

# February 10, 2014

## Special Meeting

7:30 p.m. Main Hall

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Carey, Mr. Frank, Mrs. Jahnke, Mr. Rimsky

**MEMBER ABSENT:** Ms. Gager

**ALTERNATE PRESENT:** Mr. Bedini

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mrs. Hill

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Hileman, Mr. and Mrs. Klein

Mr. Frank called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. and seated Members Carey, Frank, Jahnke, and Rimsky and Alternate Bedini for Ms. Gager.

## Consideration of the Minutes

**MOTION:**

To accept the 1/7/14 Regular Meeting minutes as written.

By Mr. Carey, seconded by Mr. Rimsky, and passed 5-0. **MOTION:**

To accept the 1/23/14 Special Meeting minutes as written.

By Mr. Rimsky, seconded by Mr. Bedini, and passed 5-0.

There were no new applications or subsequent business.

## Plan of Conservation and Development

Mr. Frank reported that CGS 8-23 had been amended regarding the timing of filing POCDs originally due between July 1, 2010 and June 2014; the due date for adoption of those Plans had been extended to July 1, 2015. A discussion followed about how to proceed with the update under the new time frame. Mr. Frank noted he had two concerns about the process to date: 1) there had not yet been comments from the other Town boards and 2) public input had not been encouraged. He noted there was now an opportunity to correct these shortcomings. It was the consensus to complete the current draft within 30 days or as soon as possible, make it available to the Board of Selectmen, other boards, and those with major responsibilities in the action agendas and ask for their input, schedule special meetings with each if necessary to discuss ideas or concerns each might bring up, and then prepare a public hearing draft, which would be referred to the Board of Selectmen and the NW Hills Council of Governments at least 65 days prior to the public hearing. Mr. Rimsky supported the idea of getting more public input. Mrs. Jahnke noted that because most Town boards meet only once a month, they should be given at least sixty days to respond. Mr. Hileman said he could make additional minor edits to the 2/1 draft without further expense, urged the commissioners to promptly get a draft out to begin the sixty day review period by the boards, but pointed out there were still issues Planning had to decide and which would have to be added to the draft at a later date. Mr. Frank recommended that these issues be resolved prior to sending the

draft to the boards for consideration. Mr. Rimsky agreed, but noted the Commission must keep focused on completing the draft. It was the consensus to resolve the outstanding issues before sending the draft out for review. It was noted that Mr. Hileman may have additional expenses depending on his workload. The commissioners began to work on the matters still to be resolved by reviewing comments that had been previously submitted by Mr. Hileman, Mr. Frank, and Mrs. Hill.

Discussion of Mr. Hileman's comments:

Mr. Hileman noted his comments were based on the 2/1 versions of both the "Revised POCD" and "Revised Appendices."

1. He noted he and Mrs. Hill had reviewed the responsible parties in the action agendas and they were now as accurate as possible.

2. Chapter 1, page 7: He asked if the map of Connecticut could be replaced with a historical map of Washington. It was the consensus this was a good idea and that the Gunn Library and/or Museum might have a suitable map.

3. Chapter 2: Mr. Hileman said he had deleted the recommendation that the Town should aim to develop 40 affordable housing units over the next ten years because Mr. Frank had previously questioned whether this should be included and because the Town could not accomplish it because it doesn't have a housing authority. Lack of funding for these units was also noted. It was the consensus this should be deleted.

4. Chapter 3: It was noted a better photo of the White Horse or a photo of some other business in Marbledale is still needed. Mr. Rimsky will contact Mr. Harris to ask for a photo.

5. Chapter 4: Mr. Hileman said he had deleted the recommendation for village district designation for each of the village centers because the commissioners had thought the process was too involved. Mr. Frank thought it had been agreed the recommendation would be that the Zoning and Planning Commissions should work together to determine whether village district designations were appropriate. Mrs. Hill suggested that in lieu of village district designations, the Planning Commission could recommend that the Zoning Commission adopt standards to address the physical design and appearance of new development. Mr. Hileman said that architectural standards could be added to the current recommendation. It was the consensus that the two commissions should consider architectural and design standards for the village centers.

6. Chapter 5: Mrs. Hill said she would get a photo of the solar panels behind the Averill barn when the snow has melted.

7. Chapter 6: Mr. Hileman and Mr. Rimsky explained the revisions they had made to chapter 6. The recommendation to reinstate contributions to the open space fund had been deleted because with over 27% open space, the Town has almost reached its goal of 30%. As setting a goal of more than 30% open space had not been discussed and because all of the commissioners thought 30% would be reached even without additional funding, it was agreed this recommendation should be dropped. It was the consensus the funds could be better spent elsewhere.

7. Chapter 6: Mr. Hileman said he had deleted the recommendation for a septic inspection ordinance because it would be very time consuming and expensive. Under to goal of protection of water quality, the commissioners briefly considered a recommendation to consider a septic

maintenance ordinance, but decided it was a Health Dept. concern and that it should not be included.

8. Throughout: Mr. Bedini suggested captions beneath each photo and all agreed this was a good idea.

9. Appendix C: A) Mr. Hileman said he did not include the five land use maps in the 2/1 draft because the Commission had expressed concern about their accuracy and usefulness. Mr. Carey thought that including them with known errors would be detrimental to the Commission's credibility, although he noted each carried a disclaimer in small print. Mr. Rimsky thought Milone and MacBroom should provide correct maps. Mr. Frank suggested a separate meeting just to review all of the maps. Mrs. Hill will work on a more detailed list of map errors, which will be sent to Milone and MacBroom so the maps it produced can be corrected. B) Mr. Carey suggested that the Plan include a reference to the 100 year floodplain/contour map that had recently been done for the section of the Shepaug River north of the firehouse extending to a point south of the primary school property and it was agreed this should be done. C) Mr. Hileman said he had deleted the Historic Sites map because it contained obvious mistakes. Mr. Carey thought this map might be useful in the future to help prevent the tear down of older buildings and their replacement with McMansions. Mrs. Hill thought, if corrected, the recommended historical society might find it useful. Mr. Hileman pointed out that this map was included in the Natural Resource Inventory Report and Recommendations, which had been incorporated in the Plan on page D39. D) It was noted the state POCD map had been deleted and everyone agree it should have been deleted because it was inaccurate and had no key.

10. Appendix E: Mr. Hileman noted the latest school enrollment projections through 2023 were now available and asked if he should update the draft. It was the consensus that the latest data should be used and the graphs should be revised to reflect it.

#### Discussion of Mr. Frank's comments:

1. Mr. Frank suggested that there be a cross reference in the main text to state that additional maps may be found in the appendices. It was agreed to do so.

2. Chapter 2: Regarding the table, "2003 POCD Goals and Recommended Actions," in this chapter and others, the commissioners agreed with Mr. Frank's suggestion that the categories should be consistent: "complete," "incomplete," "not implemented," and "ongoing."

3. Mr. Bedini asked if Mr. Hileman had revised the paragraphs on the Senior Center to more accurately reflect its current condition. Mr. Hileman said he had written that its needs had outgrown the existing facility and there is a need for a more permanent space.

4. Mr. Carey asked if all references to specific businesses had been deleted as had been requested. Mr. Hileman said they had.

#### Plaza Improvements

5. Chapter 4, page 30: Mr. Frank noted the strategies did not address Mrs. Hill's comments re: the proposed Plaza improvements. Mr. Rimsky, Planning commissioner serving on the Plaza improvement committee, reported that he had been sent only very general information, that he was not sure what had been sent out to bid, and that he did not think any responses had been received because the committee had not been called in to help with their evaluation. Mrs. Hill said it was not

known whether the Planning Commission agreed with the description of the scope of the work that had been sent out. Mr. Rimsky said it had been vague. Mr. Frank explained that Mrs. Hill's suggestion had been to include a reference to the Plaza improvements in the Plan so that the Commission's role in the process is recognized. Mrs. Hill was asked to draft a strategy to address this. Mr. Bedini asked, as he had done at the last meeting, for the scope of work that had been advertised.

6. Chapter 4, page 32: After a brief discussion regarding whether to add making each village center "more pedestrian friendly and less auto centered" to the general recommendations for all of the villages and deleting it from each specific village heading, it was the consensus not to do so because it would be difficult to accomplish in Woodville and Marbledale and because they had not been specified originally.

7. Chapter 4, page 33: Mr. Frank and Mrs. Hill questioned whether the last strategy for Washington Depot should be retained because it was so vague they did not know what it meant. It was the consensus to delete it.

8. Chapter 5, page 36: Mr. Frank noted that the Lake Waramaug Association had never been asked to "endorse" a comprehensive framework of sustainable practices and so requested "endorse" be changed to "support." It was agreed this change would be made.

9. Chapter 5, page 38: Mr. Frank did not think the discussion of water resources should include Waste Management. It was agreed that "& Waste Management" would be deleted from the Water Resources paragraph heading and that on page 39 the title, "Waste Management" would be inserted just above the fourth paragraph, which begins, "The Town has contracted...."

10. Chapter 5, page 40: Mr. Frank noted that efforts by Solarized had not been mentioned as a current initiative under Clean and Renewable Energy. Mr. Hileman will add this.

11. Chapter 6, page 48: Because all unnecessary outdoor lighting is a concern and not just that on ridgelines, it was agreed that "on or near ridgelines" would be deleted from the first bullet.

12. Chapter 6, page 48: Mr. Frank asked that the deletion of the recommendation that the Zoning Commission make its current lighting guidelines mandatory be reconsidered. He read Mrs. Hill's comments, which suggested recommendations that the Zoning Commission implement outdoor lighting regulations for the business districts and that it consider making some of its current lighting guidelines mandatory. It was the consensus to do so.

13. Chapter 7, page 53, line 2: Mr. Frank recommended, and it was agreed, that "ultimately" should be changed to "presently."

14. Chapter 7, page 55: Mr. Frank noted the time frame for the hiring of the economic development director was not consistent throughout the document. It was the consensus to change this to "as soon as possible" everywhere this recommendation appears.

#### Consideration of Mrs. Hill's comments:

Mrs. Hill said she would prefer to discuss these at another meeting when she is not taking the minutes. It was the consensus that this was a good idea and that a special meeting was not needed for this purpose. Discussion will resume at the March 4th meeting.

### **Referral from the Zoning Commission**

The Zoning Commission had referred several pages of revisions to the Planning Commission for its review. Mr. Frank noted these were mainly housekeeping changes, with only a few being substantive. He said he found nothing inconsistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development.

MOTION:

RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission finds that the proposed amendments to various sections of the Zoning Regulations (2.21 through 21.1) are not inconsistent with Washington's Plan of Conservation and Development (2003); such changes are generally in the nature of updating, clarifying, and correcting portions of the Regulations. This resolution constitutes the report of the Planning Commission required by Section 8-3a(b) of the Connecticut Revised Statutes.

By Mr. Frank, seconded by Mr. Carey, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Frank said he would contact Mr. Hileman to let him know that the draft for review by the other Town boards will not be complete until comments from Mrs. Hill and Ms. Gager have been discussed.

MOTION:

To adjourn the meeting. By Mr. Carey.

Mr. Frank adjourned the meeting at 9:45 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,  
Janet M. Hill  
Land Use Administrator