

February 2, 2010

7:30 p.m., Land Use Meeting Room

Members Present: Ms. Roberts, Mr. Frank, Mr. Rimsky, Ms. Jahnke, Ms. Gager

Members Absent:

Alternates Present: Mr. Carey, Ms. Braverman

Alternates Absent: Mr. Fowlkes,

Staff Present: Shelley White, Janet Hill

Also Present: Mark Riefenhauser, P.E., Mr. Shaun Nettleton

Regular Business

Call to Order

Ms. Roberts called the meeting to order at 7:35 pm.

Seated: Frank, Roberts, Jahnke, Gager, Rimsky

Consideration of the Minutes

The minutes of January 5, 2010 were considered.

Motion:

to accept the January 5, 2010 Regular Meeting Minutes of the Planning Commission as submitted, by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Rimsky, passed by 5-0 vote.

Subsequent Business

Motion:

to include subsequent business not already posted on the Agenda under V. Other Business:

D. Referral from the Zoning Commission Re: Proposed Revision of the Washington Zoning Regulations:

Sections: 2.3.2.g, 12.6.1.10, 15.2 and 21.1.24,

by Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Rimsky, by 5-0 vote.

New Applications

Nettleton/81 Painter Ridge Road/2 Lot Resubdivision:

Mr. Mark Riefenhauser, P.E. and Mr. Shaun Nettleton were present to discuss the proposed 2 Lot subdivision at 81 Painter Ridge Road. Mr. Riefenhauser, Mr. Nettleton and the Commissioners looked at the 2 Lot Subdivision Map, and Site Development Plan, prepared for Shaun Nettleton, 81 Painter Ridge Road, by Smith & Co., dated 12/16/09. Mr. Riefenhauser submitted Residential Density Determination Forms for the existing lot, proposed lot 1 and proposed lot 2, dated 2/2/10. He stated the parcel is 17.25 acres and the proposed subdivision will create a 5.06 acre lot (lot 1) and a 12.19 acre lot (lot 2). Mr. Riefenhauser stated that there is an existing gravel driveway that crosses the wetland area, which has been approved by the Inland Wetlands Commission. He stated that the parcel is currently registered with the Department of Agriculture as a farm. He stated that Mr. Nettleton is proposing a 4-acre Agricultural Preservation Easement, which is currently going before the Conservation Commission for review. There was a discussion regarding the location and soil tests of the proposed 2nd lot. Mr. Riefenhauser stated that they have not obtained approval from the Health Department for the 2nd lot. Ms. Roberts stated that

the Planning Commission would have to schedule a site visit and review the information before scheduling a public hearing. The Planning Commission scheduled a site visit for February 19, 2010 at noon for 81 Painter Ridge Road.

Rowe/44 Keilwasser Road/ 2 Lot Resubdivision:

Ms. Hill stated that she sent a review of the application to Brian Neff, Engineer. The Commission looked at the Property Boundary Survey, Resubdivision Map, by T. Michael Alex, prepared for Susan A. Rowe, 44 Kielwasser Road, dated June 2009, with a revised date of 10/28/09. Ms. Hill stated that there were several issues that needed clarifying, such as the Subdivision Map is not drawn to a 1"= 40' scale and the configuration of the proposed shared driveway. Ms. Roberts stated that a Public Hearing could be scheduled at the March 2, 2010 meeting when the issues with the application are resolved.

Other Business

Procedures and Template for Conservation Easements

Mr. Frank stated that he would like to take the final draft home and review it.

Revision of the Subdivision Regulations

Ms. Hill stated that Marty Connors would be away and would respond to the Planning Commission's comments from the January 5, 2010 meeting, regarding the Revision of the Subdivision Regulations, when he came back. She stated that he may have a report ready for the March 2, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting. It was noted that Attorney Mike Zizka commented on the time limitation of intra family transfers.

2010-2011 Budget

The Commission reviewed the 2010-2011 Budget. The Commissioners agreed to request an increase the amount for Consultant Fees and decrease the amount for Membership Education.

Zoning Referral Re: Proposed Revision of the Washington Zoning Regulations: Sections: 2.3.2.g, 12.6.1.10, 15.2 and 21.1.24

The Commissioners agreed to review the proposed revisions and discuss them at the March 2, 2010 Meeting.

Communications

Earth Day Challenge

Ms. Gager stated there was a discussion at the Washington Environmental Council Meeting to challenge the Land Use Commissions to adopt a section of Town to clean up for Earth Day. She stated that Earth Day Clean Up would start at the Town Hall on April 17th at 12 pm. The Planning Commission agreed to participate.

There was a brief discussion regarding a Meeting of the Selectmen and Land Use Chairmen or Commissions. Ms. Roberts stated that she would confirm when and whether or not there is a meeting scheduled.

Discussion:

Setting Priorities For Beginning Work on The Plan of Conservation and Development

Mr. Frank stated that he looked at the existing Plan of Conservation and Development and feels that the Planning Commission should start with listing what has been done and what has not been done under the

existing plan and see what new problems have arisen. Mr. Rimsky agreed with Mr. Frank and stated that he felt the process should begin with the existing plan. Mr. Frank stated that under the implementation section of the POCD it states that it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to monitor and oversee implementation of the plan. Ms. Gager suggested including this excerpt of the implementation section in a memo to the other Land Use Commissions requesting an update on their progress. Mr. Carey stated that he came across the 1/13 /06 Litchfield County Times in which there is an editorial dedicated to the Depot Study, concentrating on the townspeople's concerns. He stated that he thinks that there are a number of ways to start this procedure, that there will be a focus on the commercial areas of the Town and that most people agree with maintaining open space. Mr. Rimsky feels that it is important to get the business owners of the Town involved and to hear their opinions and suggestions. Mr. Frank stated that each section has a strategy, summary, and implementation guide to follow. He stated that there was some criticism that the POCD did not deal with economic development. He stated that 'the Statute requires that the plan shall be a statement of the policies, goals and standards for the physical and economic development.' Mr. Rimsky stated that an economic development plan is beneficial for the community and it needs to be included. Ms. Roberts suggested that the Planning Commission invite the Selectmen to a meeting to discuss the lack of an economic development plan. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission that they would use the existing POCD as the starting point to update the POCD. Ms. Gager suggested going through the POCD, checklists, comparing them, and in March, breaking into sub groups. Mr. Carey stated that ambiguous language should be eliminated from the plan. There was a brief discussion regarding funding.

Public Comment

There was not anyone from the public present.

Adjournment

Motion: to adjourn at 8:50 by Ms. Roberts.

Ms. Roberts adjourned the meeting.

Filed subject to approval.

Respectfully Submitted,
Shelley White
Land Use Clerk