

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**PUBLIC HEARING**  
**October 18, 2005**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, October 18, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Wethersfield Police Department Meeting Room 250 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Joseph Hammer, Chairman  
Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman  
Philip Knecht, Clerk  
Margaret Wagner  
Thomas Harley  
Fred Petrelli  
Anthony Homicki  
Robert Jurasin  
Dorcas McHugh

Members absent:

Peter Leombruni  
John Hallisey  
David Edwards

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner  
Denise Bradley, Assistant Planner

**APPLICATION NO. 1486-05-Z. James D'Amato** Zoning Text Amendment to Sections 2.3, 5.2.E.5 and 5.9 to permit car wash facilities in the General Business and Regional Commercial Zones.

Jim D'Amato introduced his partners Paul and Frank Giangrave and said that they would like to propose a carwash on the Berlin Turnpike but there is currently no land zoned for it, therefore they have put together some proposed text amendments to the zoning regulations. The changes are proposed for sections 2.3, 5.2 and 5.9. They would also like to add vacuums on the perimeter of the lot and want to ensure that the regulations would allow that.

Chairman Hammer reminded the commission that they had seen an informal presentation from the applicant and asked if the currently existing carwash on the Silas Deane Highway is a nonconforming condition. Mr. Gillespie responded that the old regulations were prohibitive in nature, therefore anything not prohibited was allowed. Therefore, since carwashes were not prohibited, Mr. Sparkle is a pre-existing nonconforming use. There was no provision for a carwash included in the new regulations which are now permissive in nature and not prohibitive.

Mr. Gillespie said that he has worked closely with the applicant to create the amendments and looked at regulations from other communities. There are criteria added that there shall be no carwash within 300 feet of sensitive areas, that every carwash facility be screened from residential properties, a provision for stacking capacity and parking for vacuum facilities. The criteria also involve the DEP and prohibit vehicle storage on site.

Chairman Hammer asked Mr. Gillespie if a proposed carwash would fall under a special permit use and therefore the highest level of review. Mr. Gillespie said that it would and that it would require a public hearing with notice to the neighbors, posting of the site and the commission would have discretion if the use is the most suitable. He added that the use is proposed for the General Business and Regional Commercial districts which are mainly the Silas Deane Highway and Berlin Turnpike. Chairman Hammer asked if the use would be in both zones. Mr. Gillespie said that it made the most sense to locate in those zones and not the Town Center or Village Business zones. Chairman Hammer reminded the commissioners that they were not reviewing a specific application for a carwash at this time.

Commissioner Forsdick asked if they could vote on this tonight. Mr. Gillespie said that they could.

Commissioner Wagner recalled that the proposed carwash was located near a hotel and she said that when the application appears before the commission she will be concerned about the location. She asked why a hotel was not included in the criteria listed in Section 5.9. Mr. Gillespie said that hotel was not listed in any of the other community's regulations that they reviewed. He said that it may be possible to add screening for hotels in addition to residential areas in Section 5.9.B. Commissioner Knecht asked if the use would run all night. Chairman Hammer again reminded the commissioners that the applicant was not here for a specific proposal, but rather they just wanted to amend the regulations. He suggested that Section 5.9.B read '...residential property, residential zone, hotel or motel...' Commissioner Homicki said that he would like to add in 5.9.F the wording 'including but not limited to...'

Mr. Gillespie stated that the public hearing for the proposed regulations were advertised in the Hartford Courant, the changes were referred to the Capital Region Council of Governments who sent a letter dated September 16, 2005 saying that there was no apparent conflict. Mr. Gillespie said that the notice was mailed by certified mail. He went on to discuss that according to today's definition of structure, the vacuums would be considered a structure and they are not permitted to be in a yard. The proposed zones have a 40' front yard requirement and a 25' side yard requirement. A lot of these facilities are located in the front or side yards. He said that all structures must meet setback requirements and therefore the vacuums would be limited to the central portion of the lot which is not typical. He suggested that the commissioners talk about whether these regulations should be tweaked. Commissioner Forsdick asked how they should be tweaked. Mr. Gillespie said that it depends on which yard they would prefer to see the vacuums in and say something like, ' ... such vacuum facilities may be located...'

Chairman Hammer suggested that the vacuums be located in the required yard at the discretion of the commission or not in the front yard but may be allowed in the side or rear yard. Commissioner Jurasin questioned why the vacuum would be considered a structure. Commissioner Wagner suggested that it was because it was located on an elevated concrete base. Commissioner Jurasin said that he dimensions were approximately 2'x 5'. Commissioner McHugh asked if they could define the vacuums as equipment so that it is not considered a structure. Commissioner Jurasin pointed out that an air pump at a gas station or a sign could be considered a structure according to the definition in the regulations. Mr. Gillespie said that a sign has a different definition and that if there is a consensus that it is not a structure they might want to discuss this.

Chairman Hammer suggested that such vacuum facilities be located in the rear or side yard. Mr. Gillespie asked the applicant if the vacuums were prohibited in the front then could they be put in the side or rear. The applicant said that generally that will work. Chairman Hammer asked if the commissioners would like to prohibit vacuums in the front yard as a policy. Commissioner Jurasin said that he liked Chairman Hammer's wording. Jim D'Amato thanked the commissioners for the opportunity to appear before them.

Chairman Hammer closed the public hearing.

**APPLICATION NO. 1494-05-Z. Southside Partners LLC** Special Permit under Section 3.6.C.2 to construct an accessory structure larger than permitted in a residential zone and to modify the approved site plan for Application No. 1428-04-Z with regards to exterior lighting design and the condensers and condenser pad at 82-84 & 86 Wolcott Hill Road.

John Carbone presented the application. He explained that he went in for a building permit eleven months ago and then was before the commission for a one story modification to the building and some additional things that were part of the new zoning regulations. The condenser pad and condenser didn't appear on the drawings even though they were always in the original design. The fence on the southeast side of the building conforms; it was initially going to be a chain link slotted fence and now will be a masonry block wall. Chairman Hammer asked how tall the wall would be. The applicant said that it would be six feet from grade. Chairman Hammer then asked what was highlighted in green on the site plan. The applicant said that the lighting layout was initially going to be 10' high poles with single head full cutoff fixtures. It was determined that this was inadequate lighting and was recommended to change to bullhorn dual head fixture at each location. He provided the photometrics for each commissioner. He said that there had been a concern about security, which is why they needed additional lighting. Other modifications include changes to an

accessory building. Initially, the applicant had planned to put gravel stone and now because of major run off, had to put a binder in to stabilize the ground. This effort was successful and diverted the water and is an enhancement. Finally, the accessory building is represented smaller on the construction documents.

Chairman Hammer asked what the discrepancy in the size of the accessory building was overall. Commissioner Forsdick responded 160 s.f. Mr. Gillespie added that the building increased from 792 s.f. to 952 s.f. Chairman Hammer asked what the dimensions were. Mr. Gillespie said that they were 26'3" x 36'2". The original 22' dimension increased to 26'3". Chairman Hammer asked if the staff had reviewed the photometrics and asked Commissioner Knecht to read the letter dated October 18, 2005 from neighbor Charles Vicino into the record. Commissioner Knecht read the letter into the record and Chairman Hammer asked the applicant to address the neighbor's concerns.

Mr. Carbone said that this is not a blatant disregard of the code. He showed the commissioners a series of photos so that they can see the impact of the lighting. The letter is not accurate because the neighbors are at a higher elevation. The original concern is that there is no stabilization and pooling occurred. It is farfetched to think that there was seepage. Also, Mr. Vicino's property can't see the parking lot. He concurs that in the winter he can see and the lighting has been design to project with not a lot of pollution. He is concerned about the luminary in the rear. The lights are on timers from 5:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Mr. Carbone asked Mr. Gillespie to visit the site to see the lighting. He said that there is a shade that can be placed on the structure. The angled fixture in the corner is probably the issue, he can't imagine that there are any issues with other luminaries. All lighting is on dual circuits and there is a major security issue if it is shut off. Mr. Gillespie explained to the commissioners that the specifications show the lighting at 90 degrees and currently the fixtures are angled, if they are changed back to 90 degrees then the impact to the neighbor may be minimized. Mr. Gillespie suggested that all of the fixtures be put at 90 degrees and if that doesn't address the issue then maybe the addition of the glare shields. Chairman Hammer asked if that would address the concerns. Mr. Gillespie said that it would.

Commissioner Jurasin asked if the light poles were in the approved location. Mr. Carbone said that they were with dual heads instead of single and one more pole in the rear right corner. Mr. Gillespie said that the planning staff now requires photometrics, but didn't at the time of the submission. Mr. Carbone said that it wasn't addressed whether it would be a single or double luminary. Commissioner Jurasin asked if the original lighting was inadequate. Mr. Carbone said that it was not known whether it would meet the standard, but it turned out to be significantly under lit. Commissioner Jurasin asked if the graphs are ok. Commissioner Gillespie said that Mike Turner had reviewed the plan and his only concern was whether the calculations were based on a 30 foot high pole and not the shorter ones in the field. Mr. Carbone said that the calculations were based on the 10 foot poles with an 11 foot mounting. Mr. Gillespie said that it is bright. Commissioner Jurasin suggested that the applicant go back and reposition the heads at 90 degrees and communicate with Mr. Vicino to see if he is satisfied. Mr. Gillespie said that this issue could wait until the next meeting. Mr. Carbone encouraged the commissioners to drive by the site to see the lighting.

Commissioner Forsdick asked about the plantings and fencing. Mr. Carbone said that the intent to put fencing around the site but that they would wait for spring. Commissioner Forsdick asked whether the original was a condition. Mr. Carbone said that the intent was to fence the area but it wasn't required. Commissioner Jurasin said that if he comes back can they put in writing the fencing and lighting. He also asked if the bigger accessory building was built. Commissioner Forsdick said that the building is built and is done. Mr. Gillespie said that it was caught as part of the as built. Commissioner Jurasin recalled that the commissioners had discussed at length their concerns about the accessory building. Mr. Carbone said that it was always supposed to be gravel and he was not sure that he needed a permit to pave it. Commissioner Jurasin said that he thought that the concern was about cars being parked there and that altogether the issues add up to a debate about approving the application. Mr. Carbone said that he met with the zoning board and received a variance for the accessory building. He said that they have tried to define the use but it is not in their jurisdiction, it was too far-reaching. Commissioner Forsdick asked the applicant again about the drainage. Mr. Carbone said that there is no drainage to the neighbor's site. Chairman Hammer asked the applicant to bring all of the information to the next meeting and asked when the light fixtures would be adjusted. Mr. Carbone said that they should be set by Monday or Tuesday and he will call Mr. Gillespie. Commissioner Wagner said that her concern is about the location and the shift from single to double fixtures. There is an impact more along the east side and she is concerned with spot areas, she said that it seems that the lighting should be more uniform. Commissioner Jurasin said that he is concerned about the impression as you are coming into the area. Commissioner Jurasin asked about the

condenser location and if the right of way to the street is intended to be used, he also would like to receive a report on the drainage from Mike Turner.

Commissioner Harley said that the accessory building has been denied twice and then approved; he wondered what changed or downsized. Mr. Carbone said that he ended up doing separately what he was going to do together. Commissioner Harley asked if it was generally the size. Commissioner Jurasin said that the minutes of the meetings would be helpful. Mr. Gillespie said that was the residential zone and that it was denied and they came back and it was approved. He couldn't recall the specifics. Mr. Carbone said that it was a land locked residential property surrounded by commercial. Chairman Hammer requested the pages of the minutes from the cycle of public hearings to take a look. Commissioner Jurasin asked for the information on drainage and lighting as well as the minutes of the meetings. Commissioner Forsdick recalled that the approval was just the one story and that there were stipulations, she remembers concerns about what the applicant was doing with the structure and that one bay maintained for the tenants.

Commissioner Forsdick made a motion to keep the public hearing opened. Commissioner Knecht seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion. (9-0-0)

Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, McHugh, Petrelli, Homicki, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley

Nay: None

Abst: None

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC MEETING  
October 18, 2005**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public meeting immediately following the public hearing on Tuesday, October 18, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Wethersfield Police Department Meeting Room 250 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Joseph Hammer, Chairman  
Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman  
Philip Knecht, Clerk  
Margaret Wagner  
Thomas Harley  
Fred Petrelli  
Anthony Homicki  
Robert Jurasin  
Dorcas McHugh

Members absent:

Peter Leombruni  
John Hallisey  
David Edwards

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner  
Denise Bradley, Assistant Planner

ROLL CALL & SEATING OF ALTERNATES

Joseph Hammer, Chairman  
Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman  
Philip Knecht, Clerk

Margaret Wagner  
Thomas Harley  
Fred Petrelli  
Anthony Homicki  
Robert Jurasin  
Dorcas McHugh

**APPLICATION NO. 1486-05-Z. James D'Amato** Zoning Text Amendment to Sections 2.3, 5.2.E.5 and 5.9 to permit car wash facilities in the General Business and Regional Commercial Zones.

Commissioner Jurasin made a motion to approve the text amendment with the additional wordsmithing that was discussed during the public hearing.

Mr. Gillespie read the additional wording into the record as follows:

- Section 5.9 B - *second line* - *add* "hotel and/or motel"
- Section 5.9 D - *second line* - *add* "vacuum between such setback and facility. Such vacuum facility may be located within a required rear or side yard only upon good cause shown as determined by submission."
- Section 5.9 F - *add* "Including but not limited to.."

Commissioner Forsdick seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion. (9-0-0)

Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Wagner, McHugh, Petrelli, Jurasin, Harley, Homicki

Nay: None

Abst: None

**APPLICATION NO. 1494-05-Z. Southside Partners LLC** Special Permit under Section 3.6.C.2 to construct an accessory structure larger than permitted in a residential zone at 82-84 & 86 Wolcott Hill Road.

Continued to next meeting

### **C.G.S. § 8-24 Review - Dog Park at Mill Woods Park.**

Chairman Hammer explained what an 8-24 referral was and that it may require a supermajority vote of the council if the commission does not approve it.

Kathy Bagley presented the dog park proposal. She said that she had been approached by residents who would like to see a fenced in area for dogs to run without a leash. She said that the group of residents would do all of the fundraising and there would be no funds from the town. She said it is an opportunity to provide a facility for town residents. The area would be approximately one acre and the dog owners would bring their dogs on a leash, once they arrived, the dogs would be let off the leash in the fenced in area. The area has been identified and would have trails, open areas and wooded areas.

Ms. Bagley then showed the area on a map of the proposed changes to Mill Woods Park. The work would all be done by volunteers and would involve creating the trails and doing some clearing of the underbrush. There may be some picnic tables and benches as well as signs stating the rules of the dog park, and pooper bag stations. She has included sample rules in each commissioner's packet. She said that a committee is being formed that will identify the specific rules for this park as well as figure out the cost and do the fundraising. The major expense will be the fencing. She said that since the designated area is close to the pump house, there will be water to the facility for the dogs.

Ms. Bagley went on to say that all dogs must arrive on a leash and their owners must clean up after them. Communities that have similar facilities have found that there is peer pressure among the responsible dog owners to clean up after their dog, therefore they do not expect much of a problem with owners not cleaning up. Chairman

Hammer asked if this use interferes with the master plan for Mill Woods Park. Ms. Bagley pointed out on the plan that this was a previously undesignated wooded area. The existing trees will stay. Commissioner Knecht asked if any dogs would be allowed. Ms. Bagley replied that aggressive dogs would likely not be allowed as well as small puppies and dogs in heat. Commissioner Wagner said that she walks her dog in Mill Woods all of the time. She would love to have a dog park and that it is a wonderful use of the space. She offered a suggestion to the rules, to include time periods for bigger and smaller dogs to play separately. Ms. Bagley said that the park will be designed by the committee and there has been a suggestion to set up separate areas for smaller and larger dogs to address this concern. Commissioner Wagner appreciated that they propose to locate the area within the woods and not in a meadow area where the future putting green will go, and she mentioned that this is where most dogs run now. Ms. Bagley said that the first meeting of the committee is November 2, 2005 at 7 p.m. at the Nature Center. Commissioner Jurasin asked what the material of the fence would be. Ms. Bagley said that it would be a heavy duty chain link with green vinyl coating. This is what is being used around the ball fields and the skate park.

Chairman Hammer then invited the public to speak on the matter. Don Griswold came up to speak and introduced his wife Kathy Griswold. He said that they had approached Kathy Bagley with their ideas and got over 300 names of residents that were interested. At the council meeting, 25 residents were present in support of the proposal. The council was also supportive and sent this referral to the planning commission. Commissioner Petrelli asked what other towns have a dog park. Kathy Griswold said that there are unofficial parks in a lot of towns and official parks in Hamden, Norwich and Ridgefield. Don Griswold mentioned that Ridgefield and Hamden have fit their dog parks within a park. Hamden's website is very informative about the whole process. Commissioner Wagner commented that the area planned for the dog park is presently familiar with the teenagers in town and this may eliminate the need for police to be in the woods, it would also eliminate the trash that collects in this gathering spot for the kids. Commissioner Petrelli added that the dog owner is responsible for their dog's actions, he mentioned that there is no longer a one bite rule.

Commissioner Jurasin made a motion to approve the referral. Commissioner Wagner seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the motion. (9-0-0)

Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Petrelli, Wagner, McHugh, Homicki, Harley, Jurasin

Nay: None

Abst: None

## **MINUTES**

Commissioner Jurasin made a motion to approve [the minutes from October 4, 2005](#).

Commissioner Petrelli seconded the motion.

Chairman Hammer noted a change in the second to last paragraph. It should read that "Chairman Hammer explained that the appeal period has not expired, therefore anyone can file and in light of that he would like to suggest that the commission not discuss the decision."

All members present voted in favor of the motion. (8-0-1)

Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Wagner, Jurasin, Petrelli, Harley, Homicki

Nay: None

Abst: McHugh

## **STAFF REPORTS**

Mr. Gillespie asked the commissioners to refer to a summary in their packets prepared by Denise Bradley. This

summary shows the number of PZC applications vs. ZBA applications. Specifically, the number of camper and commercial vehicle applications have increased. He asked the commissioners to be aware that the regulations have changed what goes to the ZBA.

Chairman Hammer asked if the camper and commercial vehicle applications that needed a variance in the old days could be changed to a special permit or special exception granted by the ZBA. Mr. Gillespie said that the regulations were originally changed because it was difficult to prove hardship, so that may be a good compromise. Commissioner Jurasin said that the tables prove what the PZC wanted to happen, so they should not go back to the ZBA. Commissioner Knecht pointed out that there are more people interested in attending the PZC meetings now. Commissioner Forsdick pointed out that sometimes things are approved and then not adhered to. She described a specific example at Nott Street/Berlin Turnpike where seven campers are now stored. She said that someone should be in charge of these applications and if the commission is going to make rulings, then these should be monitored - although she recognizes that the planning and enforcement staff has a lot on their plate. She thinks that the commission is doing the right thing though, by hearing these applications.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON GENERAL MATTERS OF PLANNING AND ZONING.**

None

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

- *State of Connecticut Superior Court Civil Summons brought against the Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission and Premier Building and Development, Inc. by Paul Meskiewicz and Elio Lagana regarding APPLICATION NO. 1474-05-Z. Premier Building & Development, Inc. seeking a Change of Zone from AA Open Space Development District to Special Residential Development Zone at the easterly side of Back Lane also at the end of Old Reservoir Road, known as Tax Assessor's Map 43 Block 11 & Map 42 Block 16.*

Commissioner Jurasin asked to discuss this piece of correspondence. Chairman Hammer said that it was given to the commissioners for information and the substance should be discussed in executive session. Commissioner Jurasin made a motion to go into executive session. Commissioner Forsdick seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. (9-0-0)

Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Jurasin, McHugh, Homicki, Wagner, Petrelli, Harley

Nay: None

Abst: None

- *A letter from Paula Larsen, owner of Main Street Creamery & Cafe, to Peter Gillespie, Town of Wethersfield Economic Development Manager/Town Planner, dated September 30, 2005 regarding selling additional food products from her property located at 271 Main Street.*

Mr. Gillespie said that he received a letter from Paula Larsen asking to add products to her menu. When she asked to expand her home to an ice cream shop, she specifically said that it would not be a restaurant, therefore Mr. Gillespie wanted some clarification from the commissioners about their position. He added that she wanted to sell soup and sandwiches during the cold winter months and she would deal with the health department. Chairman Hammer said that the food would not be made on the premises. Mr. Gillespie agreed saying that the food would be prepackaged except for the soup which she would heat up.

Commissioner Petrelli pointed out that the use is consistent with the neighborhood and he would like her to be able to enhance their business so that she stays in town. Mr. Gillespie said that he doesn't have a problem with the use but he wanted a consensus on the record and some guidance as to how to proceed. Commissioner Jurasin asked if this was an official request. Mr. Gillespie said that he told Ms. Larsen that he would submit her letter and if a more formal application was needed then she would do that.

Commissioner Jurasin said that as long as it is not a restaurant then he is ok with the use, but if it becomes a restaurant, then there could be a negative impact to the other property owners. Chairman Hammer said that the letter described the expanded use as not a restaurant. Commissioner Jurasin said that someone should tell this commission if it is a restaurant. Chairman Hammer said that adequate parking is a concern, but if this is during the cold winter months when not a lot of people are lined up for ice cream, he added that there are natural constraints because of the limited seating inside. Commissioner Jurasin asked if Ms. Larsen decided to cook hot dogs and quiche is she in violation of the parking regulations. Chairman Hammer said that every applicant in Old Wethersfield doesn't meet the parking regulations. Commissioner Jurasin said that maybe she should come to the PZC to tell if she is a restaurant. Commissioner Forsdick wondered what the Staff was looking for on this correspondence. Commissioner Wagner wanted to know when the name was changed to 'Main Street Creamery & Café'. Mr. Gillespie said that has been the name since she has been at the new location. He then read the definition of restaurant.

Chairman Hammer asked the commission if they would be more comfortable with a more formal submission. Commissioner Jurasin said that they have already made the decision that selling ice cream is not a restaurant. Mr. Gillespie said that they had decided that it was retail sales and not a restaurant. Commissioner Jurasin said that he would prefer to have her submit an application. Commissioner Wagner agreed and said that then there would be the opportunity to notify the neighbors and let the public have the opportunity to be heard.

Commissioner Harley asked what the contentious part of the application was. Mr. Gillespie said that if it is considered a restaurant, then there is a parking issue. Commissioner Harley asked if there was a parking requirement for retail sales. Mr. Gillespie said that Ms. Larsen had received a variance for the parking from the ZBA, and that restaurant parking is based on seats (one space per three seats) and retail parking is based on square footage. However in this case it may be a wash because there aren't too many seats inside. Commissioner Jurasin stated that he wasn't against the proposal, he would just like to see it done right. Commissioner Knecht wasn't sure what the effect of bringing food in would have on other people. Chairman Hammer said that the issue seems to be the intensity of the proposal. Commissioner Forsdick said that since this has been a very controversial proposal, she would prefer to have Ms. Larsen come in and have a hearing. Chairman Hammer said that this sounds reasonable and asked Mr. Gillespie to have the minutes of the original approval available to the members when this application is before them.

- *A copy of a report called Wethersfield Destination Signage by the Greater Hartford Arts Council for the Wethersfield Tourism Commission.*

Mr. Gillespie had included a report for each commissioner and brought this to their attention. Commissioner Forsdick had attended the meeting and said that they would like a representative from the commission to serve on the committee, but she can't do it. She asked someone to volunteer. Mr. Gillespie said that they meet as needed, but not monthly. Chairman Hammer asked the commissioners to think about it and let Mr. Gillespie know.

- *A letter from Lewis Wise of Rogin Nassau, Attorneys at Law, to Peter Gillespie, Town of Wethersfield Economic Development Manager/Town Planner, dated September 9, 2005 regarding a pending application before the Rocky Hill Planning and Zoning Commission for a motorcross and pedal bike track.*
- *A letter from Gina McCarthy, a Commissioner with the State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection dated September 23, 2005 regarding Public Act 05-227 Concerning Outdoor Wood Burning Furnaces.*

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

The commission entered into Executive Session at 8:30 p.m. to discuss pending litigation.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Knecht made a motion to adjourn at 8:50 p.m.

Commissioner Forsdick seconded the motion.

All members present voted in favor of the motion.

Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Petrelli, Homicki, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley, McHugh

Philip Knecht, Clerk