

MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING HELD ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2015, AT 7:30 P.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410.

Present

Earl J. Kurtz, Chairman; Sean Stollo, Vice Chairman; Edward Gaudio, Secretary;
Members: John Kardaras, Vincent Lentini, Gil Linder, Louis Todisco, David Veleber.
Alternates - Jon Fischer and Diane Visconti
Absent: S. Woody Dawson, Leslie Marinaro (alternate)
Staff: William Voelker, Town Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Kurtz called the public hearing to order at 7:31 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll.

III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Following roll call a quorum was determined to be present.

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

Town Planner Voelker read the call of public hearing for all the applications.

Chairman Kurtz moved agenda item #5 to current status.

V. BUSINESS

- 5. Special Permit Application**
Dennis P. Matfus
8 East Ridge Court
In-law Apartment

PH 9/28/15
MAD 12/2/15

Mr. Matfus informed the Commission that there is an in-law apartment over the garage at 8 East Ridge Court, which has been there for 30 years. He has not re-applied for approval for this apartment. The house is now up for sale and he must reapply for the special permit for the in-law apartment.

The Commission was told by Mr. Voelker that the apartment is less than 750 sq. ft. and is consistent with the regulations.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chairman Kurtz moved agenda item #3 to current status.

3. Zone Text Change Petition
Fredric M. Kudish
Section 30, Schedule A
Subsection 23C-to permit outdoor events
On a working farm.

PH 7/13/15
PH 9/28/15
MAD 12/2/15

Rebecca Parkin, Milone & MacBroom, represented the applicant. Ms. Parkin stated there is an amendment to the zone text change -- removal of barn buildings and other farm buildings in the area for events, per the Cheshire Fire Department comments.

Ms. Visconti asked about the following: item #10, food service, compliance with State codes, if this includes water; taking out the noise section which has no teeth; neighborhood complaints about events, and PZC saying "no" to future events, or not approving the permit.

In response, Ms. Parkin said there is water included and compliance with all State codes. The noise issue would come under the jurisdiction and enforcement of the Cheshire Police Department (CPD). Complaints about noise would be in violation of zoning, and be dealt with by CPD.

If there are noise complaints, Mr. Voelker said the PZC could consider requirement of approval on an annual basis for the special permit. He explained that DEEP noise regulations are not zoning regulations, and PZC has no power to enforce them. If there are concerns about noise, the special permit could be on an annual basis, and PZC could deny it. The property owner must keep track of events, book them in advance, and this would be difficult with approval on an annual basis.

The Commissioners discussed noise complaints, events ending earlier, i.e. 8 p.m., which some considered too early, limiting the type of party being hosted, 9 p.m. ending time, and their priority consideration being the residents of Cheshire.

It was clarified by Ms. Parkin that with a special permit it is a case by case basis; the special permit is on the property not event by event process; the buffer could be issued for different properties at the discretion of the Commission. She noted Ives Farm is 100 acres, an event could be held in the middle of the farm; Bishops Farm is a smaller site with houses around it; there would be two different rules for two different properties; and the permit does not have to be the same.

According to Mr. Voelker the permit is not the same as different properties have different layouts. Each property is reviewed individually; layouts would be modified on each property; and there could be a year by year special permit. The Commission is discussing the fundamental rules for a special permit application, and there will be differences which cannot be seen now.

Chairman Kurtz commented on the fact that this is a zone change, and it is not for any particular property.

For a special permit for Farm A, Mr. Todisco stated the Commission could state a setback of 300 feet due to surrounding houses, or maximum number of attendees is 300 rather than 400. The special permit is developed for each property, and he suggested the following language...*"The Planning and Zoning Commission may, when acting on an application for a special permit, specify maximum attendees, setback requirements and specific uses different than set forth in this regulation"*.

Mr. Voelker said the Commission would be more restrictive for a special permit based on the testimony, and information and layout will be described; neighbors will give their opinion on the application; and the Commission could be more restrictive than the regulations. There will be criteria involved; the farm must be 25 acres in size; a formal petition could be submitted for lower acreage in the future. For noise complaints and concerns, there can only be enforcement per the regulations, and special permits on an annual basis could affect hosting events, and there is a timing issue.

Since this is a special permit, Mr. Kardaras said the Commission can do things with this permit.

Mr. Lentini supports going with an annual special permit, see how it goes, and it could be changed in the future.

For this application, Ms. Parking said we are looking at the base level for any application, and time can be changed, additional setbacks could be imposed.

The Commissioners discussed distances from property lines, the right to modify on an application basis, more emphatic wording, modifying parameters including sight distances and towns cited with existing regulations. It was agreed that language proposed should be formalized; the applicant should see this language with the right to review it; and the public hearing should be continued to October 14th. Mr. Voelker will provide the language suggested by the Commission and forward it to the applicant's representative.

Regarding the removal of the language about "barns and other farm buildings" per the CFD recommendation, Mr. Veleber said there may be a farm with farm buildings that qualify for events within fire safety codes. Also, a farmer may want to build a barn to host events.

In reply, Mr. Veleber said there are too many fire codes to be met, and he does not believe a barn would come close to meeting fire and safety codes. There could be an amendment to the regulations regarding transformation of the property, and this would require serious consideration by the Commission.

Stating his support of this regulation, Mr. Strollo wants to insure the right regulations for the neighborhoods.

In that regard, Ms. Parkin stated the regulation is proposed to include time frames, buffers, etc. with the neighbors in mind.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 14, 2015.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Sidewalk Waiver Request | PH 9/16/15 |
| <u>Apex Developers LLC</u> | PH 9/28/15 |
| Coleman Road | MAD 12/2/15 |
| 2. Subdivision Application | PH 9/16/15 |
| <u>Apex Developers LLC</u> | PH 9/28/15 |
| Coleman Road | MAD 12/2/15 |
| 7 lots (6 new; 1 existing) | |

Attorney Anthony Fazzone and Ryan McEvoy, P.E. Milone and MacBroom represented the applicant, Apex Developers LLC.

Attorney Fazzone stated the subdivision application is submitted as a reasonable and appropriate use of the parcel of land. The property has been in the Coleman Family for five generations; has been in the same configuration; and was carved out as the restrictive R-80 zoning. The subdivision application received IWW approval. The applicant agrees with the conditions set forth in the Cheshire Fire Department comments. The cul de sac meets all of the requirements of Section 5.5 of the Subdivision Regulations.

At the prior public hearing the access issue was raised by the abutting property owners (Watts). The applicant's position, using the language of Section 6.6 of the Subdivision Regulations, is that it would not be appropriate for the Commission to require the applicant to provide access to the adjacent property. The Commission must recognize that any access strip is deeded to the Town; for any subdivision, a street not developed, must be treated as a road; each lot in the subdivision must be able to meet setback requirements and other requirements as if the road were completed.

Exhibit # 1 - shows the effect of the access on the subdivision; requiring access is not appropriate; shows physical characteristics of the adjacent land; and proposal of road coming from this property would be inappropriate.

Mr. Fazzone stated the applicant submitted information re: Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), which suggests consideration of the suitability of the land for possible extension of the road. The PZC should consider the land and appropriateness and suitability of the access when completed, and possibility for extension through that land. The POCD also shows concerns about Broad Brook Reservoir, wetlands and water sheds and public water supply (pages 11, 12 and 14). Page 17, #2, section on Physical Fields was read into the record by Mr. Fazzone. Page 18, #7 was read into the record by Mr. Fazzone.

Ryan McEvoy, P.E. submitted exhibits to the Commission.

Exhibit #1 - existing conditions, Watts Parcel, Assessors Lot 80-2.

Exhibit #2 - impact of right of way extension.

Extension of the road way (in red) would result in lot #4 being reduced to 60,000 sq.ft. from 80,000 sq. ft.; the septic system on the site would have the right of way over it. Lot #5 would have part of the driveway located within the right of way for future road construction purposes, and this is not favorable to Town staff.

The second exhibit shows the right of way extension (in red) towards the Watts parcel; it is 600 feet in length; 30,000 sq. ft. in area; the first was 525 feet long, 27,000 sq. feet in area for the right of way extension; lot #5 would have the same constraints as in exhibit #1; a longer section of the driveway would be in the right of way for future road purposes. The driveway would go directly through where this house is currently proposed; in order to develop this lot with the setbacks in mind for the right of way, the house would have to shift back closer to the upland review area, with septic system moved back into the upland review area associated with the wetland corridor.

Mr. Ryan said he has shown how the right of way seriously impacts on the development of lot #5, and loss of 1 or 2 lots would be detrimental to the owner and the applicant.

Exhibit #3 - Existing Conditions Plan of the adjacent Watts parcel, 45 acres and abnormal shape. The plan shows the right of way and where it would come into the subject application parcel. The gray area is the deep slopes in excess of 15%, which is a number of concern in the regulations. There is a long corridor, extending north to south, through the property with smaller water courses that feed into the stream on the western side. This is located within the Broad Brook Reservoir; there are environmental impacts; there are areas of significant steep slopes and wetland corridors.

The issue of the road going around the back side of Tamarack and joining into Tamarack on the other side was discussed by Mr. Watts as a possibility at the last public hearing. Mr. McEvoy said the road would go over multiple streams in order to do this, would require DEEP approval and Army Corp of Engineers.

PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Vincent Masciana, 643 Tamarack Road, addressed the Commission, stating his lot is the corner lot with Apex to the west and Watts parcel to the south. Any proposed road would come around the side of his property. Mr. Masciana read a statement into the record regarding the right of way/easement to develop a road in the future from the Apex subdivision, across Watts's property, and reconnect on Tamarack Road. He understands this is not part of the Apex application with no formal application on the table for the easement. Mr. Masciana is opposed to granting such an easement for the development of the proposed road.

Michael Simone, 639 Tamarack Road, stated his opposition to the development, his concern about IWW minutes for the minor berm to move water off the property. He said his property gets wet, and additional runoff will affect his leeching fields and saturate his property. In the PZC minutes of 9/16/15, Mr. Simone noted the HOA would be responsible for maintenance of the basins, without specific recourse cited if the basins are not maintained and flood properties. He commented on the issue of wild life that transverse the properties on a daily basis; Tamarack Road having the worst water pressure in Town; more development in the area further decreasing water pressure; the need for installation of pumps to increase pressure and the needs for the fire department.

Mr. McEvoy advised the berm is small, about 1.5 feet high, and was placed there by the town engineer; a portion of the site has runoff directed to the north wetland corridor; there is no increase in flows or runoff leaving the site. Regarding detention basins and management/maintenance by an HOA, this is standard Town practice with the Town's ability to make repairs if the HOA does not perform these tasks. The water supply system and pressure is dictated by the RWA requirements.

With regard to the issue of maintenance of the water basins, Attorney Fazzino noted that he introduced a set of model declarations, covenants, and restrictions. The document was reviewed by the Town Engineer and Town Attorney for input and impact, listing specifics of HOA maintenance required and compliance.

Barbara Coleman Heckler, 620 Windsor Court, stated she and neighbors want to protect their investment in their homes, appreciate creativity on the homes within the cul de sac, the appreciation of the due diligence of the PZC and Town Engineers for the Platt Knoll development of 32 homes in two phases. Ms. Heckler commented on the access from Wallingford Road to Tamarack Road serving 33 homes, the roadway access in this area of Town (Tudor, Stewart, Tamarack, Windsor). She talked about the introduction of an easement at the end of the cul de sac, which will not provide better emergency access. For the 44 acre Watts parcel she suggested Commissioners drive the Tamarack cul de sac, see the home being developed on the parcel which has wetland issues, the roadway foundation that is already paved for consideration of a future road. Ms. Heckler and the neighbors want to be good neighbors to surrounding properties.

Dennis Waz, Director of Public Utilities, City of Meriden, commented that Broad Brook Reservoir is an important water resource for Meriden and parts of Cheshire, providing domestic and fire services. He pointed out the site of the Meriden property on the plans, two parcels of 30 acres and 80 acres. Mr. Waz talked about the many environmental issues, and stated Meriden's opposition to extension of the cul de sac area of the Coleman subdivision, which would not be a benefit to the water shed. He cited Section 6.6 of the regulations and read an excerpt into the record. According to Mr. Waz the extension is inappropriate and would create serious issues to the water supply. He informed the Commission that the city is spending \$17 million to upgrade the Broad Brook treatment plant, which includes changing technology to protect drinking

water supply. Mr. Wax requested the PZC take the drinking water supply into consideration when making its decision.

Attorney Joan Malloy, 152 South Main Street, Wallingford CT, represented the Watts family, and noted she submitted a letter for the September 16th public hearing which was read into the record. Ms. Malloy stated the connection suggested is coming from the Subdivision Regulations, which says when a subdivision comes in for consideration, there is supposed to be provision for future road connections when there is an undeveloped adjacent piece of property.

According to Ms. Malloy there is no actual proposal to extend this road or impact the wetlands at this time. It is a request of PZC to enforce the provision of the regulations that provides for future ability to do the road. If the Commission decides not to require a 50 foot strip for the connection, it precludes any future development regardless of how it is proposed and whether it has minimal impact to the environment. Her client understands the importance of the water shed area and its protection, but people are making decisions on something not being proposed. Ms. Malloy is asking for creation of the possibility for that roadway connection, and noted there is talk on whether this property can be developed.

John Whitcomb, P.E. North Haven, CT addressed the Commission regarding development of the Watts parcel. He stated the soils in the upland area are conducive to developing on site septic systems; there are steep slopes; access can be made; stream crossings are permitted and done all the time as long as DEEP water quality manual is followed in handling of storm water during construction, and water quality requirements can be met. Mr. Whitcomb stated the property can be developed in an environmentally safe manner.

The Commission was told by Attorney Malloy that the proposed road extension has an impact on the applicant's ability to develop their property. There have been communications between the applicant and her client to come to an accommodation, try to find ways causing no impact for loss of lots to Apex. Her client is willing to compensate and give the applicant land to not lose a lot for the road extension.

Vice Chairman Strollo stated that Mr. Watts made the request for a future road and connection is between the applicant and Watts is not part of the subject application.

In reply, Ms. Malloy said the Commission has presentation of a plan which claims the applicant cannot lose a lot potential because the road has sufficient acreage. She said this is an inaccurate representation of the facts in terms of discussion; the road will not be extended until her client submits an application to the town with request to use the right of way; there is no specific information of a proposal other than concern there could be a problem. Without a formal plan the engineer looked at the Watts parcel stating it complies with environmental standards.

When he sees water down a property Mr. Stollo said he sees that as a problem. He is looking at the laterals and sees the water shed and wetlands and said it is a difficult task to build houses. There is a 100 foot drop, 320 to 220 feet.

Ms. Malloy said the engineer looked at it, and said there are ways to handle this without creating an environmental problem.

Ms. Visconti asked for an understanding of the issue -- if the Commission wants to give an easement, it is done now, and it cannot be done in the future.

Stating that is correct, Attorney Malloy said this is the only undeveloped piece that abuts her client's property. She submitted an assessor's map with her letter at the last public hearing, showing the properties around the parcel, already developed with houses. When Tamarack was built the Town required a 50 foot right of way, and this abuts a portion of the Watts property. The Town took this into consideration, said there is undeveloped land which may be connected in the future, and this right of way should be preserved. The Watts want to preserve the possibility for a future road and development. Ms. Malloy said we are talking about future planning. There are 26 houses at the intersection of Stuart and Tamarack Roads, and this is the limit.

Mr. Linder asked about the Watts property abutting additional land to access Wallingford Road.

According to Ms. Malloy there is no other internal land which the Watts property abuts. She pointed out the "orange" color on the map which is her client's property, the right of way, and no frontage on Wallingford Road. The right of way gives potential to make a connection in an appropriate location, and Ms. Malloy also pointed out the easement location to allow a road through the Watts parcel to connect with Tamarack. There are 40+ acres.

With that, Mr. Todisco said there is no longer a cul de sac but a road, and the applicant loses two (2) lots.

Ms. Malloy stated one (1) proposal loses lot #4 and the other has an impact on lot #5, and Watts told Apex they would give them land in order to not lose a lot. The Watts property is still undeveloped.

Mr. Todisco asked Ms. Malloy to point out on the plan that land to be used in the cul de sac configuration.

On the plans, Ms. Malloy pointed out the lots that could be taken.

Mr. Linder asked about Tamarack Road continuing to Wallingford Road, and it is undeveloped.

The Commission was told by Ms. Malloy that the Watts property is still not developed.

For all of this, Ms. Visconti asked if the Commission is setting a precedent.

Mr. Voelker explained that Section 6.6 states continuation of the road, and the Commission has to find the property is appropriate for that. Testimony at the public hearing from the applicant and RWA and City of Meriden, the nature of the property creates difficulties because of water sheds, wet lands, and limitations. If an easement were granted, the entire Apex application goes back to IWW. In doing this the PZC states there is a dedicated public highway that could be built. Everything would go to IWW, Town Engineer, and other Town departments. There are issues regarding a public highway, and everything must be reviewed by other agencies.

Stating she did not appear before the IWW, Ms. Malloy said what was before IWW does not directly impact the ability to do the easement. Her client thought the right of way would be proposed, and does not want Apex to stop the project or lose money.

Sara Buell, 634 Tamarack Road, property owner for 19 years, was told by everyone that the end of Tamarack Road would never be broken; it was a closed development; and there were water sheds, wetlands, and wild life. She said everyone was shocked when the application came forward, and there would be a road built with approval of the opening for the Apex property. She and her husband are opposed to the development. The people who bought the interior property knew it had wetlands and water shed area at the time of purchase.

Joe Moruzzi, 636 Tudor Drive, recently purchased his home, and submitted a map showing he owns part of the cul de sac. He is finishing one of the last houses in the development, and is at the end of Tudor and Tamarack Roads.

The map was looked at by Mr. Voelker who advised this usually means...if the cul de sac is eliminated, the property is Mr. Moruzzi's. The right of way would be set up, road extended, and the Moruzzi property would have a lawn installed by the Town. It is a 50 foot right of way.

Mr. Moruzzi commented on the resistance to the development, and the owner should find another way to extend the access road.

Eric Ehrenfels, 625 Tamarack Road, said it is unwise to consider an easement as there is no formal application at this time. This is pie in the sky, considering the wetlands. He commented on something going on with lot #1, and submitted documents to Mr. Voelker.

Lori Watts, 725 Wallingford Road, said there is confusion discussing something that should not be discussed. The application is for an Apex subdivision. The Watts are looking for access to a larger parcel of land which will be land locked when Apex is finalized. The future of the Watt parcel is yet to be determined. With regard to asking for the access way, she has spoken with Mr. Voelker about the plans and preference for

the plans. Ms. Watts said she has been told the Town would prefer a cul de sac with a 50 foot right of way left for future potential access to the larger parcel of land, and the Watt request is a similar situation. This is a cul de sac and while in the planning stages the Watts should have the right to have access to the larger parcel of land, but not discuss the future use of that parcel as this is not on the docket.

Ms. Simone stated the Watts Family has intentions to develop their property; they have hired an attorney and engineer who state the property can be built on; and to now state they are only talking about an access road into their property is false.

Diane and Edward Colechia, 647 Tamarack Road, stated agreement with their neighbors and the comments made tonight. Mr. Colechia said Apex has explained everything so well, with details, and he hears other hypothetical plans from the Watts. Mrs. Colechia said their property abuts the wetlands; they see wildlife; have lived in the home for 15 years; and they have concerns about protection of the wetlands and eco system. She believes there will be loss of habitat with construction of the Watt property, and looks to the Commission to be the stewards and guardians of the wetlands, water sheds, and eco system.

Attorney Fazzone commented on the Coleman property which has done nothing to create excess problems with the adjacent property. All the problems were created in the past by prior owners. This piece of property had 400+ feet of frontage on Wallingford Road at one time, and this frontage was transferred off. Instead of reserving or keeping title to 50 feet of land which would allow access to the 45 acres, They sold the 400 feet of frontage and kept a right of way. This property is not land locked, has access, and they came back in to subdivide a rear lot.

On the plans Mr. Fazzone pointed out the right of way from Wallingford Road to the Watt property. The Watts property is in orange; the 50 foot right of way comes off Wallingford Road; it services a house cited on the plans; and it was an election when the Watts sold it off to take a right of way instead of ownership of 50 feet. There is plenty of room for the side line with the house located on that lot. This could have been the road that connects, but it can be no longer. The cul de sac conforms to Section 5.6 of the regulations. Other regulations talk about providing easement and access, and the key word is "when appropriate". It brings into discussion the adjoining property for owners seeking this access way, taking into consideration whether it is appropriate or not to leave the access way.

Regarding lot #4 and driveway, Mr. Fazzone said there is no way the adjoining land can be connected to lot #4 because the property lines coincide. If the other path is chosen it would be an odd shaped piece of land added to #4, and would impact lot #5. Granting of the right of way is not an absolute; they have not been granted in many instances; and Mr. Fazzone noted Philson Court as significant...which would have been a perfect access way without wetlands.

Mr. Todisco asked for evidence on Section 6.6 that is making a cul de sac practical and desirable.

In response, Mr. Fazzone said people like to live on a cul de sac rather than a through street. People have stated at this meeting they do not want a through street. Practical is the land being dealt with, which is a narrow parcel, does not have a foreseeable exit from its own land, and the topography works out to make it feasible. He noted there is a limitation on developing the subject parcel of 20 acres, because of the width of the property and wetlands, it cuts it down to 7 lots, with one being the homestead on Coleman Road.

It was noted by Mr. Strollo that there are several cul de sacs in the neighborhood, and this shows the desirability for them in this neighborhood.

According to Mr. McEvoy, the location, length and placement of the cul de sac is appropriate for the development on this parcel. There are 6 lots, the cul de sac length provides safe access for all lots, and the fire department is in agreement. The practicality is that this is the most appropriate way to develop this property.

Attorney Malloy re-addressed the 50 foot right of way and how it might become a road. There is a large pond adjacent to the physical driveway; this would provide substantial physical barrier even if the 50 foot strip is acquired; and, not make the lot non-conforming as to frontage. With the pond there would not be the 50 foot width to build that road, and the implication to change easily from a 50 foot right of way to a 50 foot strip is not that simple. The land is, technically, land locked because it does not have frontage on a public street. It can be accessed. When Philson Court was built, the Watts did not own the land, and the family recently acquired the property. Ms. Malloy said the Commission should consider if this is the appropriate time to raise the easement issue. The Commission must make the decision as to whether or not it is appropriate to preserve the potential for development.

The pond is on the right of way, and Mr. Fazzone will submit the map showing the 50 foot right of way that would encroach 8 feet into the pond area.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CONTINUED TO OCTOBER 14, 2015.

- | | |
|--|--------------------|
| 3. Zone Text Change Petition | PH 7/13/15 |
| <u>Fredric M. Kudish</u> | PH 9/28/15 |
| Section 30, Schedule A | MAD 12/2/15 |
| Subsection 23C-to permit outdoor events | |
| On a working farm. | |
| 4. Special Permit Application | PH 9/28/15 |
| <u>RPG Holding LLC</u> | MAD 12/2/15 |
| 1154 Highland Avenue | |
| Urgent Care Medical Clinic in Existing Building | |

John Mullin and Jarrod Kuttler, Reno Properties Group, LLC, were the applicants for 1154 Highland Avenue. Mr. Kuttler stated they are purchasing the building in the next 30 to 45 days, and are requesting a special permit for an urgent care facility on the first floor, through St. Mary's Hospital, Waterbury CT.

Parking - The applicant is adding a medical facility use; calculated first floor space is 6,422 sq. ft. requiring 43 parking spaces. The 2nd and 3rd floors will be professional office space. There are 105 spaces available on site; the applicant requires 99 spaces. The medical office will have 8 to 10 employees on a daily basis, and patients coming in and out of the office, without many cars occupying the parking lot throughout the day.

Mr. Voelker said there were no additional staff comments, and the Fire Marshal does an annual inspection of buildings in Town. This building has a sprinkler system.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

5. Special Permit Application
Dennis P. Matfus
8 East Ridge Court
In-law Apartment

PH 9/28/15
MAD 12/2/15

6. Digital Format of the updated Cheshire Zoning Map

Mr. Voelker explained that the Town has a GIS System and is working to digitalize the mapping. The request is for PZC endorsement of the format. Staff will be going through old files and changes by the Commission will be filed on the maps.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Mr. Gaudio; seconded by Mr. Veleber.

MOVED to adjourn the public hearing at 9:43 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk