AGENDA

THE MEETING WILL ADJOURN AT 11:00 P.M.

REGULAR MEETING 7:00 P.M.

1. Roll Call

Present were Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Peter Falk, Lori Longhi, Charles Ladd, Nicles Lefakis, and Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick.

Absent was Chairman Charles Duren.

Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick would be sitting in for the absent commissioners.

2. Executive Session

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Drinan to enter into executive session. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Longhi to do item #7, Commissioners Correspondence, on the agenda at this time. The motion passed with a 6-0-1 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners. Commissioner Lefakis abstained from this vote.
7. Commissioner’s Correspondence

Alternate Commissioner Drinan stated that they received a letter from acting town manager, Lee Erdman regarding the need to appoint a temporary back up ZEO because of the absence of the current ZEO who is out of the office for a little over three weeks. He stated that they have been given several names and considered other names as well.

Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to appoint Ms. Kathleen Sarno to the temporary one time back up ZEO position. This appointment would only be for weekdays starting October 2, 2015 through October 9, 2015 for six work days from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. each day which are the open office hours of the town. Also that this temporary backup appointment is not a precedent for any future appointments of either temporary or permanent zoning enforcement officers and that this is a one-time appointment to address an emergency need. He also stated that the Town of Enfield will provide liability coverage for this person for errors and omissions and that any appointment by this commission does not constitute appointment of a temporary Inland Wetland and Water Courses agent or liaison or a temporary Zoning Board of Appeals liaison or agent because that is not in the commission's authority, despite that the current ZEO who is out for three weeks occupies all three positions.

Commissioner Longhi stated that Kathleen Sarno had been a member of the Planning and Zoning Department for many years and recently left the board and they felt that she was more than qualified. Commissioner Ballard said she agreed with Commissioner Longhi. She went on to say that this problem has been caused by other people and not by the commission. They were given four resumes for other people but these people have jobs already. She stated that there are applications with the town that need to be approved or not and so she feels that they needed to make this appointment. Alternate Commissioner Drinan also said he agreed with what Commissioner Longhi said and said that Ms. Sarno years of experience gives her a lot of experience with their zoning regulations and how they are enforced. Despite the fact that she is not CAZEO qualified her experience certainly outweighs any CAZEO credentials and she would not need CAZEO training to do the job. He said if Ms. Sarno is approved for this temporary position for one week he requests that they have her resume on file just like they would for any other applicant. Commissioner Falk asked if anyone had spoken with Ms. Sarno and Commissioner Longhi stated that she had and Ms. Sarno said she would be willing to do it on a short-term basis.

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.
Commissioner Lori Longhi left the meeting at 7:31 p.m. Commissioner Lefakis made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Ludwick to go out of order on the agenda. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.


a. PH# 2824 – Special use permit application to renovate portion of existing building from convent to 57 apartment units located at 1315 Enfield Street (aka 1297 Enfield Street); Zone District HR-33; Map 046-Lot 0002; Felician Sister of North America Real Estate Trust, owner/applicant. DoR: 7/16/2015; M CPH: 10/29/15.

Secretary Falk took the roll and present were and Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Peter Falk, Charles Ladd, Nicles Lefakis, and Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick who would be sitting in for the absent commissioners.

Mr. Paul Selnau, Architect and Vice President for Schadler Selnau Associates addressed the commission. They are the architects and representative for the Felician Sisters of North America for renovation of a portion of their existing building into 57 non-profit residential housing units. Mr. Selnau stated that there was a comment at the last meeting regarding providing handicap accessible parking closer to the main entrance of the apartment building, so they have added two handicap parking spaces and in doing that they are required to have 168 spaces which they have and are still in compliance. He stated there is a second drawing which has to do with the condenser units located on the roof. As he previously indicated they are rooftop units located on top of the building which is approximately 45 feet in height. They are about 2 feet square and 36 inches high. The cross section on the drawing is taken from South Street and with the line of site at approximately 190 feet away they are not visible from that street which is the closest street. They are putting in 57 to 60 small condensing units to keep them small, low profile, keep them energy efficient, and provide air conditioning and cooling for the entire facility. Mr. Selnau’s final update for discussion following the last meeting was in regards to the fire marshal and the location he had asked for his fire connection which is also in the updated drawing.

Commissioner Falk asked about the old driveway and that it is still on the drawing. Mr. Selnau stated that it is not part of the project. Commissioner Falk said they would have to make it a condition of approval to take it out.
Commissioner Ballard opened public hearing PH #2824 to the public and asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak in favor or against the application. Ms. Karen Laplante from 166 North Maple Street addressed the commission. She wanted to ask the commission that on a lot of the conversion these apartments are smaller than their regulations allow and wanted to know if they meet the regulations.

Commissioner Drinan stated that Mr. Rairigh assured the commission last week that the smallest unit is larger than 600 sq. ft.

Commissioner Ballard closed public hearing PH #2824.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to approve waiver submission requirements in connection with application PH #2824. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Drinan to approve PH #2824 by Felician Sisters of North America Real Estate Trust for a partial conversion of a convent building to 57 units of non-profit residential housing at 1315 Enfield Street, aka 1297 Enfield Street, in accordance with the submitted application; referenced plan cited below; documentation listed in the public record; testimony received during the public hearings of September 24 and October 1, 2015; and in accordance with conditions appended hereto.

The referenced plans are as listed below:

- “Cover Sheet with Sheet Index, Special Use Permit, Proposed Felician Sisters Apartment Project, 1325 Enfield Street, Enfield, CT July 2015.” List of Consultants Regarding their Submittals; Sheet A-0; Sheet 1 of 14; Scale: N/A; Prepared for Felician Sisters of North America, 871 Mercer Road, Beaver Falls, PA 15010; Prepared by Schadler Selnau Associates, P.C., dated August 6, 2014.
This application is approved with the following conditions:

Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:
1. The former front driveway shall be removed from drawing C-101. This approval does not include use of the former front driveway.
2. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.

3. The application number PH #2824 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.

4. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.

5. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.

6. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.

Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:

7. Four sets of paper plans and one set of mylar plans, with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission. The signed mylars shall be recorded by the applicants and/or owners in the Land Records.

8. This approval will become effective upon the filing of a Special Use Zoning Certificate signed by the Commission Secretary on the Land Records by the owner of the property. Proof of such filing shall be in the file prior to the issuance of any permits.

General Conditions:

9. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

10. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.

11. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by October 1, 2016 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.

12. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by October 1, 2020 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

13. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.
b. XZA# 15-11 Zoning Text Change to Section 8.80.1.5 – Roof-mounted small solar energy systems. Enfield Clean Energy Committee; applicant. DoR: 7/16/2015; M CPH: 10/29/15.

Secretary Falk took the roll and present were and Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Peter Falk, Charles Ladd, Nicles Lefakis, and Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick who would be sitting in for the absent commissioners.

Mr. Shawn Rairigh addressed the commission and stated that the applicant was unable to attend the meeting. He read a letter to the commission stating that they wanted to withdraw the proposed language change to the zoning code regarding solar on residential buildings. As discussed at the last meeting the Clean Energy Committee will re-submit the residential request with language added to guide installations that are not visible from the street and to please go ahead with the request regarding solar installations in commercial and industrial buildings also as discussed at the September 24, 2015. Alternate Commissioner Drinan stated that he thinks they need specific wording to take action and if and when they do any change has to go before the town attorney and then to CRCOG before they can act. Commissioner Drinan went on to stay that withdrawing part of a sentence from a prior application does not tell them what the wording is going to be. Mr. Rairigh stated that the commission does have the right to change the language. He also said that in talking with Melissa it is very specific what language she wanted to take out. As far as CRCOG they have informed everyone that they will have to wait until CRCOG approves it as well. Commissioner Falk stated that the word ‘exempt’ leaves things wide open and they need to be specific with what it is that is being exempted. Mr. Rairigh stated they would be adding to the end “All rooftop solar installations have to be in a single square or rectangular pattern; commercial buildings and industrial buildings are exempt from this requirement.’ Commissioner Drinan asked if there are any conditions at all that they would be putting on commercial or industrial buildings. Mr. Rairigh stated they would be able to do anything.

Commissioner Drinan stated he would like to see the specific words that describe what they are approving before he could consider voting to move forward. Mr. Rairigh stated that the wording would be “commercial and industrial buildings are exempt from this requirement’ and that would be added to the end of D. The idea is that most of commercial and industrial buildings in town have flat roofs and they will not see the installations. Commissioner Lefakis stated that he had something a little more specific for wording looking at exhibit 2; ‘Commercial and industrial buildings located in commercial and industrial zones are exempt from the configuration shape required in D’ Mr. Rairigh stated that that would protect them from commercial and industrial buildings in residential zones.
Commissioner Ballard opened public hearing XZA #15-11 to the public and asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak in favor or against the application.

Mr. Jeff Weber from 208 Shaker Road, Long Meadow, MA addressed the commission. Mr. Jeff Weber asked the commission if they had any questions for him that have come up since last week. Commissioner Falk asked about the square or rectangle exemption, and Commissioner Ludwick asked about the language that was just put out. He stated that the language Commissioner Lefakis came up with if it is acceptable they would like it to be voted on tonight and move this industrial and commercial side of the solar questions in town forward, so that they can continue to bring business to town. He feels the wording would be adequate for them as solar installers and contractors. He informed the commission that he did have his presentation from the prior meeting that he could show them examples from for those who were not at that meeting. Commissioner Ladd stated that part of the problem is that not all installers run things professionally. Mr. Weber stated that there are other controls involved that prevent them doing things and it is not only the towns regulations but there are national codes and fire codes also. Commissioner Drinan stated that he was in favor of doing this but he wants to have the wording in front of him to look at so he knows what he is approving and wants to do it right. Mr. Rairigh stated to the commission that commercial and industrial zones have to come before the commission and be approved and this will allow the commission to approve projects and not go against their own regulations which have they have done in the past.

Mr. Maurice Larosa, 37 Litchfield Drive addressed the commission. He stated he is not for or against this but he does have a concern about building codes. He referenced roofs and that they are not allowed to put more than two layers of shingles on the roof due to weight but he can add on solar panels on top of a second layer of shingles. He stated that some of them do not have shut off valves. He stated to the commission that at what point do they look at the building side of what they would be doing.

Mr. Rairigh stated that the amendment before them is not addressing building codes and shouldn’t be part of this hearing. He also said that the building codes that the state runs also control what can go on top of roofs with regards to weight and what is involved with that.

Commissioner Ladd asked if Mr. Rairigh could write a motion for them to look at for the next week.

Commissioner Ludwick read into the record wording to entertain a motion.
Commercial and Industrial buildings located in business and industrial districts are exempt from the configuration pattern required in D of exhibit 2 referring to 8.80.1.5. Change number 1 of 2 proposed by the Enfield Clean Energy Committee July 2015.

Commissioner Ballard closed public hearing XZA#15-11.

Commissioner Lefakis made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ladd to send XZA#15-11 to CRCOG and for review by the town attorney. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

c. SPR# 1597.02 – New special use permit to allow increase of height of building; modify previously approved plans to allow partial relocation of handicap ramp, removal of existing shed, modify window design and create entry portico located at 496 Enfield Street; Zone District BL; Map 33-Lot 100; Urvashi, LLC, owner/applicant. DoR: 7/16/2015; MCPH: 10/29/15.

Secretary Falk took the roll and present were and Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Peter Falk, Charles Ladd, Nicles Lefakis, and Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick who would be sitting in for the absent commissioners.

Attorney Carl Landolina addressed the commission. He stated that he was there to discuss modification to an approved site plan which was approved by the board approximately two years ago. Due to things that happened during construction they have come back to modify some of the components of the site plan from two years ago. He stated that the commission has an amended site plan dated September 28, 2015. He stated to the commission that this is an existing parcel of 9883.50 sq. ft. at the intersection of Enfield Street and Francis Street. His client acquired this property in June of 2013 and brought an application to modify the site plan. The general configuration of the building has not changed and the footprint remains the same.

Attorney Landolina told the commission that in fact the proposed building coverage and impervious coverage on this plan have actually decreased from what was there three years ago. The four foot overhang along the front of the building has been removed eliminating 228 sq. ft. of building area and 75 sq. ft. from taking down the shed. What they have added is a vestibule which will not be enclosed which is about 90 sq. ft. This makes them about 200 sq. ft. less non-conforming for building coverage. The other issue they discussed at the prior meeting was impervious coverage. They are proposing a handicap ramp which is going over existing impervious coverage. The only things they are adding are two cooling unit pads which are 9 sq. ft. each and a 6 x 8 concrete
pad so they have additional impervious coverage of 66 sq. ft. but they are removing the shed which is 75 sq. ft. which makes that area pervious. They are also extending a grass area that already exists giving another 68.7 sq. ft. pervious coverage. They decided to locate the dumpster on the driveway and it will be enclosed with a 6 ft. high solid PVC fence so it will not be visible from the street. With regards to landscaping Mr. Landolina stated that along the along the north side of the property is not landscaped and also the 8 ft. high fence along the property line between the residential area. They will also flatten out the roof so that it conforms to the 24 ft. height requirements in their regulations.

Commissioner Drinan asked if putting an 8 ft. high fence is allowed in their regulations and Mr. Rairigh stated that yes it is allowed. Attorney Landolina stated that the gentleman whose property it is already has fencing there and stated at the last meeting he did not want a fence putting there. Attorney Landolina also said that he did not feel that they needed both. Commissioner Drinan asked if both the fence and landscaping were required by their zoning regulations and Attorney Landolina said that one of them is a buffer and one is a privacy fence so typically a fence would be in place of a buffer. Commissioner Ladd stated that the landscaping would be seen from the street which adds to the attractiveness of the site. Commissioner Ladd asked about the detail of the new pavement to ensure it matches Enfield’s code with regards to the dumpster and Attorney Landolina said that the dumpster is going on existing pavement.

Commissioner Lefakis stated that he had looked at the building and he thinks that the peak looks fine and he would rather have a peak than a flat spot if it were his building personally, and he does not think that it stands out in comparison to the neighboring buildings.

Commissioner Ludwick asked about the step down from the vestibule and Attorney Landolina stated that they have raised the floor which has accommodated the large step down.

Commissioner Ballard opened public hearing SPR #1597.02 to the public and asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak in favor or against the application.

Mr. Maurice Larosa from 37 Litchfield Drive addressed the commission and stated he was not for or against the application. He stated that he had watched the meeting from last week and has since looked into the regulations because some of what was said did not sound accurate. He went on to reference the handicap ramp and section 3.30 on page 15 in the zoning regulations, which discusses handicap access ramps, landings and decks required for adequate access and egress of handicap residents. Mr. Larosa’s
interpretation of this is that this is for residential use and it does not say anything about business use so this does not apply to this application and so it would need a variance. He then went to page 41 of the zoning regulations and read the following into the records.

The following table establishes the lot yard and bulk requirements for business, Thompsonville Village, and special development districts except as here an otherwise provided. No lot shall have an area of width less than indicated on the table below. In addition, no building or buildings including accessory structures as well as loading docks, decks, porches, steps attached or otherwise associated with such buildings shall encroach upon the minimum front, side, and rear yard setbacks indicated below.’

He then said that the commission does not have the authority to allow anyone to encroach on the side yard or front yard setbacks and their building lot coverage does include the new loading dock. He stated that the building was legally non-conforming beforehand and once the modifications were made it now fell into needing a variance. He said that just because they took off the front awning off the building doesn’t mean that they became more into conformity so they can add other things. They have added a vestibule which comes within 10 ft. of the front property line which he understands they cannot help. He also said that the fence and the buffer zone are required and the only way they can get away with not putting up a fence is if the building is side by side with no opening but other than that they are required to have both the buffer and the fence because there is a residential area right next to the property. He again said he is not in favor or against this application but he thinks that before they approve this the commission should make sure it is within their jurisdiction to say go ahead with it. He also said that they heard tonight that McKenzie does not apply to this but the town attorney told boards and commissions that that is what applies and he urged them to continue to go with that until they hear otherwise. Mr. Larosa stated that there are obviously some issues with this property that they need to take into consideration before they move forward tonight. He also said that nowhere does it show complete building lot coverage because that is not what he is here for but the lot coverage has changed since they started the project. Mr. Lorasa also stated that the pad for the loading dock is included in building coverage according to the zoning regulations. He stated he sees a lot of problems going forward with it tonight according to the regulations that they have.

Attorney Carl Landolina addressed the commission to respond time to Mr. Larosa’s comments. He stated that with respect to the issue of building area Mr. Larosa is 100 percent wrong and if you look at the definition of building area it is very clear as to what
is including and what is not. It says; ‘The building area is defined as the ground area enclosed by the walls of a building together with the walls of all covered porches and other roof portions.’ So just because something sits on the ground and may be impervious coverage does not make it building area. As he had explained earlier they are adding building coverage but also subtracting coverage. He also said that in terms of the language regarding the handicap ramp it does say resident but it is in section 3 which are regulations that apply in general to all zoning districts; the title of section 3 is General Requirements. If that language was in the residential section then he thinks there could be an argument made that it does not apply to them but it is in the general requirements section and it says that if they have a handicap ramp they can encroach into the side yards for the yard requirements to build the ramp. He stated that if the loading ramp is a problem for Mr. Larosa and the commission which has not been approved before they will take it out of the plan and make it previous coverage. Commissioner Drinan stated that they are not allowed to increase a non-conforming building by more non-conforming aspects of the property and Mr. Larosa mentioned that the front vestibule encroaches further into the front yard and if that is a fact then that is an increase of a non-conforming use which they cannot grant. Attorney Landolina stated that the vestibule area was already approved two years ago and due to ADA accessibility the ramps, landing area, or steps required do not follow the requirements for yard setback in section 3. This is necessary because you need an area for people in wheelchairs to maneuver.

Mr. Larosa came before the commission and stated that he remembers seeing a set of plans for this building before where the handicap ramp was not in the location it is currently in. The reason that was given that it had to be put in this location was because they raised the floor of the building but again they took the building further out of compliance and by doing that they had to increase the length of the handicap ramp because they needed to bring it up higher so it needed it to be longer. Mr. Larosa said that he does not remember this being approved prior and stated why would they have approved it knowing that it was too close to the property line; so there are variance issues there and he does not think they can move on this tonight. He stated that as far as section 3 and general requirements they put it in the general requirements section but it specifically states resident. He stated that the commission’s job tonight is to uphold the regulations and he is just asking them to do that.

Attorney Landolina addressed the commission and stated that there is a difference between lot coverage and building coverage. There is a specific definition of what building area is and how it is calculated and it is pretty clear in the regulations.
Commissioner Drinan asked about the raising of the floor. Mr. Rairigh stated that the whole second floor is actually non-conforming and stated that the 2013 approval was a bad approval but it was made and no one challenged it. The prior approval showed the raised floor and the whole second floor which should not have been allowed. It also showed the vestibule enclosed in the front and actually bigger than what is being shown now as well as ramps, stairs, and other things. So they have to consider all of that as approved existing building.

Attorney Landolina stated that whether the floor had been raised or not it still would have been required because of the pitch being more than just one run to get the handicap ramp up. Attorney Landolina read section 5.10 referenced by Mr. Larosa and stated that any building including accessory buildings, loading docks, decks, porches, or steps attached or otherwise associated with such building may encroach. So whatever encroaching exists as a result of the handicap ramp that is required by federal law is taken care of by section 3.

Commissioner Ballard closed public hearing SPR# 1597.02.

Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Falk to approve waiver submission requirements in connection with application SPR# 1597.02. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Falk to approve SPR# 1597.02 by Urvashi, LLC for modifications of previously approved plans to relocate entrance ramp, modify the planned front facade, and modify the parking and landscaped areas at 496 Enfield Street, in accordance with the submitted application; referenced plan cited below; documentation listed in the public record; testimony received during the public meeting of September 24, 2015 and October 1, 2015; and in accordance with conditions appended hereto.

The referenced plans are as listed below:

- “Improvement Location Survey, Proposed Modifications to Liquor Store, 496 Enfield Street, Enfield, CT September 2015.” Cover Sheet with Map Reference, Certification, Regulations for B-L Zone, Sheet 1 of 5; Scale: 1’’= 10’; Prepared for Urvashi, LLC; Prepared by Flynn and Cyr Land Surveying, LLC dated October 8, 2012; Revised to June 2, 2015.
This application is approved with the following conditions:

**Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:**
1. Drawings shall be updated to remove the proposed 6’ x 8’ concrete loading pad.
2. The landscaping plan shall be updated to show the same area of proposed landscaping as the site plan.
3. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
4. The application number SPR #1587.02 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
5. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
6. A list outlining how the conditions of approval have been met shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature.
7. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.
8. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.

**Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:**
9. Four sets of paper plans, with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.

**Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:**
10. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Zoning Enforcement Officer has signed off on the final work. When minor site work cannot be completed because of weather or other pertinent reason, a conditional approval
may be issued for a period not to exceed 180 days, providing satisfactory surety shall be posted with the Town of Enfield in an amount sufficient to complete the site work and with surety acceptable to the Town Attorney and Finance Department.

General Conditions:
11. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or the structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
12. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
13. This approval does not include signage.
14. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by October 1, 2016 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
15. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by October 1, 2020 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
16. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

10. Reading of Legal Notice

11. New Public Hearing(s)
   a. PH# 2825 – Special use permit for a home occupation to conduct gun-smithing locate at 28 Pierce Street; Zone District R-33; Map 54-Lot 236; Brian Bartos and Stephanie Kopak, owner; Brian Bartos, applicant. DoR: 9/3/2015; MD: 11/7/2015.

Secretary Falk took the roll and present were and Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Peter Falk, Charles Ladd, Nicles Lefakis, and Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick who would be sitting in for the absent commissioners.

Mr. Brian Bartos from 28 Pierce Street addressed the commission and stated he was there to apply for a special use permit for his home internet business. He stated there is no retail presence or change in the use of the property. He has submitted all of the
paperwork to Ms. Barbra Galovich, spoke with the traffic officer already, and has emailed back and forth with Mr. Rairigh and the fire marshal. Mr. Rairigh stated, per his memo, this should not have been considered a special permit. When Mr. Bartos came to Mrs. Higley looking for a home occupation registration Mrs. Higley, he thinks, made the right decision to send it to the commission. She gave him a special permit application but this really is a site plan review and what they doing is reviewing the registration of a home occupation and making a decision that it is indeed a home occupation under their bylaws.

Mr. Bartos stated that he will be applying for a federal firearms license which does require zoning approval and someone will want to talk to someone in zoning. Mr. Bartos stated that they will be doing work on firearms and selling them at trade shows or online. There will be no retail presence and just at local guns shows or shipping to and from other licensed dealers in the country.

Commissioner Ladd asked where they would test anything they work on and Mr. Bartos stated that he is a member of a range in Monson, MA and if anything needed to be tested they would do it there. Commissioner Drinan asked if people would be calling his home and then having him ship to their home. Mr. Bartos stated that you cannot ship firearms directly to someone’s home and they must go from one dealer to another dealer and then it is the receiving dealer’s responsibility to do the background check and the transfer. Mr. Bartos stated that he does plan to be a dealer but cannot apply until he gets zoning approval. He stated as a dealer you can still not ship from your home and you have to take it somewhere to drop it off. He also said that no one would be coming to his home to just buy something. Commissioner Drinan asked if he could be working on them in the home and he said he could work on them. Commissioner Ludwick asked if a license specified between firearms and bullets and he said no but he would not be a manufacturer. Commissioner Drinan asked if he would take orders for both ammunition and guns and Mr. Bartos stated that without a license he cannot go and talk to vendors to figure that out but it could be part of the plan. Commissioner Drinan asked if he would come back before the commission after he gets his license and Mr. Bartos stated that when he applies for the federal firearms license someone from the ATF will contact someone from zoning.

Commissioner Ludwick asked how they would know that he would not be manufacturing at some time later. Mr. Bartos stated that there are different types of federal firearm licenses and he is applying for a type 1 and to be a manufacturer you need a type 7 which he does not plan to apply for. He also stated that you cannot do manufacturing from the home. Mr. Bartos stated that a condition in the approval
would be fine with him to prevent manufacturing. Commissioner Ludwick asked about hours of operation and he said there are no hours as it is internet based. He stated that he spoke with the traffic safety officer and he had no concerns about it being on a residential street.

Mr. Rairigh stated that the traffic officer passed the information on to his captain and they did not hear anything back from him. Commissioner Drinan asked if they got any comments from anyone that was required. Mr. Rairigh said that they talked to the traffic office and the fire marshal and the fire marshal did respond. Mr. Rairigh read into record the correspondence from the fire marshal. Commissioner Drinan asked if his business inventory include ammunition and Mr. Bartos stated he does not have any inventory yet because he does not have a license.

Commissioner Ludwick asked if there were any special requirements for discarding parts and Mr. Bartos stated that anything ammunition related has to be brought to the police department or a gun range.

Commissioner Ballard opened public hearing PH #2825 to the public and asked if anyone from the audience would like to speak in favor or against the application.

Mrs. Laplante from 166 Maple Street came before the commission and said the planning and zoning does not regulate how many guns or the amount of ammunition a citizen or resident may need to own but they do regulate businesses in town and whether they’re operated is safe under the regulations that they have. She stated she is against gun-smithing as an occupation. She did not hear much about added security in the home and police would not know what to expect walking into a residence that is doing this for a business. She believes this is a safety concern and she does not think they should allow it and requests they deny it.

Mr. Bartos addressed the commission and stated that he does have a home security system in the home and it reports directly to the police department. When he spoke to the traffic safety officer he pointed him to the contact at the police department that ensures that his file is noted that he is doing this out of his home and his alarm system reports to the police department. He also has to report everything he does to the ATF and they have the right to inspect whenever they want. He also stated that Connecticut has some of the strictest gun laws in the country that he has to follow.

Commissioner Drinan asked if they should also require a letter from the captain of the police department stating that he has no concerns with safety.
Commissioner Ballard closed public hearing PH #2825.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Drinan to approve waiver submission requirements in connection with application PH #2825. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Drinan to approve PH #2825 by Brian Bartos for a site plan review allowing a home-based firearm business at his residence at 28 Pierce Street, in accordance with the submitted application; referenced plans cited below; documentation listed in the public record; testimony received during the public meeting of October 1, 2015; and in accordance with conditions appended hereto.

The referenced plans are as listed below:

This application is approved with the following conditions:

Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:
1. This approval is restricted to activities permitted under a Type 1 Federal Firearms License.
2. The Fire Marshall shall submit a memo stating he is satisfied with the proposed protections against fire or explosions.
3. The Police Captain shall provide comments regarding the proposed safety and security measures.
4. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
5. The application number PH #2825 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
6. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
7. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.
8. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.
Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:
9. Three sets of paper plans, with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.

Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:
10. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Zoning Enforcement Officer has signed off on the final work. When minor site work cannot be completed because of weather or other pertinent reason, a conditional approval may be issued for a period not to exceed 180 days, providing satisfactory surety shall be posted with the Town of Enfield in an amount sufficient to complete the site work and with surety acceptable to the Town Attorney and Finance Department.

General Conditions:
11. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or the structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
12. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
13. This approval does not include signage.
14. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by October 1, 2016 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
15. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by October 1, 2020 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
16. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

Commissioner Ladd stated that since the service firearms are not his favorite thing to have around but with the police department and the fire department being aware along with the ATF he thinks the man has a right to run a business and he thinks that he is going to vote to approve.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

b. PH# 2826 – Subdivision application for a four lot subdivision locate at 90 Alden Avenue; Zone District TVC; Map 28-Lot 17; The St. Adalbert’s Church Corporation of Thompsonville, applicant/owner. DoR: 9/3/2015; MD: 11/7/2015.
Secretary Falk took the roll and present were and Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Peter Falk, Charles Ladd, Nicles Lefakis, and Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick who would be sitting in for the absent commissioners.

Mr. William Bellock of Bell Realty and Development at 50 Emily Lane, Manchester, CT addressed the commission. He stated he had come before the commission to represent the applicant. He stated that St. Adalbert’s is applying for a four-lot subdivision of the existing lot on Alden Avenue. He stated there are four existing buildings on the property and in addition there is a four bay garage behind the buildings. Going from east to west as you face the site the buildings are the former grade school, the rectory, the church, and the convent. The intent of the application is to give each building a separate lot of record. The church and rectory are still in use but the school has been closed for approximately 10 years and the convent for approximately 20 years. The future plan if this is approved is to seek approvals and permits to allow the conversion of the grade school into multi-family housing. There is no plan at this time for the convent and the church and the rectory will continue in their intended use. Each proposed lot and building has frontage on Alden Avenue. The garage has been including in lot one. He stated there are no site improvements contemplated in the application and each building and lot are serviced by both public water and sewer. Referencing the town planner’s memo of September 25th you will note that each lot meets the size and frontage requirements in the TV-C zone and in addition each building and lot meets the lot and build requirements in the TV-C zone as defined in tables 4.10 and 5.10 in the Enfield Zoning regulations. He stated that they concur with the town planners findings that a bond is not necessary and that there are no new roads or public improvements, and there are no open space requirements because as noted in the regulations the proposed sub-division contains already developed lots within the Thompsonville neighborhood. Mr. Bellock said that also required is the numbering or assigning of addresses for each individual building and they have submitted proposed addresses to the engineering office which have been accepted.

Commissioner Drinan asked what a minor subdivision is. Mr. Bellock responded and stated that a minor subdivision is three or more lots but not to exceed ten lots on an existing accepted road where no new streets are proposed or needed to serve said accepted minor subdivision.

Commissioner Ladd asked if the existing buildings are going to be used for residential buildings later. Mr. Bellock said that for the school the intent is to return to the commission to turn that into a residential structure. Commissioner Ladd also said that
when they subdivide they will become non-conforming because there has to be a 20 ft. 
buffer on each side of residential and there is only a 10 ft. buffer between them. 
Commissions Ladd also said they would have less options of what they can do with 
them once they subdivide.

Commissioner Ballard opened public hearing PH #2826 to the public and asked if 
anyone from the audience would like to speak in favor or against the application.

Walter Curzell from 21 Shiney Road and the trustee of St. Adalbert’s Parish addressed 
the commission. He stated that he is for this approval and stated that it is going to help 
them to take a building that is not being used and put it to good use.

Commissioner Ballard closed PH #2826.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to approve PH 
#2826 by St. Adalbert’s for Minor Subdivision of 90 Alden Avenue, in accordance with 
the submitted application; referenced plan cited below; documentation listed in the 
public record; testimony received during the public meeting of October 1, 2015; and in 
accordance with conditions appended hereto.

The referenced plans are as listed below:

- “Proposed Subdivision Site Plan, St. Adalbert’s Church, 90 Alden Avenue, Enfield, CT 
  October 2015.” Cover Sheet with Location Map, Map Legend, Site Data, Map 
  References and General Notes; Prepared for The St. Adalbert’s Church Corporation of 
  Thompsonville; Sheet 1 – Sheet 1 of 2; Scale: 1”= 40’; Prepared by Gary B. LeClair, 
  LLC, dated August 5, 2015.

- “Topographic Plan, Proposed Subdivision, St. Adalbert’s Church, 90 Alden Avenue, 
  Enfield, CT October 2015.” Prepared for The St. Adalbert’s Church Corporation of 
  Thompsonville; Sheet 2 – Sheet 2 of 2; Scale: 1”= 40’; Prepared by Gary B. LeClair, 
  LLC, dated August 5, 2015.

This application is approved with the following conditions:

Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:
1. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the 
   appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
2. The application number PH #2826 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title 
   Block area.
3. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans 
   submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the 
   plan set.
4. A list outlining how the conditions of approval have been met shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature.
5. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.
6. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.

Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:
7. Four sets of paper plans and one set of mylar plans, with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission. The signed mylars shall be recorded by the applicants and/or owners in the Land Records.

General Conditions:
8. This approval is for the specific subdivision plan identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the subdivision plan will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Falk said that he thinks that it is a good application and he will support it.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

12. Old Business – None

13. New Business


Mr. Rairigh stated that the applicant was no present and had asked to have this application continued.

Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to continue SPR# 1659. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.
b. SPR# 1661 – Site plan review of a change of use from office to hair salon at 74 Palomba Drive Unit A; Zoning District BL; Map 56-Lot 25; Mary LeVeille & Mar Lastrina, owners; Bridgett D’Angelo, applicant. DoR: 9/3/2015; MD: 11/7/2015.

Ms. Bridgette D’Angelo of 3 Light Street, Enfield addressed the commission and stated that she is applying for a change of use at 74 Palomba Drive, Unit A to a hair salon from real estate. Commissioner Drinan asked if this would require any review by the Health Department and Ms. D’Angelo said yes they would have to inspect before they opened and that they had in fact already done that. Commissioner Drinan stated that they do have memos from the fire department and police department public safety officer with no comments. Commissioner Ludwick asked if the business would be open every day. Commissioner Drinan stated there should be a condition with hours of operation and Commissioner Ludwick stated that for that type of business hours may vary and she may need to accommodate abnormal hours.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to approve waiver submission requirements in connection with application SPR# 1661. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to approve SPR #1661 by Bridgette D’Angelo to change the use of 74 Palomba Drive Unit A, from professional office to personal service (hair salon), in accordance with the submitted application; referenced plan cited below; documentation listed in the public record; testimony received during the public meeting of October 1, 2015; and in accordance with conditions appended hereto.

The referenced plans are as listed below:

This application is approved with the following conditions:

Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:
1. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
2. The application number SPR #1661 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
3. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.

4. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.

5. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.

Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:
6. Three sets of paper plans, with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.

Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:
7. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Zoning Enforcement Officer has signed off on the final work. When minor site work cannot be completed because of weather or other pertinent reason, a conditional approval may be issued for a period not to exceed 180 days, providing satisfactory surety shall be posted with the Town of Enfield in an amount sufficient to complete the site work and with surety acceptable to the Town Attorney and Finance Department.

General Conditions:
8. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or the structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

9. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.

10. This approval does not include signage.

11. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by October 1, 2016 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.

12. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by October 1, 2020 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

13. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.
c. SPR# 1662 – Site plan review to add retail sales to an existing hair salon business at 90 Pearl Street; Zoning District TVC; Map 25-Lot 116; Richard Weintraub, owner, Amy Schile, applicant. DoR: 9/3/2015; MD: 11/7/2015.

Ms. Amy Schile from 86 Pleasant Street, Enfield addressed the commission. She came before the commission approximately a year ago for her business at 90 Pearl Street which has been going very well and she is now looking at changing over to offering more retail products in order to grow. In addition to the retail she is also looking to offer additional services that were not previously offered. The new shop’s name will be the ‘Flaming Lotus’. She was previously approved to sell dreadlock products and now she is looking to also carry new-age supplies and also do sales of consignments good which would support local artists that she thinks will fit with the image she is looking to portray. In addition to the retail, the services, and the consignment she is also looking to offer classes and host community events. She stated that her hours of operation are Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and on Saturday 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. As far as handicap accessibility the front and the back entrances are level with the sidewalk and the adjacent parking lot has 2-3 handicap spaces. The bathroom is not handicap accessible but there is no way to expand this.

Commissioner Falk asked why the Enfield Redevelopment Strategies Committee decline review of the application. Mr. Rairigh stated that Peter talked to people and they said it is a use that is already there and they did not need to see it. Commissioner Drinan asked if the other two units were occupied and Ms. Schile replied that they were.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis to approve waiver submission requirements in connection with application SPR #1662. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Ludwick to approve SPR #1662 by Amy Schile to add retail use to 90 Pearl Street, in addition to the existing personal service use (hair salon), in accordance with the submitted application; referenced plan cited below; documentation listed in the public record; testimony received during the public meeting of October 1, 2015; and in accordance with conditions appended hereto.

The referenced plans are as listed below:
This application is approved with the following conditions:

**Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:**
1. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
2. The application number SPR #1662 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
3. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
4. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.
5. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.

**Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:**
6. Three sets of paper plans, with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.

**Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:**
7. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Zoning Enforcement Officer has signed off on the final work. When minor site work cannot be completed because of weather or other pertinent reason, a conditional approval may be issued for a period not to exceed 180 days, providing satisfactory surety shall be posted with the Town of Enfield in an amount sufficient to complete the site work and with surety acceptable to the Town Attorney and Finance Department.

**General Conditions:**
8. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or the structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
9. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
10. This approval does not include signage.
11. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by October 1, 2016 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
12. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by October 1, 2020 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

13. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for the absent commissioners.

3. Approval of Minutes

   a. September 17, 2015 regular meeting – Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Falk to approve the minutes from September 17, 2015 with the following amendments. On page 6 in the last paragraph change the word ‘flood’ to ‘floor’. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Alan Drinan and Michael Ludwick voting for absent commissioners.

4. Staff Reports

   a. Town Attorney (in writing) – Same report as last meeting.

   b. Zoning Enforcement Officer (in writing) – Nothing to report.

   c. Blight

   d. Assistant Town Planner

Mr. Rairigh said he had talked to the housing authority and would November 5, 2015 be okay to bring them in for a ‘show-and-tell’ about what the state requires for grants to re-do the Enfield Terrace thing.

There is a day-long advanced training coming up in October and he talked to Courtney and there are funds to do this. There are basically three types of classes. Commissioner Drinan state he went to this a few years ago and it was excellent.

5. Public Participation

Mrs. Maureen Mullen addressed the commission and stated that she had concerns about adults walking on top of the berm where the map indicates there is contaminated
soil, and about two weeks ago there were two children running up through the swale area. She stated she did not have time to go to the principal and ask if he was aware. She now has a meeting with the principal to make him aware of this so there are no complications down the road. She stated that she thought Mr. Duren was going to look into having another attorney look into this and the commissioners stated that they did not have any information on this. Mr. Rairigh said his recommendation would be to have the Chair write a letter to the Town Attorney and the Town Manager asking for exactly that. Commissioner Drinan said that the only information they have is that the trial has been rescheduled to November 10th. Mrs. Mullen stated that when the Town Attorney was at the last Council Meeting she was at, he indicated that CREC wants to come back in and they were asking to postpone the hearing. Mr. Rairigh said they had talked to him about doing a site plan review or special permit to modify the property and there was talk about doing something with the berm.

6. Correspondence
   - Summary of zoning, subdivisions, and POCD referrals 9/11/15 through 9/17/15
   - CRCOG

8. Bond Releases – None

14. Other Business

15. Authorization for Administrative Approvals

Alternate Commissioner Drinan made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Falk to allow Assistant Town Planner, Shawn Rairigh, to do administrative approval for a change of use for portion of building to office space located at 119 Post Road. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for absent commissioners.

16. Applications To Be Received

SPR #? – Minor modification for a reduction of proposed apartment building footprint size, Type A (10,742 sq. ft.) to Type B (8973 sq. ft.), at Mayfield Place. Clifton Chapman, owner/applicant. Date stamped 9/28/2015. – On agenda for November 5, 2015

PH #2830 – Special Use Permit for outdoor seating with liquor served located at 23 North Main Street; Zone District TVC; Map 027/Lot 0134; Silvia Salvari, owner/applicant. Date stamped 9/30/2015; DoR: 10/1/2015; MOPH: 12/05/2015. – On agenda for November 5, 2015.
17. Unresolved issues

18. Adjournment – Commissioner Falk made a motion, seconded by Alternate Commissioner Drinan to adjourn the meeting at 10:47 p.m. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote with Alternate Commissioners Drinan and Ludwick voting for absent commissioners.

19. Next Meeting (special) – Thursday, October 8, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

__________________

Peter Falk, Secretary