

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
Planning and Zoning Commission**

**Public Hearing #1458
July 26, 2005**

Draft Document - Subject to Commission Approval

The meeting was called to order at 7:32 P. M. by Chairman Guiliano in the Meeting Room of the Town Hall, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:

A quorum was established as four Regular Members (Filipone, Gowdy, Guiliano, and Rodrigue) and two Alternate Members (Kehoe and Ouellette) were present. Regular Member Saunders and Alternate Member Tyler were absent. Chairman Guiliano noted Alternate Commissioner Ouellette will sit in on any Applications he participated in during previous meetings and any new hearings/applications presented this evening. Also present was Town Planner Whitten.

ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:None

RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS:

- 1) Application of Sleepy's Mattress Company for Modification of Approved Site Plan to add 30' x 42.5' and 9.5' x 21.75' additions located at 4 Craftsman Road, owned by Craftsman Realty, LLC. [M-1 Zone; Map 15, Block 19, Lot 111A].

LEGAL NOTICE: None.

Town Planner Whitten requested the Commission consider taking the Application of TRI-KR Realty LLC as the engineer, Mr. Palmberg, must appear at another Hearing in another town.

MOTION: To GO OUT OF ORDER and take the item of NEW BUSINESS: TRI-KR Realty LLC - Modification of Approved Site Plan - for the expansion of existing storage parking area; construction of retaining wall and 9,725 square feet of paved storage parking at 16 Shoham Road. [M-1 Zone; Map 6, Block 17, Lot 3] (Deadline for decision 8/18/05) as the first item of business.

Gowdy moved/Filipone seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

NEW BUSINESS: TRI-KR Realty LLC - Modification of Approved Site Plan - for the expansion of existing storage parking area; construction of retaining wall and 9,725 square feet of paved storage parking at 16 Shoham Road. [M-1 Zone; Map 6, Block 17, Lot 3] (*Deadline for decision 8/18/05*):

Chairman Guiliano read the description of this item of business. Appearing to discuss this Application was David Palmberg, of William R. Palmberg, Land Surveyors, representing TRI-KR Realty, LLC.

Mr. Palmberg reported the Applicant is proposing to increase the parking area for storage of the recycling trucks; he noted this Application has previously been approved, they are just seeking the addition of this additional pavement. He indicated the entire site is 8 acres; they are proposing an increase of 9,000 square feet of paving. No additional drainage is being proposed as the current drainage system will accommodate this revision. They are also proposing a retaining wall 8' in height across the back of the parking lot. Mr. Palmberg noted they have received approval from the Inland/Wetlands Commission. The Planning Office has requested that the gravel area that was added in the last 6 months on the southside of the site be added to the plans. A part of that gravel area falls within the 100' buffer; that area will be mulched and cordoned off with concrete barriers. They have added that area to the current plans. Mr. Palmberg noted the Applicant may seek a variance for parking within that area in the future. Mr. Palmberg also noted they are not proposing any new lighting or signage; they are just seeking to increase the size of the parking lot. The business has expanded and they are running out of room.

Chairman Filipone requested clarification of which building is the subject of this Application? Town Planner Whitten suggested it is the last building on the right and was previously the site of a diesel repair business.

Chairman Guiliano questioned what was proposed for the site beyond the jersey barriers? Mr. Palmberg indicated they are proposing to mulch the area. Chairman Guiliano suggested he would rather see lawn in that area; they have encroached on an area that they shouldn't be on.

Commissioner Filipone requested clarification that they are doing nothing more with the drainage? Mr. Palmberg replied negatively, he then explained the current drainage system and the recent wetlands review.

Commissioner Ouellette questioned what the back of the retaining wall would look like, he is concerned with the resident's view. Mr. Palmberg suggested it will be a block retaining wall with straight concrete on the back. He noted there is a tree line and wooded buffer on the back; they didn't clear any trees to add the gravel. Commissioner Kehoe questioned if it would be the same in the Winter? Mr. Palmberg suggested the buffer is mostly evergreen trees.

Commissioner Filipone questioned if there was a curb all around the parking lot? Mr. Palmberg replied negatively, noting it pitches to the center. Commissioner Filipone noted he agreed, they should restore the encroached area with grass and add curbing. Town Planner Whitten suggested there is no curbing there now. Mr. Palmberg suggested they could add ballards; Chairman Guiliano and Commissioner Filipone agreed to the installation of ballards along the 100' buffer in place of the jersey barriers.

Chairman Guiliano noted receipt of a memo from Town Engineer Norton; all his comments have been addressed.

Town Planner Whitten suggested she had no problem with the proposal until she visited the site and saw the violation. She pointed out that condition #4 addresses the retaining wall.

MOTION TO APPROVE the application of Tri KR Realty, LLC for Modification of Site Plan Approval for the addition of storage parking and associated activities at 16 Shoham Road, East Windsor,

Connecticut, on property owned by same, presently zoned M-1 as shown on Assessors' Map 6, Block 17, Lot 3. This approval is granted subject to conformance with the referenced plans (as may be modified by the Conditions) and the following conditions:

Referenced Plans:

- Sheet 1 of 2: Existing Condition Plan Prepared for Tri-KR Realty LLC, East Windsor CT, 16 Shoham Road, Map 6, block 17, Lot 3, prepared by William R. Palmberg and Son LLC, Land Surveyors, 178 North Maple Street, Enfield, CT, 06082, 860/ 763-3300, dated 1/18/04, scale 1" = 40'
- Sheet 2 of 2 Improvement Location Plan, dated 4/15/05, scale 1" = 20'

-Conditions which must be met prior to signing of mylars:

1. All final plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for preparation of the plans.
2. The conditions of this approval shall be binding upon the applicant, landowners, and their successors and assigns. A copy of this approval motion shall be filed in the land records prior to the signing of the final plans.

Conditions which must be met prior to the issuance of any permits:

3. One set of final plans, with any required revisions incorporated on the sheets shall be submitted for signature of the Commission. Both sets shall be filed in the Planning and Zoning Department.
4. A plan for the retaining wall prepared by a registered and certified engineer must be submitted and reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer
5. A cash (escrow) or passbook bond shall be submitted for sedimentation and erosion control maintenance and site restoration during the **construction of the project**. Any funds that may be withdrawn by the Town for such maintenance or restoration shall be replaced within five (5) days or this permit shall be rendered null and void. The applicant's engineer shall submit an estimated cost of the E & S controls to the Town Engineer. The amount of said bond shall be determined by the Town Engineer.

Conditions which must be met prior to certificates of compliance:

6. Final grading and seeding shall be in place or a bond for the unfinished work submitted.
7. Final as-built survey showing all structures, pins, driveways and final floor elevations as well as spot grades shall be submitted.
8. All public health and safety components of the project must be satisfactorily completed prior to occupancy. In cases where all public health and safety components have been completed, the Zoning Officer may issue a Certificate of Zoning Compliance provided a suitable bond is retained for any remaining site work.

General Conditions:

9. In accordance with Section 13.5.4 of the Zoning Regulations, any approval of a site plan application shall commence the construction of buildings within **one year from the date of approval** and **complete all improvements within five years of the date of approval**, otherwise the approval shall become null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
10. A Zoning Permit shall be obtained prior to the commencement of any site work.
11. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the filed plans. Minor modifications to the approved plans that result in lesser impacts may be allowed subject to staff review and approval.
12. Any modifications to the proposed drainage or grading for the site plan is subject to the approval of the town engineer.
13. Additional erosion control measures are to be installed as directed by town staff if field conditions necessitate.
14. By acceptance of this approval and conditions, the applicant, owner and/or their successors and assigns 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
15. All required landscaping shall be adequately maintained.
16. The area currently gravel in the 100' buffer should be grassed with ballards along the 100' buffer instead of jersey barriers.

Gowdy moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

MOTION: To RETURN TO THE AGENDA SCHEDULE.

Gowdy moved/Filipone seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

OLD BUSINESS: Proposed Text Amendment to the Zoning Regulations Section 5/1/17/5 Active Adult Housing Application Consideration to remove the total number of units allowed:

Chairman Guiliano read the description of this item of business.

Commissioner Gowdy initiated discussion; the discussion has been reapplied as the reasons for action on this item. Commissioner Gowdy noted he put a lot of time and effort into thinking about this; he felt the cap should be market driven but he also felt the Commission should keep the cap on Active Adult Housing for now as only 93 to 97 units have been built out of 200+. Maybe the Commission should wait and see how things are going, but that doesn't preclude the fact that at a later date it could be changed; this also gives the Commission time to do revisions of the regulations for Active Adult Housing. Commissioner Filipone agreed with Commission Gowdy, in view of the public input and the fact that we have 227 approved and, by his calculations only 68 are built out - but that may be wrong, as he was recalling from memory.

Also, with both current applications, if approved, exceed the current cap. The Commission did raise it 30% from 200 to 260. He did review the Plan of Development for guidance and although it doesn't specifically address Active Adult Housing it does mention affordable housing, and this isn't affordable at \$267,000 to \$280,000 for Coleman Farms, and \$279,000 to 310,000 for Phase II of Coleman Farms. The Commission needs to look where these are going with regard to traffic, etc. Commissioner Filipone noted the Commission is supposed to listen to the taxpayers, and the Commission will do that. He is also concerned with comments made by Betsy Burns of the Human Services Department that she is already getting requests for services. Based on that Commissioner Filipone felt the Commission should hold the cap at it's present level. Commissioner Rodrigue indicated he didn't agree with Commissioners Gowdy and Filipone; he felt the cap should be lifted. Only South Windsor and East Windsor have caps on the number of units, which restricts people from using their land the way they want to. Only a small amount of people come in and complain, and they were primarily from Rye Street; when the Commission was discussing other projects he didn't see people come in and complain. Commissioner Ouellette indicated that at this time he didn't agree with lifting the cap; he felt the Commission had good intentions for open space, and he felt the Commission might not have adequate input on the demands for the elderly.

MOTION TO APPROVE the removal of Active Adult Housing cap from Section 5.1.17.5 of the East Windsor Zoning Regulations. The text amendment will remove all wording related to the cap.

The proposed change shall become effective on the date of notice of action is posted in the newspaper.

Conditions:

1. A copy of the final motion and text amendment shall be filed in the Office of the Town Clerk on the effective date by the applicant. Said amendment shall bear the signatures of the Chairman and Secretary of the Commission, and the approval and effective date of the amendment.

Gowdy moved/Filipone seconded/

VOTE: In Favor: Rodrigue
Opposed: Filipone/Gowdy/Guiliano/Ouellette
Abstained: No one

REASONS FOR APPROVAL: Commissioner Gowdy noted he put a lot of time and effort into thinking about this; he felt the cap should be market driven but he also felt the Commission should keep the cap on Active Adult Housing for now as only 93 to 97 units have been built out of 200+. Maybe the Commission should wait and see how things are going, but that doesn't preclude the fact that at a later date it could be changed; this also gives the Commission time to do revisions of the regulations for Active Adult Housing. Commissioner Filipone agreed with Commission Gowdy, in view of the public input and the fact that we have 227 approved and, by his calculations only 68 are built out - but that may be wrong, as he was recalling from memory. Also, with both current applications, if approved, would exceed the current cap. Commissioner

Filipone also noted the Commission did raise the cap 30% from 200 to 260. He did review the Plan of Development for guidance and although it doesn't specifically address Active Adult Housing it does mention affordable housing, and this isn't affordable at \$267,000 to \$280,000 for Coleman Farms, and \$279,000 to 310,000 for Phase II of Coleman Farms. The Commission needs to look where these are going with regard to traffic, etc. Commissioner Filipone noted the Commission is supposed to listen to the taxpayers, and the Commission will do that. He is also concerned with comments made by Betsy Burns of the Human Services Department that she is already getting requests for services. Based on that Commissioner Filipone felt the Commission should hold the cap at its present level. Commissioner Rodrigue indicated he didn't agree with Commissioners Gowdy and Filipone; he felt the cap should be lifted. Only South Windsor and East Windsor have caps on the number of units, which restricts people from using their land the way they want to. Only a small amount of people come in and complain, and they were primarily from Rye Street; when the Commission was discussing other projects he didn't see people come in and complain. Commissioner Ouellette indicated that at this time he didn't agree with lifting the cap; he felt the Commission had good intentions for open space, and he felt the Commission may not have adequate input on the demands for the elderly.

CONTINUED HEARING: Letourneau Builders - Special Use Permit for a 54-unit Active Adult Housing development (Norton Fields) located on the west side of Rye Street [R-2 Zone; Map 31, Block 40, Lot 17]. (*Deadline to close hearing 8/16/05*):

Chairman Guiliano read the Hearing description. Appearing to discuss this Application was Attorney T. Mark Barbieri, representing the Applicants, Gaetan and Dan Letourneau; Sandy Aeschliman, Professional Engineer, Aeschliman Land Survey; Chris Burke, Appraiser; and Dave Speer, Traffic Engineer, of DLS Consulting.

Attorney Barbieri reported they made a lengthy presentation last time; they have now received a memo from Town Planner Whitten citing 8 items, which they have addressed. They will review the following questions/issues from the last meeting: 1) traffic on Rye Street; 2) if Phase II would come under the new Open Space requirements; 3) why anyone else didn't buy the property (because it wasn't for sale); 4) relative property values in the neighborhood, and 5) the sewer avoidance area.

Attorney Barbieri submitted the Applicant's statement in support of approval, and he introduced Chris Burke, property appraiser, who will report on the affect on this project on property values. Attorney Barbieri noted the site is 8/10ths of a mile from here on Rye Street, across from the entrance to the business park, and also across from his house at 99 Rye Street; the site runs across to Norton Road.

Mr. Burke listed his credentials for the Commission; he noted he has reviewed this Application to answer Attorney Barbieri's question if this proposal would have any negative impact on surrounding property values. He has inspected the parcel, which contains 16+ acres, with split frontage on Norton Road and Rye Street. The project originally proposed 52 units, and that's the project he has reviewed; the units are anticipated to cost from \$260,000 to \$325,000, with additional costs for upgrades.

Mr. Burke reviewed the improvements in the area, starting with a large house at the beginning of Norton Road built in the late 1800s, other houses run the length of Norton Road. The sales values of homes in that area range from \$170,000 to \$450,000. Mr. Burke searched the MLS (Multiple Listing Service) for recent sales, he found only 93 Rye Street which sold for \$228,000, and 4 Norton Road - the large historic Colonial near Old Ellington Road - which sold for \$349,000. He also noted a Cape on Old Ellington Road sold for \$225,000.

With regard to the impact of this type of development on the neighborhood, he looked at other Over 55 developments in Enfield, South Windsor, and East Windsor - Coleman Farms units are going up now, they are detached units ranging from \$267,000 to \$295,000, some have actually sold for \$300,000 with upgrades. Mr. Burke suggested the average sales price of these Over 55 units is \$243,000 to \$413,000, while the average sales price of a condo is \$188,476. The price of the Over 55/Active Adult Housing is over the price of single-family homes and condos. Enfield has Autumn Fields (across from the Police station), and Shaker Heights; the price range for Autumn Fields is \$344,900 to \$359,900, while the price range for Shaker Heights is \$285,000 to \$305,000. Mr. Burke found 463 single-family home sales in Enfield with an average price of \$300,000+/-, while the average price of condos was \$186,260. South Windsor has 4 Active Adult Housing complexes, with prices ranging from \$234,900 to \$355,000; the average price of a single-family home is \$298,000, and the average price for a condo is \$170,000. Mr. Burke noted he has also appraised properties in Suffield, Windsor Locks, and Ellington; every town has Active Adult Housing projects, he has not seen one instance of negative impact to the neighborhood and he has been an appraiser since 1966. He noted the population is getting older, this type of housing offers the benefit to the town of diverse housing stock. This type of project will add tax dollars but not impact the school system. Mr. Burke reiterated he has never seen a negative impact to the neighborhood in any of these towns.

Attorney Barbieri noted since the last meeting they have acquired aerial photos of the neighborhood, which is already diverse, there is the industrial site behind his house which enters on Rye Street and is getting busier, there are 220 (Scantic Glen) plus 57 (Norton Glen) condo units with a large area of wetlands near the Scantic River, this parcel is an open field now which has been used for farming. They are proposing viable uplands as Open Space. Sewer will be available for a subdivision. The neighborhood has everything but Active Adult Housing. The Plan of Development (POD) talks about diversity of housing, this is a logical extension of what's happening there already. Attorney Barbieri cited he didn't see a problem with the proposal other than someone doesn't want it across the street from his or her house. He felt this type of development is needed, the proposal meets the regulations, they have exceeded the intent of the Open Space requirement, there are only 33 units being proposed for Phase I because the cap wasn't lifted, and the Commission can approve less units than the Application asked for.

Attorney Barbieri noted he heard the same arguments when Scantic Glen was being proposed but none of those issues happened.

Attorney Barbieri introduced David Speer of DLS Consulting to present the traffic study. Mr. Speer gave his credentials for the Commission. Mr. Speer noted the scope of this traffic study

included an observation of the existing traffic. He explained that Active Adult/Age Restricted Housing is a new use so there is little data available, however, they used data from similar facilities such as congregate housing, etc. He suggested that this type of development generates most of its traffic between 10 in the morning and 2 in the afternoon as many people are no longer working and avoid the rush hour. They believe the traffic generated by this site will be 12 trips in the morning and 22 in the afternoon. He also noted that the level of service for both intersections will be a level A (with A being the best and F the worst) because there will be the two entrances on Rye Street and Norton Road. The sight lines are generally good, although they are proposing a slight regrading looking left/north on Rye Street.

Commissioner Filipone suggested with a possible 3 people per household there would be 1 1/2 to 2 cars per house, how many trips per household per day are anticipated? Mr. Speer suggested the peak hours generate 10% of the daily trips, so if there are 22 in the afternoon the daily traffic would be 200; they may own 2 cars but they are not always driving them during the rush hours. if these were just single family houses you would be talking 1 trip per house, you are talking less than 20 trips per hour for any type of residential use. By traffic standards this use is a very low generator and is a non-impacting use. The capacity of the roads is not an issue.

Commissioner Filipone indicated that they looked at both intersections of the property, he felt that the traffic will go either to South Windsor or Broad Brook, or it might go to Old Ellington Road to Winkler to Newberry to get to the highway, he questioned if they looked at traffic in those areas? Mr. Speer suggested that the further away you get the traffic dissipates. If you are talking 100 to 200 trips per day, or 20 per hour, to Newberry or Winkler that amount of traffic isn't significant. He suggested that any intersection that is impacted by more than 100 cars should be studied but this is 20 trips so it isn't significant. Commissioner Ouellette concurred with the statements made in the report. Chairman Guiliano questioned that 50 units would generate so little traffic. Mr. Speer indicated this is what they have found for other projects; even if you take away the age restriction this is still not a high impact generator. Attorney Barbieri also noted that this project will now be only 33 units for Phase I; he felt that Depot Street would have more impact. Mr. Speer suggested it's a small number to begin with when you take the traffic pattern that's there now and apply it to the site traffic, which isn't all in one direction; it's still a small amount of traffic. Commissioner Ouellette suggested there is ample reserve capacity.

Attorney Barbieri referenced the project plan board to show the Commission what the project would look like under the present proposal, all the Open Space is on the south side of the site which makes it contiguous with the current wetlands corridor. Chairman Guiliano questioned if the existing tree line is the actual site border? Mr. Aeschliman gave a description of the site boundaries, noting all life enhancements all still proposed for the project. Commissioner Gowdy questioned how the retention of the townwide unit cap affect the proposed price now that the project is based on 33 units? Mr. Gaetan Letourneau indicated it will make the price of the units higher. Mr. Chris Burke suggested the fact that you have less units will not negatively impact the neighborhood.

Commissioner Filipone questioned the set back distances for the units? Mr. Aeschliman

suggested 50' on Rye Street, 50' on Norton Road, and 60' on "this" building line. Commissioner Filipone suggested his vision of these projects are like Depot Street, small, secluded entrances; this is in the middle of a scenic area and is visible from a lot of areas. Attorney Barbieri questioned why that was a problem as it would look like the rest of the neighborhood. He referenced the aerial photo, noting the only difference is the trees have grown up on the single family lots. He suggested this is not adverse to the neighborhood, or the town.

MOTION: To TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.

Filipone moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

MOTION: To TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.

The Commission RECESSED at 8:32 P. M. and RECONVENED at 8:42 P. M.

Attorney Barbieri suggested Mr. Aeschliman review the proposed screening plan. Mr. Aeschliman noted there will be screening from the houses on the east side of Rye Street, but also noted they could also but up an earthen berm with enhanced landscaping, which would be similar to the condos on Old Ellington Road. Attorney Barbieri suggested they could do something similar to what is required of Southern Auto Auction on the site near the main entrance. He suggested they could also fool around with berms or maybe the placement of the buildings, but he would have to consult with Town Planner Whitten to discuss how much they could change the Application. He considered that the applicant maybe could come back in the future with Phase II if the cap is lifted but he noted it sounds like the Board will tighten the regulations and maybe the Application is over for them.

Hearing that the Applicant had presented all they intended to at present Chairman Guiliano opened discussion to the audience:

Jean Sampson, 20 Norton Road: indicated she moved into East Windsor in August, 2004, she noted someone said they couldn't see the condos that were put up but she lives next to them and she can see the bulldozers coming up to her back yard. Her husband is a cop for another town and someone said to them they have moved into the super speedway. She indicated speeding occurs mostly in the evenings, maybe putting in sidewalks and stop signs would cut down on the speeding. She indicated her husband has sat at the end of the driveway with his radar gun and has clocked speeds at 50 to 60 miles per hour.

Anne Duffy, 63 Rye Street: concurs with the previous speaker, she agrees the traffic report is low, she mows her own lawn and close to the road it's scary. She can view everything from her kitchen window, she felt the sight lines and speed were left out of the traffic report. She suggested the sightline at the cemetery is bad, she feels the speeding is more like 70 miles per hour. She feels there is a bad sightline at the project site, we need more police presence.

Chairman Guiliano indicated the Commission can't control the speeding on the road, these complaints should be made to the Police Department.

Mr. Speers suggested when they put the counters out in the 85th percentile the speed was 49 miles per hour. The sight lines are good in all directions, and they are improving the sightlines going left on Rye Street as they will regrade the embankment. The sight line will be 500', which is adequate for 49 miles per hour.

Ron VanGasbeck, 89 Rye Street: they are talking about 33 units now but there will be 54 units. Chairman Guiliano clarified the Commission is deciding on this Application based on 33 units now; this Commission might not even be here in the future. Mr. VanGasbeck suggested it might be fine for now but not for later. Chairman Guiliano indicated the Commission didn't even know if 33 units would be ok yet. Mr. VanGasbeck suggested but if the cap is lifted it could be 54. Commissioner Filipone noted the traffic study was based on the 54 units.

Don Arcari, Harrington Road: do the people who purchase the units have to live there or just own them? People could unload their assets to their kids and then go on town aid. Chairman Guiliano indicated the purchaser has to be the deeded owner. Mr. Aeschliman indicated that in the covenants the purchaser must be the deeded owner. Attorney Barbieri indicated there are a lot of other reasons it's difficult to unload assets now. Commissioner Gowdy suggested they must not only own the unit but they must also reside there.

Mr. Arcari questioned that with regard to Open Space the space under the decks and side yards is considered Open Space? Chairman Guiliano indicated that's a gray area. Mr. Arcari suggested open space is open space. Chairman Guiliano suggested that's his interpretation also. Commissioner Gowdy suggested the intent when the regulation was written if you have 14 to 20 acres 7 or 10 acres would be Open Space and 7 or 10 acres could be built on. For this Application they have 14 acres and they are building on 7 of those acres and that would meet the Commission's intention. We know what we want but it wasn't written that way.

Robert Carson, North Road: will the force main going down the road be on private property? Attorney Barbieri suggested it would be on the Town's right-of-way. He advised Chairman Guiliano that he would like to address the sewer avoidance area and would discuss that at that time.

Bob Mc Cormick, Rye Street: someone from Victory Outreach spoke that their project would increase the value of the homes in that area, and that is true, but it doesn't apply to the houses on Rye Street. If people are trying to sell their property the open hills across the street now would be a selling point, if they saw 50 single homes it would be ok, but if you look at high density houses they would say no. Also, the condition will have an impact. Mark (Attorney Barbieri) spoke of the condo association being a good thing and if it's made up of old people like himself (Mr. McCormick) they don't want to spend money on maintenance.

Also, the Active Adult Housing is a loophole to get around the zoning regulations. Mr. McCormick would just ask the Commission to take into consideration the affect on the neighborhood. Commissioner Gowdy suggested the concept of having high density is to do the opposite, the 14 acres could perc for 14 cookie cutter homes. If you cluster them together you won't get that effect of house after house after house. The intent is to provide a more rural

atmosphere.

Barbara Smiegel, Melrose: this is a form of housing that hasn't been tested a lot and it serves a purpose but there was a trend 15 years ago with regard to assisted living and that house sold at a good price and people brought into it and from her personal experience it devalued very quickly, she cited the sale of a relative's property. She feels a danger for this type of house, for now it sells at a good price but it might not if the trend changes. If assisted living drops in value this is a comparable type of housing and today it will sell for a good price and in 10 years it won't, and she feels it won't for single family houses, they can be enhanced, can be changed to a 2 family. She feels the Commission should consider how this will affect the neighborhood.

Bill Loos, Melrose Road: this is a Special Use and cluster housing meets the intent of the Commission, if the intent was 3.2 units is that less than 50%; he feels it is. Half of 16 acres is 8 acres times 3.2 units is 26 units. He feels the density is way too high, and he feels it isn't 50% of the Open Space. Commissioner Gowdy felt the way the regulation is written they meet that; by the regulation they could do 5 units on a acre. Gaetan Letourneau noted that there could be 40 units on 8 acres.

Mr. Loos questioned if they had come before the Board for decks, etc. for Open Space? Commissioner Gowdy reiterated that this is Active Adult Housing and the whole concept was to cluster the houses; 10 acres of houses and 10 acres of Open Space. They can count all the common area as Open space the way it was written; it isn't the way the Commission wanted it but.....

Steve Dearborn, 144 Thrall Road: no one has spoken of the industrial zone across the street, he indicated he doesn't run his trucks from there but his tenant runs trucks out of there and there will be 100 cars when the development is done. These people living there probably won't be working, most people around him have jobs or are tradesmen, he will hear complaints because these people won't be working. The fertilizer plant is building a new plant, and will be getting many trucks, there will be a lot of traffic; these old people will be bitching all the time. With regard to the King property they put in the deed about the gun club and the right-to-farm so the neighborhood couldn't complain, he wants people to know that there is an industrial zone across the street so when they buy these places they don't have any bitches about what goes on in the neighborhood when they see people rolling out of there at 5 in the morning, and he doesn't feel that much traffic should be mixed in with the commercial traffic.

Commissioner Gowdy questioned if trucks are leaving at 5 in the morning now? He suggested calling the Zoning Enforcement Officer because the operating hours were to be 7. Mr. Dearborn questioned if that meant that Commissioner Gowdy was saying he couldn't go out of there at 1 in the morning to plow his accounts?

Nancy Masters, Rye Street: questioned the square footage? Gaetan Letourneau suggested 1300, 1700 and 2000 square feet. Ms. Masters indicated nothing personal but questioned if the neighborhood would see Attorney Barbieri's house up for sale in a month? Attorney Barbieri noted that unless someone tells him something different after this meeting he's here to stay.

Scott Novak: suggested that when considering the traffic study did they consider the Omelia Road intersection? With the King subdivision the traffic will increase and this year he'll be 55 and eligible for one of those houses and he won't be making 1 or 2 trips a day. Rye Street is a major cut across to Route 5 and South Windsor, especially in the morning.

Bob Lyke, Rye Street: submitted more signatures, the significance of these is they are from probably 15 different streets, and are in opposition to the project. Many questioned why they were not notified about what was going on in their neighborhood; there were no notices to abutting property owners. Mr. Lyke READ HIS STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD. This project started out with 13 units on 16.32 acres, then it went to 57 units, then to 54, then 52 and today it changed to Phase I and Phase II. He cited there will be 33 units on his side of the road. He suggested if they are getting 33 units and meet the Open Space requirements let them put them on Mark's (Attorney Barbieri's) side of the road.

With regard to property values he suggested people will need an appraisal themselves, the developer will have one and he will be biased. He suggested the appraiser said it changes the neighborhood and the neighbors don't like it. Can the Commission separate the project and make a decision on the first 33 units? Chairman Guiliano suggested the Commission can go less but they are not making a decision tonight.

Regarding the traffic study Mr. Lyke suggested the Commission heard from the people who live there every day and every night rather than just a study of certain points; let's ask the Police Department for a traffic study.

Commissioner Gowdy suggested if Mr. Lyke was asking for an unbiased study he was inferring that the one presented is biased. Mr. Lyke indicated he feels the traffic study and the appraisal are both biased, would you hire someone who wouldn't tell the story to your benefit? (APPLAUSE FROM THE AUDIENCE).

Mr. Lyke also noted the developer said he will get a high price for 33 units; what happens to the other 19? Chairman Guiliano indicated the developer is telling the Commission he has dropped his project to 33 units and that's what the Commission is discussing. Mr. Lyke indicated he is against the 33 units, and he is against anything that requires a Special Use Permit. (APPLAUSE FROM THE AUDIENCE).

Rand Stanley, 87 Rye Street: indicated he has over 23 years in construction and he is a licensed building inspector and he feels he brings a high degree of experience and background to his position now and before. He questioned if all Commissioners not present have listened to the tapes or read the minutes? Chairman Guiliano reported that all members tonight have been here for every meeting.

Mr. Stanley requested clarification that the developer is proposing to build 33 units? Chairman Guiliano reported that the way he understands it from the developer's attorney the developer is withdrawing the 52 units and is proposing 33 units. Attorney Barbieri suggested the developer

withdrew Phase II of the project, this is the same thing they did at Newberry Road; it was a moving target until the Commission voted on the cap. Mr. Stanley questioned that if this is presented as Phase I looking down the road, with changes to be made to the regulations, if Phase II were presented would it be presented under a grandfathered clause, or the current one? Chairman Guiliano reported it would have to go under the new regulations, this is just 33 units, period, nothing attached to it. When he comes back it would come under the new regulations if they are changed. Mr. Stanley questioned if they could be sure of that legally? Town Planner Whitten noted she concurred with Chairman Guiliano's comments but she isn't an attorney, she would have to speak with the Town Attorney. Mr. Stanley questioned if the Commission would ask that of the Town Attorney? Town Planner Whitten indicated if the Commission feels it's relevant.

Mr. Stanley questioned if the form of ownership is reviewed by the Town Attorney? Town Planner Whitten indicated it would be reviewed at a later time; it's a common interest ownership and the draft document is in the file documentation. Mr. Stanley questioned that it had been submitted to the Town Attorney? Town Planner Whitten reported it had not. Attorney Barbieri suggested it can't be reviewed until the project is approved but the form of ownership is in there, they must add to the prospectus the building styles, etc.

With regard to the Special Permit, Mr. Stanley cited a plan of single family homes that was presented. Attorney Barbieri objected, noting the plan for single family homes was never presented to this Commission. Mr. Stanley suggested the plan was presented by the developer to him. Chairman Guiliano noted the plan for 33 units is the one being presented to the Commission for review.

Mr. Stanley then reviewed the various criteria required under the Special Use Permit. He cited a project may be approved if there is a reasonable need. He suggested based on the information he has gathered there are 175 unbuilt units; he questioned the need to add another 33? He cited that Hillside (Farms) was started 2 1/2 years ago and they just closed on the last unit; will this project take 2 1/2 years? Then what about Phase II? He cited Norton Glen is going in now, and they still have another Phase III with 22 units. He questioned a reasonable need based on the cap; it's the Commission's choice. Based on 175 units not built out of a cap of 260, and 2 1/2 years to build 44 units, he questioned the reasonable need.

Mr. Stanley questioned if the Commission would look into an independent traffic study, not just for this street, but for everything that's taken place in town. This traffic study hasn't taken into consideration approval of 100 units on Norton Road and Rye Street. He cited the speeding on Rye Street; he cited the need to have a comprehensive traffic study on Old Ellington Road, Deerfield Road, Windsorville Road, Chamberlain Road. He suggested the Commission has a wonderful opportunity to shape what's happening in the next 20 years; that falls on you guys.

**Filipone moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous
MOTION: To TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.**

Filipone moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

The Commission RECESSED at 9:40 P. M. and RECONVENED at 9:46 P. M.

Chairman Guiliano continued public comments:

Rand Stanley, 87 Rye Street: suggested in light of the time and the fact that this discussion would continue at a later time he would turn the floor back to the Chairman.

Noreen Farmer, South Water Street: although she hasn't reviewed this project her concern is that it seems over the last 6 to 7 months people are really starting to frown on this type of development. East Windsor has much open space and developers are coming in and wanting us to build what they want, not what East Windsor wants. She didn't oppose some but we are getting a lot of Special Use Permits and Planned Residential Developments, she feels you need to look at the whole town, and if you err do so on the side of the people of East Windsor. Hold off on this until you get your regulations revised.

Hearing no additional requests for comments the Commission considered the status of the Public Hearing.

MOTION: To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING on the Application of Letourneau Builders - Special Use Permit for a 54-unit Active Adult Housing development (Norton Fields) located on the west side of Rye Street [R-2 Zone; Map 31, Block 40, Lot 17] until the Commission's regularly scheduled meeting on August 9th at 7:30 P. M. in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT.

Filipone moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

CONTINUED HEARING: M & L Development Corp. - Zone Change from TZ5 to SDD for property located at 94 South Main Street, owned by Dorothea E. Willson and John L. & Daniel F. Burnham. [Map 28, Block 5, Lots 46, 47, & 48]. (*Deadline to close hearing 8/16/05*):

Chairman Guiliano read the Hearing description. Appearing to discuss this Application was Attorney T. Mark Barbieri, representing M & L Builders, Merriman and LeFerberve; and Jay Ussery, of J. R. Russo & Associates.

Attorney Barbieri noted the parcel is located at 90 and 94 South Main Street, Warehouse Point. Mr. Ussery indicated the total parcel is just over 6 acres, they are looking to change the zone for 5.6 of those acres to a Special Development District (SDD). The remaining acreage would remain in the TZ-5 Zone as it is a residential structure. This parcel is just south of Jim Karat's property. All the infrastructure is there - sewer, water, electrical, utilities, gas. Attorney Barbieri suggested the type of development to be proposed is a condominium form of ownership but it will be 18 single family dwellings.

Attorney Barbieri referenced issues raised by Town Planner Whitten in comments made in her

memo of 7/12/2005. He suggested the zone change for this parcel is in compliance with the detailed business map; it's a long narrow parcel with the surrounding area - Phelps and Tromley Roads - developed as single family dwellings. With regard to approval considerations, Attorney Barbieri suggested the required information has been submitted, the infrastructure is there, the proposed use is appropriate with surrounding land areas, there would be no adverse impact on the infrastructure as a result of this zone change. The proposed zone change is consistent with the POD. The parcel borders on Mason's Brook but there is only a small amount of wetlands; there are no wetlands issues and any development would be away from the escarpment. There is no other SDD which is not developed. The proposed land use is compatible with the neighborhood.

Mr. Ussery reiterated the infrastructure is present within South Main Street. The 5.6 acres proposed for the zone change is such that any traffic generated from this development wouldn't have an impact on South Main Street, which is a State highway. Attorney Barbieri suggested the proposed zone change complies with the intent of the POD.

Commissioner Filipone suggested the Commission made this area a TZ-5 Zone to gradually move this area to a commercial use because the town is running out of commercial parcels; he felt it should stay within the TZ-5 Zone. Mr. Ussery felt the POD talked about mixed use; there are condos and single family within this area and also businesses. Commissioner Kehoe read an excerpt from the POD relative to business development. Attorney Barbieri suggested that's not what the Board suggested on Phelps Road and the Commission denied changing the frontage on Phelps Road, and one of the reasons was the land frontage didn't lend itself to a change to business. But this property has many of the same characteristics. Commissioner Ouellette indicated that when they spoke of the Board he wasn't here at that time, the Board is reshaping; he doesn't share those comments. Commissioner Rodrigue suggested you have one side that keeps developing and the other side is residential, Winton Road, south of that it's SDD - condos; this falls within that. It isn't spot zoning. Commissioner Kehoe questioned why wasn't that thought through when they developed the south end of the TZ5? Mr. Ussery suggested it wasn't a close look at the neighborhood. You have Winton Road, the brook will never be developed, this is the next piece of land, then you have the high school. He didn't know if you want to have a commercial piece near the high school? Commissioner Ouellette questioned the development across the street? Mr. Ussery noted it's been commercial for 70 or 80 years. He also cited the property next to the high school which was a problem for the Board going commercial.

Attorney Barbieri indicated he has been appearing before the Board for 29 years, and there isn't an aspect of what he's heard tonight that didn't come through the Commission before. This is the fourth time the town is getting scared about development; 100 houses looks like a lot in East Windsor but not in other towns who have already gone through this. The area from Phelps Road to Tromley Road has been a continuum of keeping the area residential; they have been told no car stuff north of Phelps Road. He doesn't feel this is not inconsistent with what the Board has intended.

Commissioner Ouellette questioned why parcel 49 isn't being considered as part of this Application since it's a little piece left over? Mr. Ussery noted it's a single family home which

they don't own, and the existing single family home will remain TZ-5. The developer may see that as a professional office area in the future. Commissioner Ouellette questioned that there was no other spot to put this development? Attorney Barbieri replied negatively. Commissioner Gowdy felt that wasn't the issue. Commissioner Ouellette questioned that Attorney Barbieri felt this Zone Change was a good thing for the town? Attorney Barbieri replied absolutely.

Mr. Ussery reiterated the Board should have the letter from Jim Karat, who is not opposed to the Zone Change.

Commissioner Gowdy questioned that the frontage on South Main Street was 250'? Mr. Ussery indicated it was 270'+/- in the actual Zone Change area. Commissioner Gowdy concurred that he agreed with Commissioner Filipone and other Commissioners that the intent was to have small business for the TZ-5 Zone. Mr. Ussery referenced Nick Tartsinis' plaza up the street, he noted it's on a similarly shaped property. It isn't full today and never has been because no one lives there. The only things that work on Route 5 are cars and you don't want that. Commissioner Gowdy suggested the configuration of this parcel fits the SDD because it's narrow and long. Mr. Ussery suggested it's consistent with what's happened on Route 5. In 1982 a property was owned by Doug King and he got approval for a shopping plaza but it didn't get built because he couldn't get a tenant. Commissioner Filipone noted the Town is running out of commercial space. Mr. Ussery suggested the biggest limiting factor with the Tartsinis property is that any property on Route 5 needs to be in close proximity to the bridge; that's why you have Big Y and the theater, you have accessibility of the bridge. Going down Route 5 businesses are successful again near the 291 interchange in South Windsor. Attorney Barbieri suggested North Road makes sense for commercial development even though there is a lot of wetlands, but you need the sewers. Mr. Ussery noted when looking at the property across the road from the high school they did an extensive marketing study - look what's still there - the restaurant. Town Planner Whitten suggested that although this really doesn't fly with the TZ-5 Zone it's spelled out for single family in the business corridor. She questioned that the property to the south would ever get developed, and the property to the north is next to the high school. Chairman Guiliano suggested that when the Commission proposed the TZ-5 Zone they tried to save properties for transitioning, even if it was in a house so you could turn your house into an office etc. Whether that fits for this property..... Commissioner Gowdy suggested that because of the size and configuration of this lot, and he is a big proponent of the TZ-5 Zone, he thinks the SDD Zone fits nicely here.

Commissioner Filipone questioned why the State is putting all new lighting poles and street lights up; is there a long term widening plan underway that we don't know about? Commissioner Ouellette suggested there is no widening plan; it's a safety issue.

Chairman Guiliano opened discussion to the audience:

Bob Lyke: his concern is the proper use of the sewers, and guys like Tartsinis aren't getting much help from the Economic Development Commission, so all the good businesses are going to Enfield. He has been lobbying for at least a part time Economic Development Director.

Barbara Smiegel: feels it's true the town needs an Economic Development Director. Part of the purpose of this Commission is planning, she feels if you had a plan for the TZ-5 Zone..... Some of the failure of the malls is marketing. She feels you need to consider this spot being spot zoning. Changes which occur with transition don't all have to happen in 20 years. You have a plan. The development of commercial development is very limited and she feels the Commission should stand it's ground and say that it fits this. Spot zoning doesn't work or look good. It doesn't stop anyone from using their property; it just closes it out for now.

MOTION: To EXTEND THIS MEETING TO 11 O'CLOCK.

Filipone moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Noreen Farmer, South Water Street: agrees with what's been said. You have a plan, you need to stick to that. To keep changing zones based on what's good for the developer. She cited the property next to the high school, and there was a big to do. We need to get to a point where we abide by the POD, or not.

Barbara Smiegel, Melrose: cited the high school and suggested maybe we don't want commercial development near them. Chairman Guiliano clarified that the TZ-5 Zone isn't commercial, it's light business. Ms. Smiegel suggested that there is no guarantee, the way the town is going, that the high school will stay a high school so to use that as an argument is fallacious because it could become light business. You need to stick with the plan; it's too confusing for the Commission, the townspeople, and the developer.

Commissioner Gowdy felt the Commission is sticking to it's plan because the TZ-5 Zone is transitional. It isn't spot zoning. Every case is a different case. If someone wanted to put a mom and pop business there that would go, but the Commission wouldn't say no to anything.

Town Planner Whitten suggested the POD calls for this to be residential, the SDD is an overlay zone which can go over any zone, providing it meets the requirements.

Chairman Guiliano suggested the parcel is surrounded by residential, and it's solid residential; it's not ready to turn into anything else. He agrees the SDD can go over anything, and the POD does say residential. Commissioner Ouellette questioned why not in any part of town, why here? Chairman Guiliano suggested the infrastructure is here. There is a minimal amount of land available for that.

Paul Anderson, 89 Main Street: referenced an excerpt from the POD, the POD says it's an appropriate use in that area, and it should be compatible with existing uses and those uses are there today. It seems like it fits.

Bill Loos, Melrose Road: questioned why the developer is asking for the change from the TZ-5 Zone to the SDD when it really doesn't require that to put what he wants there? Attorney Barbieri indicated the zone change is necessary because condos are allowed by Special Permit in an SDD Zone, and it was done that way so you could have more discretion. This is not an

exception; this lot is in yellow - single family residential, and that's the way they are proposing it - a single family development under condo form of ownership. Phelps Road and Tromley Road always pretty much looked that way even when they made the TZ-5 Zone. They are not asking for an exception.

Jim Balch: if this falls exactly within the regulations then give it to them; they deserve it.

Bill Loos, Melrose Road: indicated he was not sure his question was answered. Attorney Barbieri suggested the SDD is what they need for the condo form of development; they did it down the street for the same reason. Town Planner Whitten suggested that wasn't in the TZ-5 Zone, the residential units are really supposed to be above the commercial units and so they don't really allow single family development. They do need the SDD to do that type of development.

MOTION: To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING on the Application of M & L Development Corp. - Zone Change from TZ5 to SDD for property located at 94 South Main Street, owned by Dorothea E. Willson and John L. & Daniel F. Burnham. [Map 28, Block 5, Lots 46, 47, & 48].

Filipone moved/Gowdy seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

MOTION TO APPROVE the petition for a zoning map amendment requested by the applicant, M&L Development Corp. for a zone change for parcels on South Main Street known as 94 South Main Street, also known as Assessor's Map 28, Block 5, Lots 46, 47, & 48. The proposed zone change area 5.6 acres +/- and is currently zoned TZ-5. This approval effectively changes the zoning designations to SDD. This approval shall become effective on the date the legal notice of action appears in the paper.

Map(s) Reference: Zone Change Map TZ-5 to SDD Zone, 94 South Main Street, East Windsor, CT, prepared for M&L Development Corp., 560 halfway house Road, Windsor Locks, Conn, Map 28, Blk 5, Lots 46, 47, & 48, prepared by J.R. Russo and Assoc., 1 Shoham Rd, East Windsor, CT 06088, 860/623-0569, Fax 860/623-2485, scale: 1"=200', dated 06-03-05, Sheet 1 of 1.

Conditions:

1. This approval does not constitute approval of a site development plan or permit for any construction or use on the subject parcel.
2. Two mylar copies of the approved zone change map must be delivered to the Planning & Zoning Department to be signed by the Chairman and one member of the Planning and Zoning Commission, one shall be returned to the applicant for recording on the Town of East Windsor Land Records. One shall be placed on file in the Planning Office.
3. A copy of this motion shall be recorded on the Town of East Windsor Land Records.

Gowdy moved/Rodrigue seconded/

VOTE:	In Favor:	Gowdy/Guiliano/Rodrigue
	Opposed:	Filipone/Ouellette
	Abstained:	No one

BUSINESS MEETING/(1) Correspondence:

Chairman Guiliano noted receipt of the newsletter “Connecticut Towns and Cities”.

BUSINESS MEETING/(2) Staff Reports:

Town Planner Whitten referenced Zoning Enforcement Officer Rudek’s letters enclosed in the Commission’s packet.

BUSINESS MEETING/(3) Consideration of placing a moratorium on certain types of residential development in order to permit a review and possible amendment of the regulations with respect thereto. Possible setting of public hearing date:

Chairman Guiliano noted he and Town Planner Whitten had been working on this proposal for some time. Town Planner Whitten gave the following list of approvals since 2000: 2000 - 36, 2001 - 128, 2002 - 102, 2003 - 41, 2004 - 33, 2005 - 189 plus there could be 33 more with Norton Fields, 8 with Farnham Estates, and with Victory Estates. A developer is also proposing 220 units at Mansions by the Scantic, and 96 by Herschfield. If all those proposals are approved there would be 709 additional residential units. There do seem to be issues with the regulations and their interpretation.

Chairman Guiliano suggested this proposal will give the Commission time to get in tune with the POD and to revise the regulations. The Commission may be able to get outside help, but the Commission will be heavily involved. We just need to slow things down to give the Commission a chance to catch up.

Commissioner Filipone questioned if the Commission will be able to do it with the applications submitted? Commissioner Gowdy noted the Commission has two meetings a month, one for public hearings and one for work sessions, but the Commission has been so overloaded they haven’t been able to work on anything. Chairman Guiliano noted this is the meeting the Commission is supposed to be working on the regulations, if the applications have to be held off to the next meeting it will have to be done.

Cathy Bilodeau, speaking from the audience, questioned would this moratorium affect the applications already received by the Board? Chairman Guiliano suggested that when this goes into effect the clock starts ticking on the new applications. Town Planner Whitten suggested the Board would not accept any applications after the date the moratorium starts. Ms. Bilodeau questioned what that meant for Victory Outreach’s Application? Chairman Guiliano suggested if it’s already in; Ms. Bilodeau recalled the Commission accepted the application at the last meeting. Town Planner Whitten noted there is the issue of what’s been decided on the cap and what happens on Norton Fields. Any applications received by the Board before the moratorium date will be reviewed. The Commission is actually giving more than the statutorily required advisement period to developers, etc.

Chairman Guiliano suggested the earliest the Commission could begin public discussion on the moratorium is September 13th. Town Planner Whitten noted the Commission must hold a public hearing, a notice is sent to CROG 35 days in advance of this hearing, then the public hearing is held and then there is the appeal period. Commissioner Gowdy questioned the proposed 9 month time period, why not longer or less? Town Planner Whitten suggested 9 months seems to be the time period within which things can be accomplished, and seems to be the time period other communities, such as Enfield and Ashford, have set for their moratoriums.

MOTION: To SET A PUBLIC HEARING TO DISCUSS A LIMITED 9 MONTH MORATORIUM ON ALL TYPES OF RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT TO BE HELD ON SEPTEMBER 13, 2005.

Gowdy moved/Filipone seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

MOTION: To APPROVE Public Hearing #1457 Regular Meeting dated July 12, 2005 as written.

Gowdy moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

MOTION: To APPROVE Public Hearing #1455 Regular Meeting dated June 14, 2005 as written.

Gowdy moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

MOTION: To APPROVE Public Hearing #1456 Regular Meeting dated June 28, 2005, Public Hearing #1454 Regular Meeting dated May 22, 2005, and Public Hearing #1453 Regular Meeting dated May 10, 2005 as written.

Gowdy moved/Rodrigue seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN THIS MEETING AT 11 O'CLOCK

Gowdy moved/Filipone seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,

Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary
East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission