

# June 6, 2006

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Frank, Ms. Gager, Mr. Rimsky, Mrs. Roberts

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Charles

ALTERNATE PRESENT: Mr. Fowlkes

STAFF PRESENT: Mrs. Hill

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Fairbairn, Mr. Sears, Press

Mrs. Roberts called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and seated Members Frank, Gager, Rimsky, and Roberts and Alternate Fowlkes for Mr. Charles.

Consideration of the Minutes

MOTION: To accept the 5/2/06 Regular Meeting minutes as written. By Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Fowlkes, and passed 5-0.

MOTION: To add subsequent business not already included on the agenda. By Ms. Gager, seconded by Mr. Rimsky, and passed 5-0.

New Application

## **Potter/253 Old Litchfield Road/2 Lot Subdivision**

Mr. Fairbairn presented the map, "Site Analysis Plan," by Mr. Neff, revised to 5/31/06 and noted the site development plan was not yet completed. He showed on the Assessor's Map where the property was located and also pointed out the parcel on an aerial map. Mr. Fairbairn noted the property was almost 7 acres with an existing dwelling and it was proposed to subdivide it in to lots of 4.05 and 2.89 acres. He said the property was level and that he would request a waiver of the requirement that 2 ft. contours be shown on the site development map. Access to the new lot would be off Shearer Road at the existing bar way. The open space requirement was discussed in detail. Mr. Fairbairn explained the 15% requirement would mean 1 acre would have to be preserved as open space. He proposed to set aside the acre on other land owned by the Potters on the other side of Shearer Road. Mrs. Roberts asked whether that would affect the future use of the other property. Mr. Fairbairn said it would not. Mrs. Hill did not know whether the current Subdivision Regulations would permit the open space requirement to be fulfilled using a parcel other than the one to be subdivided, but said she would research it before the next meeting. Ms. Gager thought it would be a bad precedent to use off site land to meet the open space requirement. Mr. Rimsky supported the idea of preserving the streetscape at the corner of Shearer Road and Rt. 109 if it were possible. Mr. Fairbairn noted another option would be to submit a fee in lieu of open space. The property had not been assessed, so he did not know how much that fee would be. It was noted there were wetlands on the property and Mrs. Hill asked if an application had been submitted to the Inland Wetlands Commission. Mr. Fairbairn said this had been done. A site inspection was scheduled for Monday, June 19, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. as it was expected the site development plan would be ready by that date.

Other Business

**Depot Study:** It was noted the Commission had previously established two priorities based on their obtainability in the near future: 1) establishment of a greenway and 2) parking. It had been agreed other

issues to be addressed included; 1) traffic - both in terms of vehicle circulation and pedestrian walkability, 2) Bryan Plaza, 3) recreation, and 4) housing.

Regarding housing, Mr. Sears reported the Housing Commission was studying the need for housing in Town and was drafting a questionnaire for residents. He noted the Depot study had suggested there was room for senior housing behind the Town Hall, but said the Housing Commission wanted to first determine that more senior housing was actually needed. The different types of senior housing; owned vs. rental units, congregate, and assisted living units were discussed. It was also noted that it was not known whether any future housing development would be private or public/ profit or non profit sponsored. Mr. Rimsky noted the baby boomers were now reaching retirement age and if they had to move out of Town, an important part of the community would be lost. It was the consensus the Housing Committee should continue its study and lead future discussions regarding housing needs.

Mr. Sears then again summarized the discussions that had taken place regarding parking. He believed the problem was parking availability vs. utilization and that a solution should be actively pursued. He noted the business community was concerned and said the Town should take the responsibility of identifying the available parking and developing a town wide parking plan. Mrs. Roberts noted the local businessmen had been encouraging their employees to park on the Titus garage property to free up the spaces in front of their businesses for customers, but Mr. Rimsky did not think this had been uniformly achieved.

Work to improve Bryan Plaza was discussed. Mr. Rimsky was concerned that the school renovations might use up funds that could be spent for Plaza improvements. He also noted any work done to the Plaza would have to tie into future development plans for the land in back of the Town Hall.

Mr. Sears noted the public had not yet had a chance to discuss the issues generated from Phase I of the Depot study. He thought a public forum would help the Commission set priorities. It was noted the Planning Commission had intended to receive public comment once input had been received from the land use commissions. It was decided the major issues that would be covered at the upcoming public meeting were: Bryan Plaza, parking, vehicle traffic flow, pedestrian walkability, the greenway, and housing. Ms. Gager and Mr. Rimsky volunteered to draft an agenda for the public meeting and a letter that would be sent to all residents to publicize the event. Two dates were selected so that as many residents and weekenders as possible could attend. (After the meeting, these dates were changed to: Saturday morning, August 19 and Friday evening, August 25).

**Commission Vacancies:** Mr. Sears said the Selectmen had received the names of four candidates to fill the two vacant alternate positions and would interview each before deciding who to appoint.

**PA 06-97:** Mr. Sears suggested the Planning Commission should amend the Subdivision Regulations to reflect PA 06-97, which enables a Town to pass an ordinance to exempt from the Subdivision Regulations for the first subdivision of land provided the lot created is for affordable housing. He said the intent was not to penalize someone who wants to donate land for affordable housing.

**Walker Brook Subdivision II:** Ms. Gager noted the final public hearing had been closed on May 18th and the vote had not yet been taken. She said Ms. Purnell had done an excellent job writing the letter from the Planning Commission, which pointed out how the application did not comply with the New Milford Plan of Conservation and Development and Subdivision Regulations.

**MOTION:** To adjourn the meeting. By Mr. Frank.

Mrs. Roberts adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill, LU Coordinator