147 (the section commonly recognized as Main Street) to have been at a LOS from 1.03 to 0.94 in 2011 as reported by CTDOT. With a projected LOS of this section projected to be between 1.32 to 1.11 in 2035 it is fair to say that all of Main Street is currently at or fractionally below a LOS grade of F.

3.8 Main Street Issues

Page 34: "The preservation of the historical character of Main Street and the health and safety of Durham residents and others as they travel through the center of town are critical." *A drive-thru restaurant has never been permitted on Main Street and such use will dramatically affect Main Street's character.*

"The town should consider limiting high traffic commercial development within the Historic District. The high volume of traffic generated by commuters has created major congestion during the peak A.M. and P.M. travel times on Main Street and throughout town. The excessive speed of traffic outside of commuting hours is problematic, as it creates difficulties in entering and exiting residential driveways and hazards at all crosswalks for pedestrians." *A drive-thru restaurant will dramatically increase entering and exiting of Main Street. Because drive-thru windows are often used by commuters during peak hours such use will likely contribute to congestion and traffic complexity at travel times when capacity is highest.*

3.12.1 Route 17 Corridor Study (1994)

Page 38: "In September of 1994 the former Midstate Regional Planning Agency also produced a Regional Transportation Plan for the Midstate Region. This plan defined the Route 17 Corridor from the Route 17/Route 77 intersection north, as a roadway that was approaching over-capacity. It concluded that if the trend continued without making physical improvements, the capacity constraints would worsen and extend to adjacent roadways." *Main Street was approaching over-capacity 22 years ago. Physical improvements have not been made.*

Page 39: “Several specific problems, issues, and areas of concern were also noted by the corridor Advisory Committee for Durham. These included: "Main Street high traffic volumes and many curb cuts compromise safety". *While a drive-thru restaurant in an existing building may not physically add a new curb cut, it would certainly add more entrance and exit maneuvers and functionally create the same problems as a new curb cut.*

3.12.1.3 Problems and Needs
Page 40: "Where multiple problems were confirmed at a single location or area, or where roadway and/or access problems were considered particularly severe, the sites were determined to require a detailed alternatives evaluation." "Three such areas were identified in Durham, including the primary business areas. The three areas are:

1. Routes 17/79/77
2. Main Street from the Routes 17/79/77 Intersection to Route 147/Haddam Quarter Road (includes Fowler/Maple, Route 68 and Maiden Lane intersections)
3. Route 147 and Haddam Quarter Road Area".

Has a detailed evaluation of the affect of a drive-thru restaurant on Main Street been considered in light of the identification of this section of roadway as having severe access problems?

3.12.1.7 Alternative Improvement Concepts
Page 43: "The frequency of traffic accidents was greatest along Route 17 where there are conflicts between land access (driveways and curb cuts) and through traffic." *The functional addition of more curb cut access may be expected to have an adverse affect on the incidence of traffic conflict, disturbance of the smooth flow of traffic, and an increase in traffic accidents.*

It was his conclusion that a text amendment to the zoning regulations permitting a drive-thru restaurant will have an adverse affect on quality of life, traffic flow, safety, and character of our Town and do little to build tax base. I must oppose such an amendment.

Michael Good noted several concerns a few years ago when Durham Dairy Serve considered food service and was turned down. He talked about concern regarding trash; since December he has observed trash on his street; liquor bottles and cans and fast food wrappers. He felt this very distressing and hoped the commission would not do something that would make this matter worse.

Clark Kearney asked if there were restrictions on buildings from an architectural standpoint. F. DeFelice stated that building located in the historic district are reviewed by the Historic District Commission. As for other homes the commission has limited oversight, only for things like building height. D. Foley stated that Planning and Zoning would be some discretion in the ability to require it be in harmony with the town.

Ona McLaughlin stated she was impressed with the questions posed by the commissioners and asked if there were any statistics on fender benders when there are drive-thru’s. She noted that Durham has a volunteer ambulance corp, volunteer fire department, and only one resident state trooper.

Jim McLaughlin also stated he was concerned with the amount of trash in front of his home on Main Street. He felt current regulations limited to banks were alright and wished Mr. Battista luck. He questioned the commission, asking if the people who attended the recent charrette, asked for a fast food drive-thru. He felt the town was good as it is.

Mark Howard talked about noise; not being just from order board but also from audio or speakers from cars. He talked about the addition of lighting and peak hours in the morning and the possibility of a Burger King at night. He felt this would change the character of the town.

Roger Kleeman noted the text amendment identified three properties that did not meet the 2 acre zoning requirement in Durham.

George Eames III talked about zoning regulations prohibiting seven very specific problems. Environmental; idling cars create pollution and recent statistics show that wait times are getting longer. Land pollution and public safety; patrons walking into the store through the stacking lanes. Noise; speakers (order board) at 50 feet, radios blasting, and patron noise. Fairness to competition; if limited to three parcels what about the other businesses on Main Street that can't meet the criteria. Walkability; possibility of curb cuts to ease traffic, walkable, biking neighborhoods and drive-thru's do not go together. He felt this is not the way to go.

Suzanne Morris spoke about the addition of garbage and traffic. She noted the amount of students who jog Main Street sidewalks.

George Eames stated he was against drive-thru's in any part of Durham; the main reason being traffic and pollution. He noted prior applicants coming before the commission and being turned down. Durham is not a commercial town, he loves Main Street and the historic district.

Duncan Milne stated his vision for Durham is embracing its rural character and felt traffic would be an issue.

John Swift stated that he was opposed.

Anne Cassidy stated she was opposed to fast food restaurants in Durham.

Molly Nolan noted various comments well taken. M. Nolan cautioned not to fool around with the historic district and asked the commission to please be careful with what they do as there are no do-overs.

F. DeFelice asked if there were additional public comment speakers.

F. DeFelice thanked the public for their comments on a very important issue.

F. DeFelice asked the commissioner's if they had any additional questions for the applicant.

J. Pasquale asked in regards to parcels, why they didn't limit the amount of windows per parcel. Attorney Ceneviva stated they did not think about it.

D. Foley thanked the applicant noting the commission asked him to come back with a better proposal and they did a good job at threading the needle. He thanked Mr. Battista for hiring town youth.

The applicant was offered the opportunity for rebuttal.

Attorney Ceneviva reminded commissioners that there was no site yet before them in reference to traffic and noted that noise coming from an order board at 50 feet was recorded at 48 decibels which would equate to that of a refrigerator or light rain. He also noted that he did not review the towns Plan of Conservation and Development noting the encouragement of development without traffic being a difficult balance. He reiterated that they were only asking for a process change and with each application the commission would have the opportunity to review and can vote no.

D. Eriksen again questioned the request made by the applicant to have the language submitted to the attorney. He noted that the commission went forward with an open public hearing with public comments. He felt the language continued to be specific and may be spot zoning and the clock was ticking on the application timeline.

MOTION BY DAVE FOLEY, SECONDED BY LISA DAVENPORT TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING AT 9:53 P.M. ADAMS, BARRETT, DAVENPORT, DEFELICE, ERIKSEN, FOLEY, FRONC, PASQUALE; AYE. FLANAGAN; OPPOSED. MOTION CARRIED.

MOTION BY JOE PASQUALE, SECONDED BY DAVID FOLEY TO RECONVENE REGULAR MEETING AT 9:53 P.M. ALL AYE

7. <u>Graceful Bee Realty, LLC, Text Amendment to Zoning Regulations</u>

L. Davenport suggested having the text amendment reviewed by Attorney Byrne. C. Barrett questioned why she felt it needed review. L. Davenport responded that she felt any text change in regulation should be reviewed.

D. Eriksen stated that the public hearing was closed and the commission has the opportunity to change the text.

J. Pasquale stated he was against changing the language.

L. Davenport reiterated that making a text change to regulation should be reviewed by an Attorney.

D. Eriksen stated that the commission would not need advice if they don't agree on the text change. He noted prior issues with safety and litter being the reasons why banks are only allowed to have drive-thru windows.

F. DeFelice recommend that if the commission felt inclined to adopt the proposed language it should be reviewed by council.

D. Foley stated he did not feel the commission would be approving language based on the feedback received at the hearing.

L. Davenport, C. Flanagan, and Alana Adams stated they both would like to have additional time for review.

MOTION BY DICK ERIKSEN, SECONDED BY JOE PASQUALE TO AMEND THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS OF THE DURHAM ZONING REGULATIONS: SECTION 02. FOR RESTAURANT-FAST FOOD WITH A DRIVE-THRU SERVICE; AND TO ADD A NEW PERMITTED USE IN SECTION 06.01 BEING RESTAURANT-"FAST FOOD" (WITH DRIVE-THRU WINDOW SERVICE AS PROVIDED IN SECTION 06.13) AND A NEW SECTION 06.13 WHICH PROVIDES FOR 7 CRITERIA A RESTAURANT-FAST FOOD WITH DRIVE THRU WINDOW SERVICE MUST MEET. ADAMS, DAVENPORT, FLANAGAN; ABSTAIN. BARRETT, ERIKSEN, FOLEY, FRONC, PASQUALE; OPPOSED. MOTION FAILED.

8. <u>Discussion of Meeting Practices</u>

Tabled

9. <u>Process for Recording Planning & Zoning Commission Meetings</u>

F. DeFelice and G. Colegrove met with Town Clerk, Kim Garvis on the storing and retention of recorded meetings. F. DeFelice reviewed the file naming convention preferred by the town clerk.

G. Colegrove stated that a question was brought up at the last meeting about recording deliberations and after review was found that they do need to be recorded and retained; only applications and public hearings need to be recorded.

10. <u>Payment of Bills</u>

MOTION BY DAVE FOLEY, SECONDED BY DICK ERIKSEN TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING BILLS. ALL AYE.

- Byrne & Byrne, #16-05-006i, 5/1/2016, $855.00
- Beth Moncata, Recording Services, March 16-May 4, 2016, $960.00

11. <u>Minutes of Previous Meetings</u>

MOTION BY DAVE FOLEY, SECONDED BY JOE PASQUALE TO APPROVE THE MAY 4, 2016 MEETING MINUTES AS PRESENTED. ADAMS, DAVENPORT, DEFELICE, ERIKSEN, FLANAGAN, FOLEY, PASQUALE; AYE. BARRETT; ABSTAIN. MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting minutes of May 18, 2016 were tabled.

12. <u>Zoning Enforcement Officers Report</u>

G. Colegrove advised commissioners that a large wooden sign at the intersection of Routes 17 and 77 has been removed. A large inflatable advertisement was also removed.

13. <u>Town Planners Report</u>

G. Colegrove asked the commissioners to review correspondence received from the Lower Connecticut River Valley Regional Planning Committee on their review of the draft Plan of Conservation and Development (PoCD).

14. <u>Miscellaneous</u>

J. Pasquale asked if the minutes are being posted on time. F. DeFelice stated yes. J. Pasquale asked for an update on the PoCD budget. F. DeFelice stated that June 30th was the end of the fiscal year and that he would request an update from the Finance Director.

C. Barrett thanked D. Foley for all the public awareness about tonight's public hearing.

15. <u>Adjournment</u>

Meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m. Respectfully submitted, Beth Moncata