

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING**

January 2, 2013

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing and meeting on Wednesday, January 2, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. in the Wethersfield Town Council Chambers located at Town Hall, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut 06109.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Harley called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m.

1.1 ROLL CALL & SEATING OF ALTERNATES (5 members required for a quorum):

Vice Chairman Roberts called the roll as follows:

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused
Thomas Harley, Chairman	✓		
Richard Roberts, Vice Chairman	✓		
Antonio Margiotta, Clerk		✓	
Joseph Hammer		✓	
George Oickle	✓		
Anthony Homicki		✓	
James Hughes	✓		
Dave Edwards		✓	
Angelo Robert Fazzina	✓		
Thomas Dean (alternate)	✓		
Alex Vasel (alternate)	✓		
Leigh Standish (alternate)	✓		

Also present: Peter Gillespie, Town Planner/Economic Development Manager;
Denise Bradley, Assistant Planner

Chairman Harley noted at the time of roll call there were five (5) full members and (3) alternate members in attendance. All members present to participate.

Members of the Public were present.

2. OLD BUSINESS:

2.1 APPLICATION NO. 1785-12-Z: TO Design, LLC Seeking Site Plan and Design Review for renovations and additions to the building and site at 411 Wolcott Hill Road (Wethersfield High School).
--- Continued from 12-18-12.

Rusty Malik, Educational Architect, Quisenberry & Arcari Architects, LLC; Stephen Ullman, P.E. of Alfred Benesch & Company (note: Purcell Associates, Inc. is now affiliated with Alfred Benesch & Company); and Mark Fisher of TO Design, LLC appeared before the Commission Seeking Site Plan and Design Review for renovations and additions to the building and site at 411 Wolcott Hill Road (Wethersfield High School).

The Commissioners and Mr. Malik continued the discussion of this Application which was first heard at the December 18, 2012 Planning & Zoning Commission Public Hearing and Meeting with the focus being on vehicle and pedestrian traffic patterns in and around the site.

Mr. Malik reviewed the various Site Plan Options that were considered and discussed with the Building Committee and Town Staff (including Police and Fire Departments) and highlighted the significant modifications with the Commissioners to explain why Site Plan Option D3 is being presented for Commission consideration. The Commissioners received the Traffic Impact Study on December 19, 2012, which was prepared by Alfred Benesch & Company. The Traffic Impact Study noted existing conditions, the impact of proposed development, capacity analyses of surrounding roadways and conclusions in consideration of the WHS Renovate-as-new Project that was approved in the April 24, 2012 referendum vote.

Commissioner Oickle inquired and Mr. Malik indicated that Site Plan Option D2 was not chosen as optimal due to concerns of student safety.

Commissioner Standish inquired and Mr. Malik indicated that Site Plan Option E1 (parent drop off location in front of proposed area for tennis courts) was not favorable from the perspective of Wethersfield Fire and Police Departments.

Mr. Ullman indicated that the Traffic Impact Study results indicate, at this point, the addition of a traffic signal is not required for Wolcott Hill Road.

Commissioner Standish inquired and Mr. Ullman indicated accident data was considered in the evaluation of traffic signal necessity for Wolcott Hill Road.

Vice Chairman Roberts mentioned the study does not take into consideration the non-existent element of the renovation project as completed.

Commissioner Dean noted the site plan proposed is driven by the element of motor vehicle traffic. He inquired if there will be a promotion of bicycle use and/or walking to/from school rather than by motor vehicle. Mr. Emmett, Superintendent of Schools, mentioned the main concern of the site is safety. Mr. Emmett indicated school staff, with the assistance of traffic safety personnel when necessary, would be on site during peak school traffic hours to assist with safe traffic flow and that parent behavior is critical in the ongoing success with these major traffic pattern changes. Mr. Emmett noted the increase in parking at the site as proposed accommodates not only events held at the site but the increase in the number of student drivers at the site as a school year progresses.

Christine Fortunato, Chairperson of the School Building Projects Committee, mentioned that driving laws not allowing students to ride together at a certain age and spectator events dictated the request for an increase in parking.

Chairman Harley noted the corner by the proposed tennis courts will not function well as presented. He also noted lining up the eight (8) tennis courts longitudinally is a solution to that particular traffic problem. He also noted while separating bus, parent, and student traffic is a good idea, behavior of parents who drop their students off will not change, as parents will drop their students off on Jay Street and Folly Brook Boulevard, for example, to avoid a traffic jam. Chairman Harley indicated several area high schools (such as Glastonbury High School and Newington High School) have their tennis courts lined up longitudinally. He stated site circulation and safety concerns outweigh the priority of tennis court layout.

Mr. Malik noted the proposed configuration for the tennis courts allows for hosting of competitions.

Commissioner Standish concurred with the statements made by Chairman Harley. He explained that the "U" shape of the parent drop off will result in students turning in front of parents. He noted either the parents will be blocked by students pulling in front of them, or the parents will block the students from entering into the parking lot by filling that cross-over point.

Mr. Malik explained the rationale as to why the drive on the north side of the tennis courts was created. There would be emergency access to the site and gates could be opened during peak drop off and pick up times to allow students who park on site to utilize that north side drive.

Fire Marshal Dignoti noted that the renovation will result in fewer access options to the site. He noted that Site Option D was a compromise and that Site Option E would not work for emergency access

purposes. He noted that emergency access to the north side of the site is critical. He also noted the increase in parking is necessary, as the Police Department has had to issue many parking violations.

Commissioner Hughes concurred with the statements made by Chairman Harley. He mentioned that the loading dock, an area of which is considered as high risk, is located on the north side of the building/site. He inquired and Mr. Dignoti indicated that three hundred fifty (350') linear feet of aerial access to the building will be lost, and therefore, access to the north side is critical.

Commissioner Standish inquired and Mr. Malik indicated that having the emergency access road between the two (2) sets of four (4) tennis courts would not work because additional space would be needed between the courts and that road. Town Engineer, Michael Turner, indicated there would be insufficient space to plow that emergency access road if said road was located between the two (2) sets of four (4) tennis courts.

Commissioner Hughes discussed the emergency access strip, curbing and plantings. Mr. Dignoti indicated the final design would have to take into account that the largest piece of fire apparatus is forty seven (47') feet (ladder truck) could fit within a twenty-two (22') foot wide road. Mr. Dignoti reiterated that the plans need to reflect that access by the emergency vehicles can be made.

Commissioner Oickle concurs with the statements made by Chairman Harley. He suggested the Committee take another look at the site circulation issues mentioned and come up with alternative suggestions.

Commissioner Vassel inquired and Mr. Malik indicated that locating the tennis courts on the south side of the site is not optimal, as the area is located on the property line and there is a significant grade change that would warrant the necessity of a large retaining wall.

Commissioner Fazzina inquired and Mr. Malik indicated that locating the tennis courts closer to the playing fields would compromise necessary emergency access to the site.

Commissioner Standish inquired and Mr. Malik indicated having the emergency access road located between the bus circulation area and the fields after the building will present complications in managing that road in terms of width (for accommodating emergency vehicles) and pedestrian access into the field areas.

Vice Chairman Roberts inquired and Mr. Emmett indicated that the two hundred (200+) plus additional parking spaces will be used to accommodate parking needs for extra-curricular events and that more than one (1) extra-curricular event could occur at the same time on the site.

Vice Chairman Roberts concurs with the comments made by Chairman Harley and noted that from the traffic study, the two hundred thirty (230) cars exiting from Jay Street and Folly Brook Boulevard in a half hour peak AM timeframe (as noted in the Traffic Impact Study) would now be directed to enter and exit from the Wolcott Hill Road driveway if proposed Site Plan Option D3 was adopted.

Vice Chairman Roberts mentioned that keeping the parent drop off area on the south side of the site (Jay Street/Folly Brook Boulevard) may relieve the traffic problem by guiding half of the current traffic flow south and the other half guided north.

Mr. Malik indicated parents can come off of Wolcott Hill and exit via the Eagle Drive area or onto Wolcott Hill Road. He noted Administration may want to look at the possibility of having vehicle traffic on Eagle Drive after the buses have passed through the bus drop off area proposed. He stated that the objective is to create a certain path/circulation pattern and promote a public awareness that the pattern needs to be followed to allow for minimal disruption.

The Building Committee will look at the feasibility of having the eight (8) tennis courts stacked rather than the four on four configuration proposed and Fire Marshal Dignoti will review the width of the emergency access driveway which was proposed for location along the northeast side of the site next to the tennis courts.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments made by the public during this meeting regarding this matter.

The Commissioners requested Mr. Malik to return to the next meeting of the Commission (Tuesday, January 15, 2013) with some additional information, including but not limited to alternatives, relative to the traffic queue on site.

Motion: Commissioner Oickle made a motion to Table **APPLICATION NO. 1785-12-Z: TO Design, LLC** Seeking Site Plan and Design Review for renovations and additions to the building and site at 411 Wolcott Hill Road (Wethersfield High School) for further discussion at the Tuesday, January 15, 2013 Meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Second: Vice Chairman Roberts seconded the motion.

Aye: Harley, Roberts, Oickle, Hughes, Fazzina, Dean, Vasel, Standish;

Nay: None;

Vote: 8 – 0;

This Application was Tabled to the Tuesday, January 15, 2013 Meeting.

3. NEW BUSINESS:

3.1 PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATION NO. 1786-12-Z: Leonard Sande III Seeking a Special Permit in accordance with Section 5.7 of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations for a General Repairer's License and outside storage yard at 61 Arrow Road.

Mr. Leonard Sande, III, appeared before the Commission regarding his Application. He would like to operate the repair portion of his business at the site Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and Saturday from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The repair portion of his business would be closed on Sunday. The towing operation and storage yard hours (vehicle release) would occur twenty four (24) hours a day, seven (7) days a week (Sunday through Saturday). There will be a total of three (3) employees (including him). There will be three (3) vehicles used for the business [two (2) light-duty wreckers and one (1) light/medium duty car carrier (flatbed)]. There will be a designated impound area for vehicles towed to the site. The business would be located in Unit #1 (back unit, end of building) at 61 Arrow Road. The outside storage yard would house received vehicles as a result of the non consensual towing, pursuant to State requirements for operating a towing facility.

Chairman Harley noted for the record the December 31, 2012, Memorandum to the Planning and Zoning Commission from Peter D. Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner and Denise Bradley, Assistant Planner regarding this Application.

Mr. Gillespie indicated the Applicant is seeking a general repairer's license in addition to the outside storage yard use which would involve tow operations. The Site Plan provided by the Applicant shows a general depiction of the impound area and noted that more information is needed regarding the details of the improvements for that area. The impound area would be located off the Russell Road side of the property (north side of the property). The area circled on the Plan is Unit #1 (located on the back side of the building and closest to Russell Road), which he intends to occupy.

Mr. Gillespie indicated his Memo mentioned notes Unit #1 is subject to an environmental land use restriction and easement to the State DEEP and that the Applicant needs to review the proposed improvements to the interior with the State DEEP to make sure he is not exposing that area which is below the foundation level of the property.

Mr. Gillespie mentioned that the property owner recently removed an area of dense brush and trees to the north which had provided a buffer to the site, its parking lot and to the adjacent property owners of the Crossings residential condominium development located to the north of the site. Additionally, site improvements previously required for the development of this property have not yet been completed. Mr. Gillespie mentioned that a condition for an approval may include the establishment of a buffer replaced to a certain extent and more particularly in the proposed impound area.

Mr. Gillespie noted that in terms of zoning, the requested use is not permitted, as the site is located in the Business Park (BP) Zone. He indicated that the Applicant applied for and received a use variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to operate an automotive repair business with one of three stipulations being that Planning & Zoning Approval is required (refer to Certified correspondence from the Wethersfield Zoning Board of Appeals to Mr. Leonard Sande, III, dated October 25, 2012).

Mr. Gillespie also noted that approvals for the entire property made in the 2006-2008 year timeframe had explicit improvements tied to the next building that have not been completed, and this subject Application is affected by the lack of follow-through on those approvals.

Commissioner Oickle inquired and Applicant, Mr. Sande, III, indicated the property owner, Mr. Tartaglia of 61 Arrow Road, LLC, was not present at this meeting. Commissioner Oickle expressed his concerns in allowing the owner of the subject property, as said property owner has not fulfilled obligations regarding Site Plans and a Special Permit pertaining to the property. He is also concerned with the clearing of the buffer area on the north side of the site.

Chairman Harley inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated the three (3) service vehicles [a flatbed and two (2) wreckers] will be parked outside in the proposed storage compound and fifteen (15') feet away from Unit #1 and not in the impound area. The non consensual towed vehicles would be parked overnight in the impound area.

Vice Chairman Roberts inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated there is no criteria set forth by the DMV regarding the storage (impound) area. Mr. Sandee noted the fifty by fifty (50' x 50') foot impound area will be screened with a six (6') foot slotted fence with canal irrigates and would house twenty five to thirty five vehicles.

Commissioner Hughes inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated outside, fenced and lighted (with no razor wire on top of the fence and no paved surface) would be the level of storage (class rate) for his business. Commissioner Hughes mentioned the Town may require curbing and an oil separator for an operation of this kind.

Mr. Gillespie mentioned the Town Engineer has not yet commented on this Application and noted that the Health Department may have commentary.

Commissioner Oickle commented that the old Plan shows infiltration trenches and Mr. Gillespie indicated those trenches still exist.

Mr. Gillespie inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated that there was never a discussion with the property owner, Mr. Tartaglia, to move the impound area closer to the existing building rather than having the impound area isolated on its own.

Commissioner Hughes inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated that light duty towing [consensual and non consensual (trespass towing)] is the core of the business. Mr. Sandee also indicated his ambition of growing the business to a medium/heavy duty towing operation. He plans to get on the State towing rotation right away with the hope of landing on the Wethersfield Police Department's towing rotation. He noted the busiest times for trespass towing are the early morning hours, particularly on the weekend, for restaurants, bars, etc. Mr. Sandee indicated that if his business grew to a medium/heavy duty towing operation, he would need more than the proposed fifty by fifty (50' x 50') foot storage area to tow and store tractor trailers, and thus, the storage area would have to be quadrupled. He noted that with the twenty four hour a day, seven days per week operation (non-consensual towed vehicles) described in this Application, the office would have to remain open for that purpose.

Commissioner Vassel inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated that a towed vehicle could remain in the

impound area for at least one (1) month before the claims, inquiries, etc., associated with that vehicle are resolved.

Commissioner Standish inquired of the size of the service vehicles that will be on site and utilized for the business. Mr. Sandee indicated there are three (3) vehicles which consist of two (2) legged wreckers and one (1) flatbed car carrier.

Commissioner Hughes inquired and Mr. Sandee indicated a fifty (50) ton service vehicle would remain stored outside when not in use.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Michael Aparo, 82 Schoolhouse Crossing, appeared before the Commission in opposition to this Application. He mentioned the dissatisfaction the property owner's removal of trees that created a buffer between the subject commercial site (61 Arrow Road) and his residential community. He spoke of a previous Application for the subject address to which he had no objection, as it was his understanding a storage facility was to be built further south and west of the buffer herein described. He is concerned that with the loss of the buffer area described and the noise, fumes, illumination and hours of operation of the Applicant's proposed business, the impact on the neighborhood will be severely negative. He questioned why there was a clear cut of the buffer area if the proposed business is located further away from that buffer area.

Elaine Ihnat, 92 Schoolhouse Crossing, appeared before the Commission in opposition to this Application. She is concerned that the property owner will not comply with any terms associated with the subject Application because the property owner does not have a history of following through with terms established for other Applications for this subject property/site. She is also concerned with the noise and lighting associated with the twenty-four (24) hour, seven (7) days per week commercial business operation proposed (and the potential growth of the business in this location, as described by the Applicant).

Rose Germano, 17 Tinsmith Crossing, appeared before the Commission in opposition to this Application. She noted that since the buffer has been removed, she can see what she referred to as the creation of a dump yard on the subject property, which is in direct view from her deck. There is a boat and a lunch wagon on the site. She also noted that deer are walking directly on Tinsmith Crossing pavement, as their habitat has been altered. She has been a resident at her current address for twenty seven (27) years and noted her compliance with rules such as where her rubbish can is placed on her property, etc., so that the property would look good. As such, she does not understand how and why the proposed Application would be approved based on the property owner's lack of care of the subject site.

Commissioner Oickle inquired and Ms. Germano indicated that the removal of the buffer occurred very recently (in the last week or possibly two), and the neighbors may not have had the chance to complain to the Town. Ms. Germano also mentioned that when Hooters Restaurant on the Berlin Turnpike has a car event, the Tinsmith Crossing neighborhood can hear that event. She is concerned with the ongoing presence of salvage and/or damaged vehicles on site, as well as the noise and lighting, associated with the operation of the business proposed.

Lynn Ford, 24 Tinsmith Crossing, appeared before the Commission in opposition to this Application. She mentioned her thirty (30) years of experience as a property manager has shown her that typically areas of this kind turn into a junk yard. She noted property values will be adversely affected. She also noted that she did not move to a quiet, serene place (Tinsmith Crossing) to look at the subject site in the condition that it is in.

Commissioner Oickle inquired and Ms. Ford indicated that the buffer trees were cut down and just left on the site, noting the appearance of that [former buffer] area is one of a negative aftermath from a severe storm. Ms. Ford is concerned with the noise generated from the twenty four (24) hour per day, seven (7) days per week business proposed that will constantly run trucks powered by diesel fuel. She is also concerned with the noise generated from the vehicle repair operation as well.

Lynn Burdick, 58 Tinsmith Crossing, appeared before the Commission in opposition to this Application. She mentioned her understanding was the property owner planned to build garages for the commercial tenants of the building because their vehicles were being looted and/or vandalized. She suspects the property owner has something going on due to the fact that the buffer was completed cleared and asked the Town to investigate that notion. As a twenty seven (27) year resident at her current address, she believes this Application will deteriorate the area and will add to the complexity of the Toll Brothers project going on across the street, especially with the issue of traffic.

Chairman Harley indicated that a property owner does not need permission from the Town to cut trees on their own property.

Mr. Gillespie indicated that a landscape buffer is required by Town Regulations if a certain type of structure were to be built or if the Planning and Zoning Commission made it a condition of an approval.

Mary Raum, 10 Tanner Crossing, appeared before the Commission in opposition to this Application. She mentioned she recognizes the right of a property owner to remove trees on their property. However, she noted it is unacceptable for stumps and tree debris to be left on site in disarray and in direct view of neighbors. She asked if the Town felt it was acceptable. She provided photographs taken of the site depicting a post removal of the buffer. She noted the property owner failed to comply with the terms of a prior approval for this site that required the property owner to provide a screening/buffer between the abutting neighborhood and the parking lot on Russell Road. She expressed that the proposed Application is out of step with the feeling of the area. She mentioned there is a gully on the site where drainage occurs and that land erosion will occur if the gully is not considered when altering the site. She also mentioned the Town's concern with drainage from the proposed Toll Brothers luxury home development, which is directly across the street from the site. She indicated the notification sign regarding this hearing was placed behind a tree on the site which was virtually not visible to passersby.

Commissioner Oickle inquired and Ms. Raum noted the dust and dirt from the unpaved site will likely be more of an issue due to the removal of the extensive buffer on the north side of the site.

This record reflects there were other residents of the Crossings who were present in the audience and chose not speak but were opposed to this Application.

Mr. Gillespie his several attempts to reach out to Mr. Tartaglia led to him being referred to Mr. Tartaglia's legal counsel today. Mr. Gillespie suggested a continuation of this hearing to allow Mr. Tartaglia and/or his counsel to appear at a Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting to address outstanding issues, etc. The issues to be addressed could be separated into the following two (2) categories: 1) issues to be addressed by the property owner and/or his legal counsel, and 2) issue to be addressed by the Applicant. Mr. Gillespie indicated the property owner had mentioned the trailers, junk, boat, etc., were supposedly going to be cleared away by this evening.

Commissioner Standish inquired and Mr. Gillespie indicated that input from the Town Attorney, Town Engineer and Town Staff may be necessary to weigh in on issues of blight, etc.

The Applicant is to consult with Town Staff regarding information needed for this Application. Information such as: 1) more details for the impound area, 2) compliance issues with lighting (full cutoff, etc.), 3) hours of operation, 4) screening where appropriate, 4) type/adequacy of ground cover.

Motion: Commissioner Oickle made a motion to continue the public hearing to Tuesday, January 15, 2013, of **PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATION NO. 1786-12-Z: Leonard Sande III** Seeking a Special Permit in accordance with Section 5.7 of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations for a General Repairer's License and outside storage yard at 61 Arrow Road.

Second: Commissioner Standish seconded the motion.

Aye: Harley, Roberts, Oickle, Hughes, Fazzina, Dean, Vasel, Standish;

Nay: None;

Vote: 8 – 0;

This Public Hearing was continued to Tuesday, January 15, 2013.

3.2 Review of the Draft 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development.

[Glenn Chalder, AICP, Planimetrics, made a presentation and led a discussion thereafter with the Commissioners, Mr. Gillespie, Ms. Bradley, and Members of the Public regarding the community's review of the Draft Updating the 2000 Plan of Conservation and Development at the Commission Meeting held December 4, 2012 in the Keeney Center. Mr. Chalder noted the Wethersfield 2013 Plan of Conservation & Development is a strategic plan for the physical development of the community and that it is an advisory document prepared by the Planning & Zoning Commission intended to guide local actions and to provide a framework for consistent decision making in the next decade or so.

Themes discussed in the Draft Plan concerned maintaining community character and quality of life, guiding development, and addressing other issues such as protecting natural resources, preserving open space, managing the roadway system, supporting farms and farming, promoting sustainability and resiliency, maintaining and enhancing utility infrastructure, and managing Wethersfield Cove. Implementation schedules are included in the Draft Plan that would indicate a task a priority code for a given subject, a date of when the task was added, a target date for task completion, Town agency leader of the task, and Town agency partners in the task.

Mr. Chalder had encouraged the public to refer to the website: <http://planwethersfield.com> to obtain a Draft of the Plan and to learn more information regarding the Plan, as well as the on-line and telephone survey results pertaining to how Wethersfield citizens responded to inquiries regarding Wethersfield.

The Commissioners and Mr. Chalder reviewed the latest language modifications made to the Draft Plan and some minor changes were made. The cover proposed in this Draft Plan is agreeable to the Commission.

Mr. Chalder indicated the next edition of the Draft Plan will not be revisions marked, as to allow it to be shared by having it available on the website, at the Library, and for Mr. Gillespie to direct its distribution when needed.

The Commission has taken the next step in the process of Plan adoption by scheduling a public hearing regarding this Plan as they felt that no additional investigation was needed at this time.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

There were no comments made during this meeting from the public regarding this Draft Plan.

Motion: Vice Chairman Roberts made a motion to schedule a Tuesday, April 2, 2013 public hearing pertaining to the adoption of the 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development.

Second: Commissioner Fazzina seconded the motion.

Aye: Harley, Roberts, Oickle, Hughes, Fazzina, Dean, Vasel, Standish;

Nay: None;

Vote: 8 – 0;

A Public Hearing regarding the 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development is scheduled for Tuesday, April 2, 2013.

4. OTHER BUSINESS:

There was no Other Business discussed at this meeting.

5. MINUTES – December 18, 2012 Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes:

Motion: Commissioner Oickle made a motion to approve the Minutes from the December 18, 2012, Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting, as submitted.

Second: Vice Chairman Roberts seconded the motion.

Aye: Harley, Roberts, Oickle, Vasel, Standish;

Nay: None;

Vote: 5 – 0;

Commissioners Hughes, Fazzina, and Dean did not participate in the vote.

Minutes of the December 18, 2012 Meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission were Approved, as submitted.

6. STAFF REPORTS:

Mr. Gillespie reported that the façade details on the south side of the building at the site f/k/a the Porter & Chester Building, as stipulated to in **PUBLIC HEARING APPLICATION NO. 1755-12-Z: PDS Construction Inc.** [PDS Construction, Inc. Seeking a Special Permit in accordance with Section 5.2 of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations for a change of use from business to retail and associated site improvements at 125 Silas Deane Highway], have been completed.

7. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON GENERAL MATTERS OF PLANNING AND ZONING.

There were no public comments made at this meeting regarding general matters of planning and zoning.

8. CORRESPONDENCE:

There were no items of correspondence discussed at this meeting.

9. PENDING APPLICATIONS TO BE HEARD AT FUTURE MEETINGS:

There were no pending applications discussed during this meeting.

10. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion: Commissioner Oickle motioned to adjourn the meeting at 10:10 p.m.

Second: Commissioner Fazzina seconded the motion.

Aye: Harley, Roberts, Oickle, Hughes, Fazzina, Dean, Vasel, Standish;

Nay: None;

Vote: 8 – 0;

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Ellen Goslicki, Recording Secretary