

Subject to Approval

MADISON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

August 18, 2022

The Regular Meeting of the Madison Planning and Zoning Commission was conducted Thursday, August 18, 2022, at 7 p.m., remotely, using Zoom Videoconferencing. The public was invited to participate remotely by joining the meeting through a Zoom webinar link password, telephone call-in number, and a webinar identification number. Log-in and call-in details were posted to the Town of Madison website (<https://www.madisonct.org/>), prior to the meeting.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Carol Snow, Elliot Hitchcock, Seonaid Hay and Ron Bodinson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Giselle McDowall

ALTERNATES PRESENT

None

OTHERS PRESENT

Town Planner Erin Mannix. The meeting was recorded via Zoom Videoconferencing software for You Tube viewing.

The Meeting of the Madison Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at approximately 7p.m. by Chairman Carol Snow.

She read her public hearing procedure statement.

The Town Planner read the legal notice.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

22-17DVD. 14 Railroad Ave., Map 49, Lot 64, D-District. Owner/Applicant: 14 Railroad Avenue, LLC; Special Exception Permit Modification per Sec.6.2.2.2 to construct 13-unit multifamily development and associated site improvements.

Present for the applicant were Attorney Michael Iacurci, John Matthews, AIA, Michael Ott, PE, LS of Summer Hill Civil Engineering & Land Surveying, and John Cunningham of TEC Landscape Design. Atty Iacurci introduced the design team and provided an overview of the proposed modifications to the project, which include reducing the number of units from 14 to 13. Mr. Matthews then explained the changes to the architectural design indicating that no changes were proposed to Buildings B & D, but that Building C is eliminated and Building A would be expanded from a two-family to a three-

family dwelling. He reviewed the elevations including colored renderings of Building A and details of the floor plans as well.

Mr. Ott explained the reasons for the modifications with respect to CT Water Company requirements for a compliant water main location. He explained the changes to the wastewater system. Mr. Ott further detailed the utility plan and changes to the stormwater management system.

Mr. Cunningham detailed the landscape plan explaining the relocated common area over the stormwater management system. He noted changes to the tree species at the rear of the property from Red Maple to Hedge Maple due to the overhead wires. The caliper is 4". Chairman Snow asked if another tree could be added near the corner of Building D and Mr. Cunningham agreed and indicated it would be a Shadblow species.

No additional questions were asked by the Commission. Opportunity was given for questions from the public. Barbara More of Edinburgh Ln asked why the number of units changed and why did the applicant change the septic system?

Mr. Ott responded that the number of units changed because of water main location on site that required Building C to be eliminated. The septic system for Building A changed because the original design was for a 6 bedroom building and that has been increased to an 8 bedroom building.

Mr. Matthews noted that the septic system for Building C was also eliminated.

No further questions or comments were made by the Commission or the public.

Cmsr. Hitchcock motioned to close the public hearing, Cmsr. Hay seconded. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Deliberation:

Cmsr. Hitchcock indicated the application seemed straight forward with one less unit and no zoning issues. He noted he wasn't opposed to the changes. Chairman Snow felt the revised plan provided additional open space for the project. Cmsrs Hay and Bodinson indicated they had no issues with the project either.

Cmsr Hay motioned to approve the modification as drafted by the Town Planner. Cmsr. Bodinson seconded the motion. No further discussion was made. Motion passed unanimously.

IN FAVOR: 4
OPPOSED: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

22-18+CSP. 35 Cottage Rd., Map 31, Lot 5, R-2. Owner/Applicant: 35 Cottage Road, LLC; Site Plan application for a proposed affordable housing development under C.G.S. 8-30g, to

construct eighteen residential dwelling units and associated site improvements. Application also includes a Coastal Site Plan Review.

Present on behalf of the applicant were Attorney Marjorie Shansky, Michael Ott PE, LS of Summer Hill Civil Engineering & Land Surveying, Carl Giordano, PE of SLR Consulting (traffic engineer), Joe Versteeg, Independent Building & Fire Code consultant, Brian Miller, AICP, and John Matthews, AIA.

Attorney Shansky introduced the applicant's team and explained both the project and CGS 8-30g briefly. She indicated when considering an 8-30g application, the Commission has the burden of protection of substantial public interest, not the applicant. Deviations from the underlying zoning code are shown both on the site development plan as well as within the Affordability Plan. 12 of the 18 units will be market rate while 6 will be designated as affordable. Of this 6, 3 will be restricted at 80% area median income and 3 will be restricted at 60% area median income. This is a set-aside development with a 40-year deed restriction, not a government subsidized housing development. The Affordability Plan has been submitted in accordance with CGS 8-30g. All units are comparable. Atty Shansky indicated that the development implements goals of the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) and the Town's Affordable Housing Plan. CGS 8-30g requires 10% of a municipality's housing stock be designated as affordable. Municipalities that do not provide this 10% are subject to the affordable housing appeals process in CGS 8-30g. Madison, per the 2021 Affordable Housing Appeals List provided by the State, has 1.68% affordable housing. Attorney Shansky further stated that this project helps add units and adds housing diversity as emphasized in the Town's POCD. The project incorporates architectural vernacular and robust landscaping that is in harmony with the area.

Michael Ott, PE, LS explained the site characteristics and location stating that the parcel is 1.69 acres and currently improved with two buildings. There are existing driveways on Mill Rd & Cottage Rd with gravel parking area in between. Along Cottage Rd there is dense landscape material existing. At the corner of Mill Rd. & Cottage Rd, a large Beech tree exists and a granite mile marker. Mr. Ott explained there is a pond on site that is surrounded by lawn with the northern border of the parcel being wooded. There is an existing stone wall along the northern property line. There is a single-family dwelling to the north, multi-family development to the east, and State-owned land to the south and west. Mr. Ott said that Richard Snarsky delineated the inland wetland/watercourse boundary on the property. The elevation of the pond water fluctuates seasonally and ranges between el. 3 and el. 5. The topography on the site is such that except for the curb cuts on Mill Rd & Cottage Rd, it drains into the site, not onto roads or adjacent parcels (except for the pond which extends onto 41 Cottage Rd).

Chairman Snow asked if the pond is natural or manmade. Mr. Ott indicated that he was told that it was excavated in the 1980's. There is no inlet or outlet to the pond.

Mr. Ott continued explaining that the site is served by public water which is available on both Mill Rd and Cottage Rd. Overhead power lines exist and gas is available on Cottage Rd however, the existing site is not served by it. No formal storm drainage system is within Cottage Rd but there is one on Mill Rd. The drainage on Mill Rd discharges to tidal wetlands to the west near Hammonasset Connector. The property is located in an R-2 Zone and within the coastal boundary and partially within the special flood hazard area zone, AE el. 11. The property is not located within a high hazard zone. The adjacent zoning boundaries are shown on the site map including

Commercial, Transition, and R-2. The pond is not tidally influenced but is an interception of the ground water table.

Demolition plan includes removal of existing buildings, parking areas, and driveways. There is some tree removal shown on the plan. Tree protection is shown for the Beech tree at the corner of Mill Rd. & Cottage Rd.

Mr. Ott began explaining the proposed development. There will be a 3 story multifamily building with 18, 1-bedroom units with a building footprint of approximately 7775sq.ft. Parking area is proposed in the front of the building with 27 spaces provided. ADA parking spaces are also provided. There is a sidewalk that internally connects Mill Rd to Cottage Rd to the driveway at 41 Cottage Rd. There is a designated trash collection area and enclosure on site. Lighting consists of 4 pole mounted lights on sight. Building lighting includes recessed lighting at entrances to each unit.

Utilities, including water, power, and communications will all come in below grade from Cottage Rd. The septic tanks are located along Mill Rd with leaching fields towards the rear of the property near Mill Rd. The system was located as such to keep as far away from the pond and the constructed stormwater wetland. As the design is greater than or equal to 2000 gallons/day, State and local health dept approvals are required. Both approvals have been secured.

Mr Ott detailed the stormwater management system for the new development. He indicated that the stormwater drains inwardly to the site and will continue to do so. There will be a single catch basin in the parking area. Sidewalks, and a major portion of the parking area drain to the catch basin. From there water enters the diverter. This diverts the volume of water to be treated to the treatment structure. From there, the treated stormwater flows down gradient to the constructed stormwater wetland. The runoff from 90% of the rainfall events will be sent to the treatment system and wetland. In large events, the water will be temporarily stored in infiltrators located below the parking area. That water then goes through a control structure to the constructed wetland. In proposed conditions, a larger amount of stormwater will drain to Cottage Rd. It is a small amount and will not have an impact on Cottage Rd. Details of this are located in the drainage report submitted.

The goal of the system is to treat stormwater and keep it on site and not tax the road stormwater system or the tidal wetlands. The system is designed in accordance with the 2004 CTDEEP Stormwater Manual and Town standards. The treatment structure is considered the secondary treatment and the constructed stormwater wetland is considered the primary treatment. A stormwater wetland is an excavated area that seasonal reaches the water table to support any plantings. A small berm will be constructed and planted that will separate the wetland from the pond. When the pond surface elevation rises or floods, water floods onto 41 Cottage Rd around the pond. A formal drainage easement will be established with the property owner.

Cmsr Hay asked where the drainage from the buildings go. Mr. Ott responded that roof leaders go directly to the stormwater wetland. Roof water under CTDEEP guidance does not have to be treated but this proposal is treating it in the stormwater wetland. Cmsr. Hay asked how much does the pond rise during major storms and will it be mitigated or increased. Mr. Ott responded that if stormwater leaves a site, typically analysis is done to show no down stream effects. No off-site analysis is required here. He indicated that it is difficult to estimate how much the pond surface will rise, but a conservative analysis was done as if the pond was a bathtub with a solid bottom. The

pond surface would rise 10 inches. The lowest elevation of grade at the north side of the property is 6ft. higher than the pond.

Cmsr Bodinson stated that only excess stormwater from a portion of the site goes onto Cottage Rd. With a goal of not taxing the Town's stormwater system, and if Cottage Rd doesn't have a stormwater system, isn't that an automatic overtaxing?

Mr. Ott responded that about 700ft east of the intersection of Mill Rd & Cottage Rd is a highpoint on Cottage Rd. There are four catch basins at the intersection of Mill Rd. & Cottage Rd. From that high point, water then drains to the east towards Windermere development. From the 700ft line, that drainage goes west towards Mill Rd & Cottage Rd intersection.

Cmsr Bodinson asked how stormwater is guided down Cottage Rd to the intersection of Mill & Cottage Roads. Mr. Ott stated that even without gutters, water flows along the gutter line or dirt curb along the grass line. There is very little opportunity for water to go off the road along that 700ft. Because of this, it ponds where it is flat in the road in front of the property. This is an existing condition of the road and when a rain event ends, eventually the water goes away. The applicant is aware of this situation and explored this further and did preliminary designs to install drainage, widen Cottage Rd and alleviate the flooding issue for roughly 260ft of road length.

Mr. Ott began discussing the special flood hazard zone. The property is located in a special flood hazard zone AE el. 11, not a coastal high hazard area zone, known as a velocity or coastal A zone. The property is not in either of those zones. Residential development is not prohibited in a special flood hazard zone, otherwise places like Middle Beach Rd wouldn't exist. The design of this project must comply with Federal FEMA regulations, Town Flood plain ordinance, and the building code. The Town engineer reviews flood compliance as the flood plain manager.

Mr. Ott indicated that there has been lots of conversation about the well to the north of the property at 42 Mill Rd. During the Inland Wetland application process, the applicant's team could not visually see the well at 42 Mill Rd. Mr. Ott spoke to CT Water and they confirmed that the property at 42 Mill Rd was not publicly served by water. He looked at building dept records and historic imagery and estimated the well location the best he could. At some point, he found the well was now visible from the project site. The project surveyor located the well with reflectorless technology without going onto the adjacent property. The survey is submitted as part of the record and was sent to the State Health Dept. There has been discussion about needing a 150ft. separating distance from the well at 42 Mill Rd and septic systems. The well was installed in 1976 and a well completion report is on record with the Town. The well driller at the time estimated the yield of the well to be 15 gallons/minute. The State requires a 75ft separating distance for a withdrawal rate of 10 gallons/minute. If there is a greater draw, the State requires a 150ft. separating distance. There is no evidence in Town records that the pump in the well at 42 Mill Rd has a withdrawal rate exceeding 10 gallons/minute. A yield test is different than a withdrawal rate. The yield test that was completed on the property was done using the bailing method, which is done by rope. This is different than the well pumping rate. There is no information on town records regarding the specific pump in the well at 42 Mill Rd. Mr. Ott indicated that he spoke with SIMA Well Company. The industry standard for a single-family residence is 3-5 gallons/minute. Typically, well pumps are installed to manage this rate which is usually a 7 gallon/minute pump. Mr. Ott indicated that the applicant has done its due diligence to investigate the location of the well and the type of pump in it. He noted that the property owner of 42 Mill Rd stated he would be pulling his well pump to

determine the pump rate and that the State asked for this information four months ago on April 18, 2022.

Cmsr Hitchcock asked Mr. Ott to clarify the law regarding separating distances from the well. Mr. Ott stated that it's extremely unusual to have a residence with a greater withdrawal rate than 10 gallons/minute. The law is that if there is less than 10 gallons/minute withdrawal rate, then the separating distance to a septic system is 75ft. If there is over 10 gallons/minute withdrawal rate, then the separating distance increases to 150ft.

Mr. Ott indicated that the proposed septic system is down gradient from the well at 42 Mill Rd and that groundwater flow direction is away from the well as documented by the wastewater engineer during the inland wetland review process. At this time, both State and local health department approvals have been issued.

Mr. Ott detailed the proposed landscape plan which included extensive plantings. He highlighted this by focusing on specific wetland planting areas and the number of plugs proposed. There are shrubs and trees proposed throughout the site and a separation in the rear yard between mowed lawn and a "no-mow" mix. The applicant plans to remove invasive plant species along the northern property line and plant some evergreens. Deciduous trees are proposed along Mill Rd. and smaller plantings near the old Beech tree at the intersection and along Cottage Rd. In the landscape architect's documents, detailed maintenance plans are also provided.

Cmsr Hay asked if there was screening along the east and west sides but not the north. Mr. Ott responded that there are existing evergreens on adjacent properties to the north but that the applicant will be removing invasive species.

Carl Giordano, traffic engineer, from SLR Consulting presented the traffic findings. The firm studied existing conditions, site traffic and future conditions. They determined traffic impact, parking demand, and made recommendations. He stated that their investigation found no impacts to traffic and they acknowledge seasonal influx of vehicles in the area. Studies were done at Cottage & Mill Roads intersection including traffic counts and accident records. There was only one accident at Boston Post Rd and Mill Rd within the last three years.

The traffic study findings indicate this is a low volume area. Cottage Rd is 17-18ft wide and considered a slow neighborhood road. There is no noticeable impact on traffic from this development. 10 additional trips (ins and outs) are anticipated during am and pm peak hours. Mr. Giordano discussed fire truck maneuverability into and out of the subject site. He indicated that site lines can be improved by trimming vegetation. He indicated that the speed limit sign could either be relocated on Mill Rd or a second sign added prior to Cottage Rd intersection. Mr. Giordano indicated that they looked at neighboring uses when studying the development and then created a parking demand number. This was compared to industry standards and the result was 24 cars expected. 27 parking spaces are proposed, so this is considered adequate.

Cmsr Hay asked if fire trucks needed to only come from the north direction and asked if the Fire Dept has seen this proposal and approved it. Mr. Ott responded on behalf of the applicant and indicated that the downtown fire dept is located to the west on Route 1 and the North Madison volunteer fire dept is way up north. Looking at the lower left diagram of Mr. Giordano's slideshow presentation, Mr Ott asked if that was a truck entering or leaving site, shown as a green movement.

If a truck came north on Mill Rd heading north, could a truck turn into the subject site off Mill? Mr. Giordano answered yes. The upper left diagram shows the turn accessible from the north as well. Mr. Ott indicated that the apparatus measurement is from the Town's largest ladder truck.

Cmsr Bodinson asked if a fire truck could turn left on Mill. Mr. Giordano answered yes.

Cmsr Bodinson asked if this applied to any other large truck or just fire trucks. Mr. Giordano indicated any truck could make the turn but that the fire truck would be the largest vehicle coming into the site.

Cmsr Bodinson stated that a moving truck or fire truck could not make a right turn out of the site onto Cottage Rd heading west. Mr. Giordano agreed. Cmsr Bodinson questioned why this was the case, road width, size of truck, skewed driveway? Mr. Giordano indicated that if the driveway were reconfigured, Cottage Rd expanded and truck could likely turn right out of the site.

Cmsr Bodinson recalled from Mr. Giordano's presentation that there is little traffic impact anticipated to the east on Cottage Rd. He indicated this statement wasn't accurate. He also indicated that vegetation on Mill Rd is overgrown and an additional speed sign could be helpful. He stated the Town hasn't made any improvements to that area in years. Mr. Ott responded that he witnessed evidence of recent tree trimming in the area. He also stated that as former Town Engineer and Public Works Director for the Town of Madison, he personally has measured all the town's vehicle apparatus. School buses would not enter the site. Pick up and drop off of school children would be on either Mill or Cottage Roads. Site entrances are not designed for construction entrances. Those are temporary entrances during construction. Fire ladder trucks are the largest vehicle to be accommodated on site. In a residential development, the design is for the largest emergency vehicle responding. In commercial sites, the design would be for the largest tractor trailer visiting the site. This is standard engineering practice. With respect to trips currently happening today, fire, school buses, garbage trucks currently drive down Cottage Rd today.

Cmsr Bodinson asked if standard practice allows for trucks to turn into adjacent lane on a small town road. He wondered if the Town has taken any steps to widen the road. He indicated he was concerned that the Town won't widen the road. Mr. Ott stated that ultimately the decision of widening the road would involve discussion with town staff and the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Joe Versteeg, Fire & Building Code consultant, indicated that the fire safety code has specific requirements for entering sites and requires the ability for adequate turning radii and access to the property. He stated that the design meets all standards and they have the ability to drive through the site and not trap a fire truck. This design is compliant with all aspects of fire safety code.

Mr. John Matthews, AIA, detailed the architectural design of the building. He stated they are essentially 9 duplexes. He detailed the floor plans and indicated that six units on the first floor will be deed restricted as affordable housing.

Chairman Snow asked if the height of the building was based on the flood zone. Mr. Matthews answered yes that the building will have a 4ft crawl space with all mechanicals above the base flood elevation.

Cmsr Hay asked if there will be no porches off the 1st floor units in the rear of the building. Mr. Matthews said that was correct.

Cmsr Bodinson asked why some of the units weren't two bedrooms. Mr. Matthews stated that the open floor area in some units is not considered a bedroom and could be used as a tv room or office.

Mr. Joe Versteeg, Building and Fire Code Consultant detailed his independent review of the application. Additionally, he submitted his CV for the record. Mr. Versteeg determined the plans are compliant with both the current and proposed building and fire codes. State building code and statute require detailed construction drawings for this project and those will be submitted to the Building Official and Fire Marshal for review. Once they determine substantial compliance, a permit can be issued, inspections are required, then a certificate of occupancy is required prior to occupancy. The Fire Marshal has annual compliance inspections and can enter for inspections on a complaint driven basis.

Mr. Brian Miller, AICP, Planning Consultant, reviewed the development for consistency with the town's Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD). He indicated that the proposal conforms to the POCD and will benefit the neighborhood. The project provides both affordable housing and market rate unit diversity. This proposal is less intense than adjacent uses. Mr. Miller indicated there is regional accessibility to the site as well as proximity to other services as it is located along major commercial corridors. With respect to community character, this project is compatible. Historically, Cottage Rd has had more density than the properties to the north.

Mr. Miller explained that except for density and lot coverage, all standards of the R-2 zone are met with the proposal. Additionally most of Cottage Rd is located in a Transition Zone and he found it odd that this one parcel on the corner was excluded from the zone. The housing profile of the town is dominated by detached single family dwellings on individual lots. There is little diversity. The average sales price is \$500,000, which excludes a lot of people from town. This development helps address the need. The town is currently excluding a whole portion of the workforce. With respect to affordability, the Town's Plan reinforces the finding of need for housing and identifies that other areas of town may be appropriate for multi-family. Mr. Miller provided examples of salaries for Madison Board of Education teachers and other employees. He explained their eligibility for affordable housing. He also went through roughly 55 occupational categories of Town employees that would be eligible for affordable housing. These small affordable projects are good ways for Madison to help reach their affordable goals and keep in character with the community.

Attorney Marjorie Shansky had no additional comments prior to opening up for public questions.

Chairman Snow asked for questions from the public.

Robert Marzitelli-22 Todd's Mill Circle- decided to make comments later on in the hearing.

Rossi Feratovic- 42 Mill Rd- How does the Town expect to have such a large building on that small property? Mr. Feratovic felt it was not acceptable and questioned the ability to have fire truck access, septic system concerns regarding effluent and location of the system in proximity to his well and the adjacent pond. Mr. Ott indicated that the wastewater effluent is discharged into the ground per State and local regulations. The septic system is located at the northwest corner of the lot.

Barbara Moore-20 Edinburgh Ln- Asked what the expectancy of the life of the leaching fields would be. She questioned who maintains the system and is responsible for repairs. Additionally, she

asked how it can be located right next to a well. Lastly, she mentioned that the applicant calls for 18 new vehicles on the site, but more likely it will be 32 new vehicles. Will a stop light be installed?

Deb King-49 Cottage Rd- Indicated that 27 parking spaces will be provided not 36. Where will additional parking be located? Can people park on adjacent roads? Lofts are technically not a bedroom but if they are used as one, how will this be addressed? There are current drought conditions. Pond appears to be lower in elevation. Have dilution calculations been updated to reflect lower pond levels? On CT State library website, there is a pond in a historic 1934 photo. Have you seen it? Mr. Gentile previously told the Commission during a zone change meeting that it's natural and spring fed. Why is the Town making the neighbor pay to pull his pump to determine the withdrawal rate?

Don More-20 Edinburgh Ln- How do you weight the cost vs. benefit? It will be harder for neighbors to sell their houses.

Maureen Drouin- 73 River Rd- I haven't heard any other approved developments in the area taken into account for traffic, Wellington & Marina Landing. Are these accounted for?

Brianna O'Neill- 49 Cottage Rd- How is this impacting the health, safety, integrity, nature and history of the community?

Robert Marzitelli- 20 Todd's Mill Circle- How can this meeting be held given my email to the Commission with 4 major issues? How can Mr. Ott advocate that 42 Mill Rd is a single family residence when documents from the Town indicate otherwise? How has the Town not addressed the narrow road that is Cottage Rd?

Barbara More- 20 Edinburgh Ln- The Commission previously did not allow 4 units on the property, what is the reasoning behind this?

Paula Steere- 48 Deveron Dr- Who in the past has put temporary no parking signs along Mill Rd? With respect to the septic system, how many filters are being used? Has this system been used before for residential developments and who monitors the filters?

Eileen O'Neill- 49 Cottage Rd- Why is Town considering changing a residential zone on such a small piece of land with environmental issues, neighbor's well, etc? How is application happening with a pending Inland Wetland Agency appeal?

Tom Sullivan- 49 Cottage Rd- Applicant has been given plenty of time to talk. Can neighbor's be given the same amount of time? John Matthews said units are technically 1 bedroom. Will Commission consider issues if used as 2 bedrooms? Have you done a site walk? Have you seen how the developer impacted our property with the previous approval at 41 Cottage?

Dave Major- 111 Acorn Rd- What is average lot size in Madison and average square footage of homes? Mill Rd is heavily traveled. What that downplayed? What was the volume of traffic on Mill Rd each day? Why was this specific location chosen? Can lofts be used as bedrooms? What's the plan to prevent this?

Robert Marzitelli, 20 Todd's Mill Circle- Why is this meeting being held?

9 - *Madison Planning and Zoning Commission, Regular Meeting, August 18, 2022*

Dave Major- 111 Acorn Rd- Why is the public's time so limited?

No additional questions were raised. The applicant had no further comments for the evening.

Chairman Snow asked if the Commission would like to continue the hearing to September 1, 2022. Cmsr Hay motioned to continue the hearing to September 1, 2022. Cmsr Hitchcock seconded.

IN FAVOR: 4
OPPOSED: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

Motion carried and the hearing was continued to September 1, 2022.

REGULAR MEEETING:

Pending Application(s)

22-19. New Road. Map 60, Lot 18, RU-2. Owner/Applicant: 155 New Road Madison, LLC; Petition for Zone Boundary Change, Planned Development District per Sec. 32 to construct 29, 980 +/- sq.ft. medical/ office building with associated site improvements. ***(Received on 8/4/22; set public hearing date)***

Chairman Snow motioned to schedule the public hearing for this application on September 15, 2022. Cmsr Hitchcock seconded.

IN FAVOR: 4
OPPOSED: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

Motion carried and the hearing was scheduled September 15, 2022.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: July 7, 2022 and July 21, 2022

Cmsr Hitchcock entertained a motion for the July 7, 2022 meeting minutes. Chairman Snow motioned to approve as drafted, Cmsr Bodinson seconded. Cmsr Hay abstained from voting.

IN FAVOR: 3
OPPOSED: 0
ABSTAINED: 1

Cmsr Hitchcock indicated he was not in attendance for this meeting and the minutes should reflect such. He then entertained a motion for the July 21, 2022 meeting minutes. Cmsr Bodinson motioned to approve as corrected. Cmsr Hay seconded. Cmsr Hitchcock abstained from voting.

IN FAVOR: 3
OPPOSED: 0
ABSTAINED: 1

REMARKS: **Commission Chair** – Chairman Snow indicated that the Commission has a new alternate member, John Dusza who will be attending the next meeting.

Town Planner – Erin Mannix informed the Commission that our next meeting of September 1, 2022 will include a kick-off with our planning consultant, John Guskowski for the POCD update. We'll look to use the 1st meeting of the month to dedicate time to the Plan update.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hay made the motion to adjourn at 11:07pm; seconded by Commissioner Hitchcock.

IN FAVOR: 4
OPPOSED: 0
ABSTAINED: 0

Respectfully submitted,
Erin Mannix, Town Planner