



# Town of Watertown Connecticut

51 Depot Square Business Center

Suite 502, Watertown Connecticut 06795-2200

Planning and Zoning, Zoning Board of Appeals, Conservation Commission/Inland  
Wetland Agency

Telephone: (860) 945-5266

Fax: (860) 945-2704

Website: [www.watertownct.org](http://www.watertownct.org)

## Town of Watertown Planning and Zoning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes

**Time:** 6:30PM  
**Date:** Wednesday, March 3, 2010  
**Place:** Watertown High School  
Lecture Hall  
324 French Street  
Watertown, CT

### 1. Call meeting to order

Chairman Minnich called the meeting to order at 6:30PM.

### 2. Roll Call

Land Use Secretary, Ms. Allen executed the roll call.

**Present:** Chairman, Mr. David Minnich  
Vice Chairman, Mr. Gary Martin  
Mr. Ronald Russ  
Mr. Carl Mancini  
Alternate, Mr. Ken Demirs  
Ms. Marie Genovese  
Mr. Richard Rossi

**Absent:** Mr. Jim Blais  
Mr. Glen Duplissie  
Alternate, Mr. Duane George

**Also Present:** Land Use Administrator, Ms. Ruth Mulcahy  
Land Use Secretary, Ms. Carol Allen

M. Genovese sat in for J. Blais  
K. Demirs sat in for G. Duplissie

3. **Public Participation - none**
4. **Communications and Bills**
  - a. Invoice #3075 dated 2/2/2010 from Slavin Stauffacher & Scott in the amount of \$5,910.00
  - b. Council of Governments Minutes January 8, 2010
  - c. Council of Governments Minutes January 12, 2010
  - d. Naugatuck River Greenway Public Workshop #2 – March 24, 2010 – 7:00PM-9:00PM – John Trumbull School, Oakville, CT

Text of Motion: By Unanimous Consent place on file

5. **Meeting Minutes**
  - a. Regular Meeting February 3, 2010
  - b. Motion Sheet Special Meeting February 17, 2010

Text of Motion: By Unanimous Consent approve 5a-b

6. **Staff Report**
  - a. **Status of incentive housing** – Waiting for notice of award, when the paperwork is received and documents executed and the office receives the check from Policy and Management the consultant will be contacted to get started.
  - b. **Other**

**Mike Garrassino:** Interested in creating a retail operation for the sale of organic foods, and supplies for dogs on Main Street near Horatio's. Ms. Mulcahy asked if he needed to come in for site plan approval for change of use from retail office.

Mr. Minnich said to proceed the way the regulations are stated.

**Pelegano:** Maps are finalized on the land records, the subdivision is moving forward and the bonds were met.

**Valenti – 600 Straits Turnpike:** Review and finalization is recorded.

**Echo Lake Brownfield:** Sent approval back to DEP last week and they will be meeting and reviewing what they want them to accomplish and will contact Ms. Mulcahy on the outcome.

**Apple Rehab:** Left messages not getting any return phone calls.

**The Connecticut Federation of Planning and Zoning Agencies:** Is having their annual conference meeting on March 18, 2010 at the Aqua Turf. There is some money allocated if anyone is interested please contact the office.

**Board Member Concerns:**

Mr. Minnich asked the status of the old drive-in site with approvals for demolition.

Ms. Mulcahy replied DEP is just about ready to issue permits.

**7. Chairman's Report**

**a. Economic Development Strategy**

Chairman Minnich informed the Commission there will be a meeting March 10, 2010 to discuss how to make the land use application process for the town agencies easier to understand and more efficient. Chairman Minnich suggested forming a sub-committee. The members of the sub-committee will be:

D. Minnich, R. Rossi, K. Demirs, G. Duplissie.

**8. Old Business**

**a. Text amendments initiated by Commission members:**

**1. Zoning Regulations – Parking: G. Martin**

Mr. Martin spoke with Attorney Hess and he will e-mail the first draft of the regulations to him and the draft will be forwarded to the Commission. Mr. Hess will focus outside the core areas in the center of town.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Minnich asked about the property areas that were being described are they adjacent to Main Street.

Mr. Martin replied yes.

**2. Zoning and Subdivision Regulations – 2004 CT DEP Storm Water Quality: Chuck Berger, Town Engineer**

Mr. Cavanaugh is working on the 2004 DEP Storm Water Quality Regulations. The regulations will be incorporated into the Zoning Regulations after review and discussion by the Commission.

**3. Zoning Regulations – Section 64 Removal of Earth Materials, and Filling of Land: D. Minnich**

Office staff and the Town Attorney are reviewing the regulations. The second draft will be reviewed for the Commission to schedule a public hearing. Ms. Mulcahy, Mr. Rafey, Building Inspector, Town Engineer, Public Works Director, and the Torrington Health District are involved in this process for their comments for the intention to make the two sections more clear.

**b. Planning and Zoning Operations Committee – G. Duplissie**

Mr. Duplissie was not present to give a report.

**9. New Business time**

**a. Review 2009 planning and zoning law changes with Attorney Paul Jessell**

Attorney Jessell reviewed the changes with the Commission.

**Statutory Changes:**

**Approval times:** Have been extended to six years and the maximum time to eleven for Act 09-181 and Section 8-26c relating to subdivisions and site plans other than businesses for 400,000 square feet or less. Applying only to subdivisions and site plans approved between July 1, 2006 and July 1, 2009.

**Voluntary Pre-Application Reviews:** For regional significant developments such as theater shopping centers or other developments entailing more than 500,000 square feet of indoor commercial industrial space, 250 housing units in a one to three story buildings and developments that have 1,000 parking spaces have imposed on the Regional Planning Agency to provide a voluntary pre-application review with the developer, municipality and the state.

**Conservation and Development:** The State has been granted a reprieve for their plans until 2012 and as a result they granted municipalities a reprieve with regard to their plans of Conservation & Development.

**Case Law**

**Pomfreit - Freedom of Information Complaint** – The Act requires that copies of documents be provided during business hours and would not require someone to make copies in the middle of a public hearing.

**Groop – South Windsor** – The general site plan has to be non binding you must give an opportunity for interveners or other people to talk about that general site plan in conjunction with the discussion of the specific site plan.

**LaMonte Realty – Vernon** – Expansion of what can be discussed during a public hearing.

**Holt – Stonington** – They discussed what would an appealable discussion vs. advisory decisions.

**CCPW – Watertown** – Appeal for a denial of a zone change.

**Bozrath** – ZEO was granted an injunction to inspect a property for zoning violations.

**Ross – Westport** – Commission jurisdiction regardless of whether you have filed an application.

**b. Watertown High School bond reduction – None**

**c. Polk Elementary School bond reduction - None**

**d. Judson School bond reduction - None**

**10. Public Hearings - None**

**11. Articles on Agenda**

<b>a. Applicant:</b>	<b>Joseph Polletta</b>
<b>Re:</b>	<b>Lot Line Revision</b>
<b>At:</b>	<b>Lots 3&amp;4 Lakeview Estates</b>
	<b>Watertown, CT</b>
<b>Zone:</b>	<b>R-30</b>
<b>Action:</b>	<b>Consider acceptance</b>

K. Demirs recused himself from this discussion.

Mr. Polletta said the house on lot #4 is too close to the wetlands and by moving drainage to the edge of the property line it would make the lot more attractive. Mr. Polletta would like to move the easement from the middle of the lot to the edge of the lot.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Mancini said if the lot line revision meets the 30,000 square feet minimum it should not be a problem.

MOTION: Mancini moved to accept the lot line revision as presented

SECOND: Martin.

All in favor 6 – 0

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Martin asked if this was reviewed by Mr. Berger.

Ms. Mulcahy replied he does not have a problem with it.

Mr. Mancini asked about the additional costs taken by Mr. Polletta

Mr. Polletta replied he will create a Mylar and will be done properly.

Mr. Minnich said this drainage issue is a minor revision and is not a requirement to come before them and that staff has authority, however if staff or the applicant want to come to us for our judgment on it that is fine.

Mr. Polletta replied he spoke with the Engineering Department and they said to run it by the board.

Mr. Mancini commented the easement makes sense.

MOTION: Mancini moved to approve the relocation of the drainage line on lot 4 as presented.

SECOND: Martin.

All in favor

K. Demirs returned to the meeting at the end of this item discussion.

**b. Applicant:**

**Agent:**

**Re:**

**At:**

**Zone:**

**Action:**

**Lynn Family**

**Attorney Jim Strub**

**Modification of Southridge Estates**

**Subdivision**

**Bunker Hill Road, Watertown**

**R-70**

**Decision by May 15, 2010**

**Attorney Thomas Parisott**

Southridge Estates is a subdivision from a portion of the Lynn Family Farm on Bunker Hill Road. Mr. Lynn wants to eliminate lots 12 through 21 on the subdivision because he wanted the back acreage to remain as farmland so it does not get developed into housing that was originally approved.

**Bryan Baker – Civil One**

Mr. Baker reviewed the original approved subdivision and the revised map.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Russ asked if Parcel X was left for drainage.

Mr. Baker replied no, parcel X is going to be incorporated back into the lot.

Mr. Parisott said Mr. Berger has reviewed this and issued the opinion that the town has no need for parcel X if Southridge Road is not going to be built. He went before Town Council on Monday night, passed out copies of the draft motion from Attorney Jessell. There is a conjunction request for the revised subdivision map, a complete unconditional release of all the terms and obligations in the development agreement, including return of the original unrecorded deed for Southridge Lane and the release of the 5% fee in the revoking space that would apply to the ten lots that are being eliminated, release of the drainage easement for Southridge Lane lots 18 and 19, a release of the fire safety tank easement for lot 20 and the release of the conservation restriction over lots 1 through 9 and 12 through 15. Newman Holdings need to plant by March 15<sup>th</sup> and are anxious to get this done.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Rossi asked if Parcel X1 and X2 are to remain.

Mr. Parisott replied correct. Mr. Berger indicated the town specifically has use for X2 and that will remain with the town.

Mr. Martin asked about the fee in lieu of.

Mr. Parisott replied the developer's agreement provides for a 5% fee it was a total fee of \$55,000.00 a proportional increment to be paid on the sale of each of the respective lots.

Mr. Minnich said this revision does present another discussion.

Mr. Parisott replied that Gail McTaggart her recollection it was very important in terms of the Commission viewing 5% as the appropriate fee so that Mr. Lynn was committed to keeping the remaining lands that were not going to be this subdivision in farm use.

Mr. Minnich asked if labeling lot 12 as agricultural is an issue.

Mr. Parisott replied no, the Newman family has indicated they are applying immediately upon acquisition for farmland.

**WHEREAS** the Watertown Planning and Zoning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) received a subdivision modification application on March 3, 2010 to merge lots 12 through 21 into one lot 12, remove the 960 foot long cul de sac called Southridge Land, release Parcel X deeded to the Town for drainage, release the portion of the Conservation Easement on Lots 12, 13, 14, and 15, release the 10’ wide drainage easement on Southridge Lane, Release Fire Tank Easement B and to release the 5% fee in lieu of open space on the new Lot 12 consisting of 37.129 acres for a formerly approved 21 lot residential subdivision with 11 lots on a 1160 foot long cul de sac called Old Meadow Lane and 10 lots on a 960 foot long cul de sac called Southridge Lane titled “Southridge Estates”, located on 1269 Bunker Hill Road, Watertown, Connecticut, on 88.812 acres of land owned by applicant Walnut Grove Farm, 1269 Bunker Hill Road, Watertown, CT which included plans consisting of 23 sheets with a Title Sheet, Existing Conditions Sheet 1 dated 7/6/07, Site Plan Sheet 2 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision of 6/16/08, Site Plan, Grading and Erosion Control Plan Sheets 3-9 dated 7/7/07 with final revision date of 6/27/08, Plan and Profile Old Meadow Lane Sheet 10 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision of 7/30/08, Plan and Profile Southridge Lane Sheet 11 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision date of 7/30/08, Driveway Profiles Sheets 12-14 dated 7/06/07 with final revision date of 7/30/08, Storm Drainage Profiles Sheets 15-16 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision of 6/16/08, Site Distance Profiles Sheet 17 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision date of 11/15/07, Drainage Area Map Sheet 18 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision date of 6/16/08, Soil Testing Results Sheets 19-20 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision date of 1/18/08, Details Sheets 21-22 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision date of 07/30/08, Erosion Control Narrative Sheet 23 dated 7/6/07 with a final revision date of 06/16/08 prepared by Civil One, 43 Sherman Hill Road, Suite D-101, Woodbury, CT and a Record Subdivision Map dated 2/5/08 with a final revision date of 8/05/08 prepared by Riordan Land Surveying, 701 Middle road Turnpike, Woodbury, CT;

**WHEREAS** the Commission heard the modification application on March 3, 2010;

**IT IS THEREFORE RESOLVED** that the Watertown Planning and Zoning Commission approves the subdivision modification application to effectuate the partial termination of Southridge Estates Subdivision received on March 3, 2010 to merge lots 12 through 21 into one lot 12, remove the 960 foot long cul de sac called Southridge Land, release Parcel X deeded to the Town for drainage, and release of the Conservation Easement on Lots 12, 13, 14, and 15, release the 10’ wide drainage easement on Southridge Lane, release the Fire Tank Easement B and to release the 5% fee in lieu or open space on the 37.129 acre Lot 12 to be used for agricultural purposes with the all the August 6, 2008 Planning and Zoning Commission approval modifications remaining in effect except the following:

1. A complete, unconditional release of all terms, conditions and obligations set forth in the Development Agreement in favor of the Town of Watertown, dated May 26, 2009, and recorded in the Watertown Land Records on May 26, 2009 at Volume 1653, Page 74, only as said Development Agreement relates to Lots 12-21 and to the improvements associated with Southridge Lane; as to all other matters stated in the Development Agreement, that Agreement to remain in full force and effect.
2. A release of the Drainage Easement to the Town of Watertown over Southridge Lane and Lots 18 and 19 dated May 21, 2009, and recorded in the Watertown Land Records on May 26, 2009, at Volume 1653, Page 123.
3. A release of the Fire Safety Tank Easement to the Town of Watertown Over Lot 20 (Fire Tank Safety Easement B), dated May 21, 2009, and recorded in the Watertown Land Records on May 26, 2009, at Volume 1653, Page 116.
4. A release, as to Lots 12-15 only, of the Conservation Restriction to the Town of Watertown, dated May 21, 2009, and recorded in the Watertown Land Records on May 26, 2009, at Volume 1653, Page 97, as to Lots 1-9, the Conservation Restriction to remain in full force and effect.
5. A deed conveying Parcel X back to the developer, which consists of 0.78 acres and abuts Bunker Hill Road, to Walnut Grove Farm, Inc. or its successors or assigns: Parcel X was conveyed to the Town of Watertown in a deed dated May 21, 2009, and recorded in the Watertown Land Records on May 26, 2009, at Volume 1653, Page 108.
6. The newly formed Lot 12 shall be labeled for agricultural purposes only.
7. The fee in lieu of open space shall be 5% on the remaining 51.683 acres and the amount of the fee in lieu of open space shall be based on the accepted appraisal of Biondi and Rosengrant, L.L.C. dated 6/13/08. The entire value of the 88.12 acres according to the Biondi and Rosengrant appraisal is \$1,100,000. The per acre value is \$12,386.00/acre and 5% of the value for the remaining 51.683 acres is \$32,000.00 for fee in lieu of open space.
8. The maps titled Record Subdivision Map "Southridge Estates" dated 2/05/2008 with final revision dates of 2/24/2010 and 2/9/2010 are not approved by this motion.
9. Prior to Town officials signing mylars, final revised Plans shall be submitted for approval and accepted for approval by the Town Engineer and the Administrator for Land Use / Zoning Enforcement Officer, and are subject to review and approval by the Commission at the discretion of the Chairman or Commission. Once all documents and maps are finalized, two sets of paper maps and two sets

of maps on Mylar shall be submitted for signature by the Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission and other Town officials. All documents that are required to be executed shall be filed by the applicant with a signed Mylar copy of the maps in the Office of the Town Clerk.

Ms. Mulcahy said on the first page the bottom the date was left off with a final revision date of 6/16/08.

MOTION MADE BY: G. Martin

SECOND: C. Mancini

All in favor

VOTE: Minnich, Martin, Russ, Mancini, Demirs, Genovese and Rossi.

NAYS: None.

MOTION UNANIMOUS PASS 7-0.

<b>c. Applicant:</b>	<b>Karl Czarzasty &amp; James Zappone</b>
<b>Agent:</b>	<b>Paul Buenevich, Land Data Engineers</b>
<b>Re:</b>	<b>Zone Change Application BG-F to RG-F</b>
<b>At:</b>	<b>183 Echo Lake Road, Watertown</b>
<b>Zone:</b>	<b>B-GF</b>
<b>Action:</b>	<b>Requires Public Hearing by May</b>
<b>5, 2010</b>	

**Karl Czarzasty**

Mr. Czarzasty said this parcel is in the old fire district zone under business general and we are requesting a change to residential. The basic outlay of that area is mostly housing with multi or single family and one restaurant down the street and one liquor store up the street. After considering your input on last month's meeting we have decided to change our original proposal from a commercial type building to a residential dwelling. Mr. Czarzasty would like to keep it small and would not go any larger than a two family.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Minnich said the zone you want to change requires a minimum lot size of 7,500.00 feet and looking at the documents to which you presented to us the lot size is 7,001.00 feet and that it did meet regulations

Mr. Czarzasty requested to withdraw the application and request the refund the application fees.

Mr. Minnich asked the applicant to sign the document of withdrawal and give it to Ms. Mulcahy.

Text of Motion: Accept withdrawal of application and grant the request to refund the application fee

Motion made by: R. Russ

Second by: C. Mancini

All in favor

- d. Applicant:** **Cocchiolo Paving (18) & TGB Properties (25)**  
**Agent:** **Franklin Pilicy**  
**Re:** **Zone Change RG-To IG-80**  
**At:** **18 & 25 Falls Avenue, Oakville**  
**Zone:** **RG**  
**Action:** **Requires Public Hearing by May 5, 2010**

**Judy Pilicy**

Would like to schedule hearing for next month if possible.

Text of Motion: Accept application for review and schedule a public hearing for April 7, 2010

Motion made by: R. Russ

Second by: C. Mancini

All in favor

- e. Applicant:** **Vincent Giannetto & John McHugh**  
**Agent:** **Curt Jones, Civil One**  
**Re:** **Preliminary Discussion**  
**Zone Change Application IR-80 to B-G**  
**At:** **777 Echo Lake Road, Watertown**  
**Zone:** **IR-80**  
**Action:** **No action required**

Text of Motion: Table

Motion made by: C. Mancini

Second by: R. Russ

All in favor

Text of Motion: Remove motion to table

Motion made by: K. Demirs

Second by: R. Rossi

**Vincent Giannetto**

Mr. Giannetto said on September 2, 2009 met with the Commission for a preliminary discussion regarding the zone change for the 8 acre parcel. The Commission's recommendation was to exclude both the text amendment and the overlay district and choose an existing zone which best fits the needs of a more commercial nature. Mr. Giannetto spoke to two owners and they had no objections as long as we can maintain the benefits of their existing district in conjunction with the changes. Mr. Giannetto reviewed the overlay zone and the existing district and compiled the information. Mr. Giannetto is now asking for further guidance and direction from the Commission as to how we should proceed from here.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Martin said EDC came forward with the recommendation of completing the Buxton Study. Did it go before Town Council and where does it stand.

Mr. Minnich replied Town Council did not schedule it on the agenda now. Our intent was to include this as a free study with Buxton and it was going to determine what kind of medical facility is needed in terms of doctors and ancillary services.

Dr. McHugh responded I have been a podiatrist in the town for 25 years. Every patient that I see from Watertown, Woodbury, Bethlehem, and Morris that come to my office, I have to send out to Waterbury for MRI studies or for Laboratory studies and I think there is a huge need for this town.

Mr. Giannetto said if we cannot resolve the zoning issues with this parcel then we are not going to solicit people to come to a piece of property that we cannot get a zone change and not waste time.

Mr. Russ commented the Commission should meet before April on this topic only one night and this is in the best interests to speed this along.

Mr. Minnich said we can invite Mr. Giannetto and Mr. McHugh to be part of our discussions for a meeting scheduled for March 24<sup>th</sup> for zone change for medical uses.

Text of Motion: By unanimous consent Chairman Minnich scheduled a meeting to be held on March 24, 2010 for the full Commission, and invited the two applicants, for the purpose of looking at a zone change for medical uses in the Buckingham Street area, with the goal of coming up with the area of the zone and the text of the zone for medical uses and to be finished by the April 7, 2010 meeting and then to schedule a public hearing for May 5, 2010.

**f. Applicant:** Gregory Chere  
**Baldwin School Neighbors**  
**Re:** Preliminary Discussion  
**Zoning amendment – R-10F**  
**At:** North Street, Watertown  
**Zone:** R-10F  
**Action:** No action required

**Mr. Gregory – 87 North Street**

Mr. Chere was speaking for the Baldwin School Neighbors. Mr. Chere read a letter addressed to Chairman Minnich from the Baldwin School Neighbors regarding a potential R-10F zone change amendment.

Dear Mr. Minnich,

At the Commission's regular meeting on November 4, 2009, Taft North LLC (the "Developer") informally presented a "preliminary proposal" for the redevelopment of the former Baldwin School property (the School) for multiple residential uses. The Developer's counsel acknowledged at that time that a formal text amendment would be required for such a development. The necessity for a text amendment was, of course, known from the time the Town determined to sell the School. You brought this necessity to the attention of the Town Council when they voted to sell the School, in explaining why the Planning and Zoning Commission had denied approval of the proposed sale pursuant to section 8-24 of the General Statutes. *See*, Minutes of Regular Meeting of the Watertown Town Council, April 16, 2007, Remarks of David Minnich, Chairman, Planning and Zoning Commission. (pp. 9, 10)

The School was sold pursuant to a sealed bid auction held in September of 2007. The Town's invitation to bid included an estimate of value by Robert J. Nocera who noted that the property "would require a zone change to be converted for some alternate use." In large part because the property was being sold "without any defined or approved reuse," Mr. Nocera estimated a value range of \$250,000 to \$300,000. A representative of the Developer was the successful bidder, with a bid of \$450,000. The transmittal letter that accompanied and amplified that bid made a very significant undertaking to the Town and, by extension, to those who live in the School neighborhood. Copies of the bid and the accompanying letter are enclosed. The letter represented that the Developer's intent was "to transform this beautiful property into an age restricted high end luxury condominium," and then went on to emphasize that it had done the due diligence necessary to confirm that this was a viable concept. The letter emphasized: "All facets of construction have been accounted for and given much attention, starting with the architecture." The letter then went on to identify a team of architects, designers, landscapers and their credentials that had been put together to make the Developer's concept a reality.

The Town conveyed the School property to the developer on June 3, 2008, by a deed that included a restriction that any residential use of the property "must be designated as 55 years and older housing with no residents under the age of 18 years of age."

We do not know what efforts the Developer made toward developing the property as a "high end luxury condominium" after acquiring it. To our knowledge, the next public event was the November 4 appearance before the Planning and Zoning Commission mentioned in the first paragraph of this letter. As you and several of the members of the Commission noted at that meeting, this proposal is too intense to be consistent with the character of the Baldwin School neighborhood. Since then, per your suggestion, our group has met with the Developer and the plan presented at that meeting was the same plan presented at the November 4th meeting. The developer had not incorporated the suggestion of this board.

Nevertheless, the Baldwin School Neighbors agree that the use represented by the Developer's transmittal letter is one that could make sense and could be made consistent with the character and values of the neighboring properties. Accordingly, rather than taking a reactive position of adamant opposition to any change of zone, our group, with the assistance of a lawyer, an architect, and an engineer, has taken a proactive planning position and have developed a potential amendment to the R -10F District that would allow development of the type promised by the Developer in any qualifying location in the R-10F District. As applied to the School property, this amendment would allow an adaptive reuse of the school building itself for condominiums large enough to qualify as "luxury, high-end" units; require retention of the historic external appearance of the building; and allow development of the remainder of the lot for sensitive value increasing accessory uses, including open space.

We recognize that this proposed amendment covers only a residential adaptive reuse and that quality sound planning should perhaps contemplate other uses such as municipal office buildings or residential/office/school mixed use. We expect the commission will have thoughts as to how this amendment could be improved; therefore we are proposing our amendment for discussion with the Commission, rather than filing it formally at this time. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this potential amendment informally with the Commission at its convenience.  
Thank you very much.

Mr. Chere said we have submitted a draft of regulations for review and discussion. These regulations were drafted from sections of your existing regulations as it relates to adaptive reuse of a former school 55 and older developments and the R10F district.

Regulations that will meet heavy opposition if changes are considered:

1. Open Space
2. Density

We hope you will study the regulations and work with them and comeback with these regulations.

**Board Member Concerns**

Mr. Minnich said your intent then is to bring these regulations back to us and then we will hold a public hearing and considering adoption.

Mr. Chere replied he would like to do that and would also like to see input from the board on these regulations.

Mr. Minnich said the use of this property as it stands now is restrictive, the property owners are doing all of the risk and the investment in it. By changing the zone to the language that you wish to have here and it does not mean it is going to happen and his not wanting to develop it he is going to come back to the Commission and want something changed. The Commission encourages starting that process along with the property owner and to have a solution to the issue in terms of language and with that will come a proposal acceptable for all.

Mr. Chere said that is not a problem with the neighborhood, what we wanted to do is to place something which we thought was proper zoning regulations for this area ignoring the idea of what a development is and get feedback from the board that these regulations are in keeping with what should be there.

Mr. Martin commented your strength would be more dealing with the property owner. You are coming in looking for changes and regulations without knowing what he is coming forward with.

Mr. Chere said thank you very much.

Chairman Minnich suggested the Baldwin School Neighbors speak to the owner of the property and come to an agreement for what the zoning amendment should be and bring the zone change amendment to the Commission for review.

**12. Adjournment**

Text of Motion: Adjourn at 8:43PM

Motion made by: R. Russ

Second by: C. Mancini

All in favor

Carl Mancini \_\_\_\_\_

Secretary