

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
Tuesday, February 20, 2018
Clifford B. Green Meeting Center
69 South Main Street
6:30 p.m.**

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order** – Michelle Sisfridson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.
- II. Roll Call** – Michelle Sigfridson, Carleen Kelleher, A. Kerouac, J. D’Agostino, Austin Tanner.
J. Mohn was absent with notice. Alan Carpenter resigned.
- III. Seating of Alternates** – None.

IV. Adoption of Minutes:

Regular Meeting Minutes January 3, 2018

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 3, 2018. Second by A. Tanner.

Discussion:

The following correction was suggested:

- A. Tanner – Page 4, The Item/Heading was missing for the following:
 - VIII. New Business:**
 - 2. **SP 18-001** - 554 Providence Road, McDonalds; PC Zone; Proposed façade update, side by side drive-thru layout, ADA accessible parking spaces, walkway improvements, and pedestrian connection to the public right of way.

Motion carried unanimously with the correction (5-0-0).

Special Meeting Minutes January 16, 2018

Motion was made by A. Tanner to approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting of January 16, 2018. Second by A. Kerouac. There was discussion.

J. D’Agostino provided copies of a page that he had prepared regarding a poll that had taken place that he feels the results were inaccurately depicted (on page 7) in the Minutes of the Meeting. Mr D’Agostino explained the sheet that he had provided containing his comments and he said that, twice before, consensus of the Commission was for Industrial Zone, not the RA Zone. He asked that the Commission Members review it prior to a vote being taken.

Mr. D’Agostino suggested amending the results of the poll as depicted in the Minutes:

Since there was confusion regarding poll results, the Commission decided to re-do the poll regarding where to allow contractor’s yards:

- J. D’Agostino – Industrial Zone only. He does not see this business in the RA Zone at all.
- A. Tanner stated that he disagrees with J. D’Agostino. He does see it in the Ra Zone and Industrial.
- J. Mohn – Industrial and RA with the kind of restrictions that C. Kelleher spoke about.
- C. Kelleher – Industrial and RA with conditions and stipulations.
- A. Kerouac – Industrial only.

RESULTS OF POLL – IN WHICH ZONES WILL CONTRACTOR’S YARDS BE ALLOWED?

**3 IN FAVOR OF INDUSTRIAL ZONE AND RA ZONE
2 IN FAVOR OF INDUSTRIAL ZONE ONLY**

To reflect the results of the poll as follows:

JD – Industrial
AT – Industrial and RA
JM – Industrial and RA
CK – Industrial and RA
AJ – Industrial

Industrial – 5
RA - 3

Mr. D’Agostino also suggested that the amendment include the following:

That an appropriate notation is earmarked and initialed on the January 3, 2018 Minutes.

Second by A. Kerouac. There was more discussion as there was disagreement among the Commission Members regarding whether the vote was supposed to have been for one or the other, Industrial or RA.

Amendment to the Main Motion failed (2-3-0). M. Sigfridson, C. Kelleher and A. Tanner were opposed.

- A. Tanner suggested the following correction:
Page 5, Poll of the Commission to see how many are in favor of Home Businesses in the R-30. Mr. Tanner clarified that his vote was yes.

Motion to approve the Minutes of the January 16, 2018 Meeting including Mr. Tanner’s correction carried (3-2-0). A. Kerouac and J. D’Agostino were opposed.

V. Public Commentary – None.

VI. Unfinished Business:

- a. Reading of Legal Notice** – Read by M. Sigfriden. J. Roberson noted that the Public Hearing was originally scheduled for February 7, 2018, but had to be rescheduled this evening due to inclement weather. The Cancellation notice had been posted on the door on the evening of February 7th and that it had been posted on the Town’s website and that it went out to the required list of people who get public hearing information.
- b. Continued Public Hearings:** None.
- c. New Public Hearings:**
 - 1. SP 18-001** - 554 Providence Road, McDonalds; PC Zone; Proposed façade update, side by side drive-thru layout, ADA accessible parking spaces, walkway improvements, and pedestrian connection to the public right of way.

John Cusick, Bohler Engineering, represented the Applicant and explained that James Cranston was unable to attend this evening. Mr. Cusick gave an overview of the project:

- Upgrades to the facade
- Improvements to the drive-thru
- To ensure the site is in full compliance with accessibility standards

Drive-Thru:

They will incorporate side-by-side ordering. McDonalds has been using this technology for over twelve years. Mr. Cusick indicated where the two ordering stations are to be located and the path the vehicles would follow through the queue and he explained that this will help to reduce stacking of vehicles. He indicated twelve existing parking spaces that would be removed to make space for this drive-thru. He noted that removing those twelve spaces would reduce the number of proposed parking spaces to 63 (which, he stated, is still within full compliance with local requirements as well as McDonald’s operational needs).

Accessibility:

- Mr. Cusick indicated where they will be rebuilding existing sidewalks, ensuring that they meet slope requirements. Sidewalks will go out to the street.
- He indicated where accessible parking spaces will be ripped out and rebuilt to compliance.

Mr. Cusick stated that the remainder of the site would be unchanged (specifically noting that there would be no changes to driveways, perimeter of site, utilities).

Mr. Cusick referred to an updated plan regarding the Building (which he stated had been submitted). He gave an overview of proposed changes:

- Roof – He indicated where the existing roof is to be removed and the parapet will be raised.
- Mechanicals on the building to remain screened as they are today.
- To be more of a New England-style color as opposed to white, yellow and red.

Mr. Cusick took questions from the Commission:

- He explained what is proposed for the interior of the building: the dining room will be fully re-done and improvements will be made to the bathrooms. He stated that the goal is to make it look like a new restaurant. He explained that there may be a few less seats in the dining room because they make it a little roomier. There will be order kiosks (for pre-ordering).
- When asked about the proposed colors, Mr. Cusick explained that there are a couple different color palettes that they choose from and the colors chosen for this site are shades of what they have been using throughout New England.
- They are not proposing a children's area for this site.
- When asked about wall signage, Mr. Cusick indicated the locations for two wall signs: one on the front of the building; and one on the non-drive-thru side (east elevation). Each would be about 14 s.f. There will be no moveable signs. J. Roberson noted that McDonald's sometimes has temporary signs for particular offers. Mr. Cusick explained that those are the old loading chutes that have probably been shut off.
- J. Roberson was asked which abutters were notified. She stated that all abutters were notified and that she had received documentation of the notices. She stated that the sign had been posted on the property as required by the Regulations. She commented that everything was prepared completely by Bohler Engineering.
- When asked if she had received any feedback, Ms. Roberson stated that she had not received any comments from neighbors. There was no interest at all. Mr. Cusick stated that they also had not received any comments.

The Design Review Report from Evelyn Cole Smith Architects, LLC (dated January 22, 2018) and comments from Syl Pauley, Regional Engineer-NECCOG (e-mail to J. Roberson dated January 9, 2018) were included in packets to the Commission Members.

There was discussion regarding the Design Review Report. There was discussion regarding the colors (cool grey tones of various shades, with the exception of the yellow). Mr. Cusick explained base building paint: the building is brick and that the brick will be painted. There will be a couple of build-out features (there was a sample of the tile material that is proposed to be used).

M. Sigfridson expressed disappointment with the proposed facade as it seems very industrial. She feels it is harsh and unattractive. Mr. Cusick explained that the intent of the design is to get away from the red/white/yellow and lighted roof. They are trying to make it look more colonial. Ms. Roberson mentioned that she had previously provided photos of other McDonalds that had been done in this style to the Commission Members. J. D'Agostino voiced agreement with M. Sigfridson. Discussion ensued regarding possible other warmer-toned color schemes that would still fit in with the corporate brand. Mr. Cusick stated that most of them revolve around the grey scales. A. Kerouac voiced agreement with

M. Sigfridson, but also noted that he has noticed that there was another style being done in previous years that was more colonial, this style being proposed seems to be what is being done presently.

- Architectural Question: When asked about the awning, Mr. Cusick stated that it will come out a little bit, but the purpose is more of a design element to provide additional character.

C. Kelleher stated that they have done a fairly nice job with existing landscaping and it is adequate, they are putting a new face on an existing building so there are some limitations inherent in that, the Engineer and the Design Review Architect are okay with it.

- A. Kerouac expressed that he feels the landscaping is adequate. He asked about parking (all the way to the north) and how the turning radius (for the 18 wheelers) fit. Mr. Cusick measured and stated that they are 18 feet with a concrete overhang and he explained that the drive isle is still well-within the requirements for one-way circulation (over 20 feet). Mr. Kerouac stated that this is the most significant modification to an existing building that he has ever seen. Mr. Cusick stated and indicated that there is room and that the spaces will be functional.
- A. Kerouac asked what the interior capacity will be. Mr. Cusick explained that the capacity inside the building will be less, but overall, you want to keep the client base that you have and may them want to come back by giving them a nicer building.

There were no comments from the public.

J. Roberson asked what size truck the truck circulation was based on. Mr. Cusick stated it was based on a WB50 truck which is a semi-trailer with a 50-foot wheel base. Ms. Roberson noted that the loading space was being moved further away from the building to the area where the parking spaces are being eliminated. She noted that the parking is still in excess of what is required by the Regulations. She also stated, for the record, that extending the pedestrian walkway out to the sidewalk on Route 6 is something that the design guidelines would call for.

Motion was made by J. D'Agostino to close the public hearing for **SP 18-001** - 554 Providence Road, McDonalds; PC Zone; Proposed façade update, side by side drive-thru layout, ADA accessible parking spaces, walkway improvements, and pedestrian connection to the public right of way. Second by A. Tanner. Motion carried unanimously (5-0-0).

d. Other Unfinished Business:

1. **SPR 17-004** – 242 Hartford Road, Balone Properties, LLC; RA Zone; Proposed Home Business with Resident Contractor/Office.

J. Roberson stated that IWWC has not acted on this Application yet and that Mr. Barone may rescind the application. She stated that there are no changes at this time. The Application automatically gets tabled.

2. **SP 18-001** - 554 Providence Road, McDonalds; PC Zone; Proposed façade update, side by side drive-thru layout, ADA accessible parking spaces, walkway improvements, and pedestrian connection to the public right of way.

Motion was made by A. Kerouac to approve **SP 18-001** - 554 Providence Road, McDonalds; PC Zone; Proposed façade update, side by side drive-thru layout, ADA accessible parking spaces, walkway improvements, and pedestrian connection to the public right of way, as presented. Second by C. Kelleher.

Discussion:

M. Sigfridson asked J. Roberson if all preliminaries were taken care of and if the Commission is ready to act on this Application tonight. Ms. Roberson stated, “yes.”

A. Kerouac stated that he feels it is going to look very nice, but the Commission needs to consider the trend that it is setting. As there have been recent significant remodels/new constructions that do not fit the New England, “cottagey”

town look as recommended by Design Architect, Evelyn Cole-Smith. M. Sigfridson has concern regarding the same thing and stated that the Applicant has not paid attention to the design guidelines. She stated that the unarticulated surfaces are very unattractive. She said that it is an improvement to an out-of-date building, but it could have been done much better. Discussion ensued.

J. D'Agostino agrees and asked what the cost of the project is. Mr. Cusick stated that the overall cost is approximately \$700,000.00.

A. Tanner understands, but he stated that this type of suggestion should have been brought up sooner so that the Applicant could have been working on it.

Motion carried (4-1-0). M. Sigfridson was opposed for the reasons she stated above.

VII. New Business:

a. Applications:

1. **SP18-002** – George M. Richardson, 15 Providence Road, Map 24, Lot 139, VCD; Restaurant and Café.

Dr. George M. Richardson represented himself. He is a resident of Woodstock, CT. He wants to change from a hair replacement salon to a restaurant & café. There are to be no physical changes to the outside of the building, but the inside will be renewed.

J. Roberson explained that the Special Permit Application was automatically received at the meeting that had been cancelled (February 7, 2018). The Application is incomplete at this time, but the Applicant is working with Paul Archer to prepare a site plan. They are working to arrange meetings with the Fire Marshal, Building Official, ZEO, Ms. Roberson and contractors to identify potential issues. The building is not currently connected to sewer, but can be. Parking requirements to be based on seating. Accessibility also needs to be addressed. It is a permitted use in the VCD and would be a great re-use of the historical structure. She suggested postponing scheduling the public hearing until the Application is complete.

Dr. Richardson stated that his philosophy is to give people memories. He stated that it would be reasonable and they would try to cater to the neighborhood and families. He said that the Churches are in favor. He said that he spoke to the Arch Diocese and they won't have problems with parking.

A Kerouac commented on getting a shared parking agreement with the Churches and he also commented regarding shutting down the access point to the right (near the intersection). Mr. Kerouac asked about hours of operation. Dr. Richardson answered: Mornings 6 a.m. – 2 p.m. for breakfast and lunch; Wednesday thru Saturday 5 p.m. – 9 p.m.

Dr. Richardson stated that this would be a table service restaurant with 120 seats (8 rooms). The second floor will be used. Handicapped seating will be on the first floor.

Parking requirement is one parking space for every three seats (40 spaces). There is some land in the back where the parking area could be expanded. If a shared parking agreement can be made with the Churches, it is permissible if the Commission approves it (a traffic study would need to be done and the two uses' peak parking cannot be at the same time).

Dr. Richardson, who has owned a bed-and-breakfast for 27 years, plans to manage the business. His daughter is a French pastry chef. His son-in-law is a teacher at a culinary institution.

2. **ZRC18-001** - Carrie Juhasz, 38 Day Street, Map 42, Lot 74, R10 Zone; Request to amend Article 6.1.

Ms. Juhasz was not present.

M. Sigfridson read the requested change from the Application:

“Beauty shops of more than one sink and one haircutting station or beauty shops of more than one operator.”

“To move my clients to a home-based salon so that I can maintain my clientele while also spending more time with my child and husband.”

J. Roberson explained that she had informed Ms. Juhasz that the meeting had been rescheduled to tonight. Ms. Roberson stated that she had done some research and had sent her findings to Ms. Juhasz.

There was discussion. C. Kelleher stated that she would like to see this get approved. However, she is concerned with the way it is drafted which would permit one chair/one sink beauty shops to be included as an enterprise in the home. It would only fit in as a home business which would not fit in with Home Business Regulation. J. Roberson provided copies of new drafted language for definitions of Beauty Shop and Single Service Salon. She suggested also adding Single Service Salon as a use as of right in the appropriate zone. She explained that the Application can be modified.

C. Kelleher stated that she likes this approach and she is okay with the definition for Single Service Salon as long as it can reasonably be considered an accessory use.

J. D’Agostino voiced concern for opening the door.

There was discussion. M. Sigfridson suggested amending the Home Office Regulation so that it would not exclude this type of business (Single Service Salon). C. Kelleher expressed agreement. J. Roberson asked if there was a consensus. No opposition was voiced.

There was more discussion. A. Kerouac stated that Home Business is a more intrusive use than a one-chair home salon. He stated if a one-chair salon were included in Home Business areas it would bring down the traffic uses that are already permitted there. J. Roberson read from Section 6.2.2.4 – “No business shall be conducted from the home office except by mail or electronic medium.” Ms. Roberson stated that a single client at a time is more akin to an office than some higher tiers of home enterprise (that would qualify as home business). M. Sigfridson stated that she is in favor of easing up on the definition of Home Office. A. Kerouac feels it would be expanding the Home Office. A. Tanner and C. Kelleher expressed that they like it because it will allow the hairdresser and also a dietitian.

M. Sigfridson asked if any of the Commission Members would object to removing or changing the language that restricts a Home Office to electronic and mail modes of business. J. D’Agostino stated that he is willing to keep an open mind, but he has some issues with it. A. Kerouac stated that, when he reads it, he thinks it speaks to the buying or selling of goods, not services. Mr. Kerouac suggestions: Eliminating it – probably not what should be done; Add language – Buying or selling of goods shall not be conducted on site other than by mail or electronic. Discussion continued.

J. Roberson will draft language and e-mail to the Commission Members.

3. **SPR 04-05 #2** (Special Permit Modification #2): Addition of second generator at Creamery Brook Village.

Bruce Woodis, KWP Associates, represented the Applicant and explained that a week after approval was granted on December 19, 2017, Eversource told the electrical engineers that, because of a voltage difference, the cottages would require another small generator (150 kilowatts) in addition to the one that was approved. The big generator has been reduced in size (was 900 kilowatts, now 750 kilowatts). They are proposing to expand the pad to accommodate the additional generator (behind the other one). IWWC approved the modification. Mr. Woodis asked what the procedure would be.

J. Roberson stated that no application fee had been paid yet. Ms. Roberson explained that a fee of \$310.00 had been charged for other special permit modifications. IWWC did not charge an additional fee, they just modified a previous approval. Ms. Roberson feels that a legal notice should be republished because the description has changed, but the Commission needs to decide if this is significant enough to be considered a whole new approval subject to an application fee or not.

Mr. Woodis stated that the amount of fuel (diesel) storage is the same. Stored in special tanks on the pad under the generator (with special precautions for leak prevention, etc.).

A. Kerouac feels that it is a modification to a previous approval. C. Kelleher agreed. Mr. Kerouac feels that it was covered under the first legal notice. Mr. Kerouac asked why it would come to the Commission as a special permit modification. J. Roberson stated that Creamery Brook itself was a special permit.

M. Sigfridson feels that it should not require a new application and she stated that, if there is any doubt about the notice, it should be republished especially since the Applicant is not objecting to pay for it. J. D'Agostino stated that is a wise thing to do. J. Roberson offered to give a drafted legal notice to the Applicant to publish. Mr. Woodis submitted a check in the amount of \$100.00 for J. Roberson to publish the notice and she will reimburse any unused portion. J. Roberson stated that this is a break in protocol which may create a delay.

b. Other New Business:

1. Discussion of Zoning Regulations Rewrite: Contractors Yards, Zoning Map, Release of Public Review Draft, etc. (time permitting).

M. Sigfridson suggested that discussion regarding Contractors Yards be postponed to a meeting when all Members of the Commission are present.

J. Roberson asked to be allowed to present her research regarding contractors yards (provided copies to Commission Members)

Contractors Yards:

- She did not draft language for the RA Zone, but added it to the Industrial Zone guided by the Commission's concerns. She was unable to find regulations from other towns.
- There is a definition.
- Portland, CT breaks contractors yards two ways: Construction Contractors (big – site work/excavation); Trade Contractors (e.g. painter). Only allowed in industrial zones. Construction Contractors are not allowed in Restricted Industrial Zone.
- Ellington, CT breaks down between contractors, equipment sales and storage (e.g. landscapers, pool companies) are allowed by special permit in industrial and commercial zones. Big contractors (e.g. excavation and demolition) are only allowed in the industrial zone. Wholesale or retail sales of mulch, pea stone or soil is a retail use. She suggests not having a one size fits all for different kinds of contractors yards.
- Criteria:
 - Ellington requires buffering when adjacent to a residential zone/residence. Can use existing vegetation. Outdoor storage is regulated.
 - Deep River – Industrial Zone by site plan review. Not officially adopted yet. Loose material stored in bins, landscape buffer along residential property lines and 15-foot buffer along the street line, designated storage areas, hazard materials requirements, equipment must be on impervious surface designed to retain spills.
 - She spoke with the Aquifer Protection person at DEEP regarding fluids.
- Out of State Research Results:
 - Lebanon, NH - Home-Based Contractors Yards by special exceptions.
 - Cortland, New York has some very industrial zones where they allow contractors yards in the designed industrial and light industrial zones. They have criteria which the Commission may want to use as a guide.
 - Montgomery County, Maryland – Also uses two classifications. Criteria were interesting. Landscaping Contractors allowed in RA Zone, Residential and Industrial Zones. Contractors storage yard only allowed in industrial zone.
- Conversations with local people who may have a contractors yard use:
 - Mike Malone prefers to be on the eastern side of Town.
 - Another person looking at a property in the Planned Commercial Zone with access to Route 6 who is interested in storage of construction materials as accessory to an Interstate trucking operation.

Ms. Roberson stated that although three Commission Members were interested in pursuing contractors yards in the RA Zone, she did not find other towns doing it. She feels that the Home Enterprise Regulations are accommodating if it is a home-based business. She asked Commission Members to think about adding contractors yards to the Planned Commercial Zone and RB (wholesale landscaping products are already allowed in RB) as an alternative option to the RA Zone (which is 80 percent of the Town), in addition to the Industrial Zone. Changing boundaries can be looked at as part of the Zone Boundary discussion.

J. D'Agostino voiced his opinion which is to start slow and only allow it in the Industrial Zone and see what happens, see if it is good for the Town, then maybe add it to other zones. Changing boundaries makes him nervous.

A.Kerouac voiced his opinion which is, "common sense tells us not into a residential area." He does not want it in the RB.

M. Sigfirdson asked if anyone has expressed interest in putting anything into the Industrial Zone. J. Roberson stated yes, but not a contractors yard. J. Roberson stated that she was going to suggest that the Commission consider adding another residential property close to the intersection to connect Route 6 to the Industrial Zone to allow for better access to the Industrial Zone. She also asked the Commission to consider adding Industrial Agriculture (which may occur indoors) to the Industrial Zone.

A.Kerouac explained his opinion that adding contractors yards to the Industrial Zone is expanding and allowing businesses to grow in Town.

J. Roberson noted that water, sewer, natural gas and three-phase power are important for certain businesses to locate and they are all there in the Industrial Zone.

There was discussion regarding access.

J. Roberson asked if she should draft regulations for contractors yards as a special permit use in the RA Zone since new information was presented (that other towns don't have in residential areas). There was discussion. J. Roberson will draft regulations for review by the Commission.

Zoning Map Discussion:

Copies of the draft prepared by A. Kerouac were provided to Commission Members.

Release of Public Review Draft Discussion:

J. Roberson suggested that she feels that the the draft of the Regulations is ready to be released to the public. Although she and Martha Fraenkel have discovered that they each have a different approach, they are still working on the ones that try to be more user friendly. C. Kelleher feels that it is important that the public understand that the draft that will be presented is not the final draft. Ms Roberson stated that she has not had time to make the bulleted list of all of the major changes. There was agreement that Ms. Roberson should do the list of changes before working on regulations for contractors yards. It was suggested that the list have a note that it is not all inclusive. Ms. Roberson will send the list (via e-mail) to the Commission Members for review.

J. Roberson explained that the draft will be dated, she will have copies made, and she will not release it until the Commission Members have had a chance to review it.. She stated that they still need the Zoning Map, they need to finish contractors yards, and the public hearing should not be scheduled until the draft of the Regulations is complete. The draft needs to be complete 30 days before going to public hearing.

There was discussion regarding feedback from other Commissions regarding the Zoning Map.

A. Kerouac reported:

- EDC had one issue – South Main Street.
- Housing Authority had one issue – Public Safety and Traffic.
- IWWC – Looked along the River for uses with Martha Fraenkel. The Aquifer Protection Regulations which covered most of their concerns.
- There has been no response from the Selectmen yet.
- Conservations Commission – They want to make sure that soil maps are taken into account.
- Agriculture Commission – They were easy - they are exempt from a lot. M. Sigfridson stated that they may be interested in preserving farmable land. A. Kerouac stated that they would need to see Pay Boyd and Mae Flexer regarding concern with soils. It involves zoning, but we won't be the decision makers for that.

J. Roberson will draft language for gravel processing special permit. She did not find another town with a gravel processing special permit. J. Roberson will make sure that the place holder in the draft will state that gravel processing has to occur in conjunction with gravel mining, but it is its own special permit.

There was discussion regarding timeline and when changes would be made to the draft if a Commission suggested changes.

J. Roberson has notes from A. Tanner regarding gravel processing and other topics:

- Special Permit is an owner's burden for adaptive re-use of an agricultural building.
- 100-feet of frontage on a Conservation Subdivision lot may be too much.

J. Roberson will copy the list so that it can be discussed at another time.

Discussion regarding the Zoning Map to take place at the March Regular Meeting if time allows and making it a priority for the March Special Meeting if not finished at the Regular Meeting. A. Kerouac has comments from Martha Fraenkel regarding expanding the RB and West Wauregan for the Zoning Map discussion. A. Kerouac suggests putting the newest one up totally blank and have all suggestions on a bulleted list.

J. D'Agostino asked about Alternative Business Arrangements.

C. Kelleher asked about a letter from a resident regarding a complaint about lighting that was included in the packets to the Commission Members. J. Roberson explained that the new Section 7.G.3.1 addresses this residential situation and she offered to contact the writer of the letter and send a copy of the new regulations so they will know what to expect. There was discussion.

VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees:

1. ZEO's Report – No Report.
There was discussion regarding lighting at Courtesy Ford.
There was discussion regarding Danielson Glass outdoor equipment storage (two lifts).
2. Budget
M. Sigfridson stated that everything looks like it is order.
A. Kerouac asked if there is enough money in the current budget to do another build-out (Paula Stall): VCD; West Wauregan; South Main Street. It was suggested that the re-write be completed first. There was discussion. J. Roberson distributed copies for those who wanted them.
There was discussion regarding the public review of the draft and who will be organizing it.
3. Correspondence
See Above (letter regarding lighting complaint).
CFPZA Annual Dinner on March 22, 2018, at the Aqua-Turf.
4. Chairman's Report – No Report.

IX. Public Commentary

There was discussion regarding the public review of the draft and who will be conducting it

X. Adjourn

M. Sigfridson adjourned the meeting at 9:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault

Recording Secretary

(The Recording Secretary was not present at this meeting and did the minutes from the audio recording.)