

January 22, 2007

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Averill, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Owen

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Fitzherbert

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Mr. Abella, Mr. Shapiro

ALTERNATE ABSENT: Mr. Wyant

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Ajello, Mrs. Hill

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Cornet, Mr. Mustich, Mr./Mrs. Buonaiuto, Mrs. Wildman, Mr./Mrs. Fraley, Ms. Levitt, Ms. Dupuis, Mr. Ross, Mr. Carey, Mr./Mrs. Frank, Mrs. Mestre, Mr. McGowan, Mr. Wilson, Mr. Kozak, Mr. Carlson, Mr./Mrs. Weber, Mr./Mrs. Sarjeant, Mr. Papsin, Mr. Lyon, Mr. Solley, Mr./Mrs. Boyer, Mrs. Boucher, Mr./Mrs. Tagley, Mr. Canal, Mrs. Andersen, Mrs. Condon, Mr. Nicholas, Mr. Distell, Mr. Piscuskas, Mrs. Bouquillion, Mr. Bouquillion, Mr. Robinson, Residents, Press

PUBLIC HEARING

Town of Washington/59 East Shore Road/Special Permit: Section 6.

Boat Ramp and Parking

Mr. Owen called the public hearing to order at 7:33 p.m. and seated Members Averill, Friedman, and Owen and Alternate Shapiro for Mr. Fitzherbert. Mrs. Friedman read the legal notice published in **Voices** on January 10 and January 17, 2007. Mr. Owen read the list of documents in the file. Mr. Abella arrived and was seated.

Mr. Solley, Selectman, introduced Mr. McGowan, Director of the Lake Waramaug Task Force.

Mr. McGowan provided the background regarding all of the work done by the three towns and the state since 1995. He stated it had taken nine years to reach an agreement with the state and another year and a half to draft an acceptable design for the boat launch. He noted the state had originally proposed a new 40 space parking lot, 45 slips, and a new boat launch at the state park, but that due to safety concerns, environmental impacts, and the dangerous conditions of the existing state road, the towns of Kent, Warren, and Washington had opposed it. Testimony by Dr. Kortmann regarding the adverse environmental impacts of such a facility was provided for the file and Mr. McGowan detailed the dredging and continued maintenance that would be required for a launch at the shallow end of the lake. He presented the map, "Day Use Boat Launch, Lake Waramaug State Park," to illustrate the scope of the work required at the state park versus what would be required on the Town property and explained the proposed plan was the agreed upon alternative to locating the launch at the park. He stated the Lake Waramaug Agreement had been signed in September of 2004, the rights of the Town had not changed, and the Town beach would

not be affected. He explained a maximum of 20 non resident boats would be permitted on the lake per day; 13 for those registered for at least two nights at the state park and 7 for day boaters. Car top boats and boats with motors under 12 hp would have no limit, but would have to be inspected for invasives. He distributed the document, "Town of Washington Proposed Boat Ramp Improvements - Review of Applicable Sections of the Zoning Regulations," undated, unsigned and he reviewed how the application met each requirement of the Regulations. He briefly reviewed the drainage plans, which included catch basins and a natural plant buffer that would trap sediments before they reached the lake. He noted these proposed protective measures would improve the quality of the lake. Mr. McGowan noted there had been public concern about traffic safety in this limited sized location, but he assured the Commission that both the state boat unit engineer and the Town's engineer had worked together on the plan, which met the acceptable limits for safety. He also noted Mr. Payton of the DEP had written to Mr. Sears to confirm the plan as proposed had been approved by the state.

Mr. Wilson, engineer, first presented a topo map, which was an overview of the existing site conditions, and noted the narrow ramp and most of the parking located in the state right of way would no longer be permitted. He pointed out the proposed location of the ramp had been selected after considering the topography of the bottom of the lake because the ramp requires 4 ft. of water at the deep end and a slope no greater than 15%. He noted the lake drops off rapidly at the Washington end. The proposal would leave the Town beach "untouched" and all boat traffic would be kept to the east of the police dock. The second map reviewed was, "Boat Ramp," by Mr. Wilson, revised to 1/19/07. Mr. Wilson explained how the project would proceed so that there would be continuous access to the lake while the new ramp was being constructed. In response to the concerns raised by Mr. Kozak in his 1/2/07 letter, Mr. Wilson said the state requires 7 parking spaces, plus one for handicapped parking and 9 are proposed. Each space would be 10.5 feet wide and 40 ft. long. He said the state organization for boating access, the DOT, and the Army Corps of Engineers had been consulted about the parking plan and noted the design standards were included with the application. He discussed maneuvering the angled parking spaces and stated the most difficult space to use would be at the east end of the site. Next he briefly reviewed the construction technique whereby the ramp would be made in sections on the staging area on site and then slid down into the lake. Once completed, the necessary regrading would be done. He noted a segmented retaining wall with a planting shell would be constructed along the shoreline. The landscaping notes were included on the plan. Native plants such as fescues and low blueberry bushes would be planted to provide a buffer that in addition to trapping sediment, would keep trash and people out of the lake. Drainage was briefly reviewed. Mr. Wilson said the runoff from the state road would remain in the state system and would not affect the Town property. The on site drainage system would contain three catch basins, each with a slotted insert to slow the velocity of the runoff so that sediments would be dropped before they reached the lake. They would also contain material to absorb petroleum based wastes so they would not reach the lake. This spongelike material would be removed at the end of each season. Mr. Wilson also noted that: 1) the entrance and exit would be gated, 2) the hours of operation would be the same as they are now, 3) there would be a walk through access to the lake to maintain the rights of nearby property owners, 4) the work would affect 220 ft. of shoreline, 5) the size of the property would increase by 3300 sq. ft., 6) 240 cubic yards of fill would be deposited, 7) the driveway would be 24 ft. wide with a 9% grade, 8) the ramp would be attended whenever open, and 9) a sign would be posted with boating regulations, operational information, and instructions regarding permits. He briefly reviewed peak use based on last season's numbers.

Mrs. Friedman asked Mr. Frank to explain how the ramp would be monitored. Mr. Frank noted that although once the ramp is completed a maximum of 20 non resident boaters a day would have access to the lake, during construction only 5 campers from the state park and no day boaters would be permitted. He explained state park campers would have to present an ID certificate from the park to use the ramp and pay both a registration and inspection fee. The boat and trailer would be inspected at this point. Once the boat was in the water, the camper

would be required to drive his vehicle and trailer back to the state park because campers would not be allowed to park on Town property. He said the 9 parking spaces provided would be used on a first come/ first served basis. There would be no limit to the number of car top boats or boats with motors under 12 hp that could be launched at the state park or at the ramp, but they would all have to be inspected. He said currently there are no DEP funds for inspections at the state park, but he hoped to have volunteers inspecting at the park. Mr. McGowan noted negotiations were currently underway to eliminate the need for the trip to the state park to pick up the ID certification.

Mr. Owen read the 1/22/07 ZEO Report.

Mrs. Friedman asked about the Inland Wetlands Commission's condition of approval recommending mitigation in Phase II of the project. Mr. Ajello explained this was due to the filling required in Phase I.

Mr. Owen asked for public comments.

Mrs. Bouquillon was concerned about 1) what the area would look like, 2) whether her existing right of way to the lake would remain, and 3) that parking be kept off her property. Since the picnic area would be removed she feared she would see only blacktop from her home. She noted currently vehicles park on her lawn and asked that this be monitored. She said she would be satisfied with the proposal if her 24 hour access to the lake would be maintained. Mr. Wilson submitted photos to show what the Town property looks like now and said the chain link fence would be replaced with a 2 ft. tall single rail fence and the gravel area would be planted with grass to create a green border along the road. Mr. Owen noted the state would not allow parking along the state road once the parking lot had been installed.

Mr. Carlson asked 1) wouldn't the boats using the proposed ramp also dredge up sediment, 2) what would happen when there were no parking spaces left for "wannabe" boaters, and 3) would Town residents be permitted to park in the 9 designated spaces? He also noted that with the number of trips between the state park and Town ramp required for permits and parking there would be almost as many vehicle trips on the dangerous roads as if the state had installed the launch as originally proposed at the state park. Mr. Frank responded there would be no dredging required for the ramp at the Washington end of the lake and that the churning up of sediment would not be an issue for the mooring of boats. He also stated that negotiations were underway and he hoped the state eligibility form could be available at the Town launch to eliminate trips back and forth between the park and the ramp. In response to what would happen to the waiting boaters, Mr. Owen noted there is no available parking now and so this was not a new issue.

Mrs. Friedman asked if when a boater could not prove Town residency and the maximum 20 non resident boats were already in the lake, would the boater be turned away. Mr. Frank said he would.

Mrs. Weber noted the boathouse would be demolished and the plans did not show where the caretaker's cottage and boathouse would be rebuilt. She did not want any of the existing Town beach or surrounding park to be lost. She received a round of applause from the audience. Mr. Solley responded the rebuilding of these structures was not included in Phase I, the boathouse would be rebuilt in some configuration, and the Town beach was "sacred." He indicated there was a possibility the large building might be replaced with several smaller ones to house police equipment and the lake compressors. Mr. Owen noted at this time the Zoning Commission was considering the current application for Phase I only.

Mrs. Weber noted what was approved in Phase I may affect future plans, which was a concern of the townspeople who were paying for the project. Mr. Owen said their concerns were legitimate, but that the Zoning Commission had no authority to deal with future hypothetical applications. He added the beach could not be eliminated without a public hearing.

Mrs. Andersen had procedural questions; 1) had there been a review under Section 8-24 of the state statutes and 2) did the proposal comply with the 1999 Heritage Lake Act? She thought there might be new ways to accomplish the goals of the three towns and that the introduction of power boats to the lake would be detrimental. Mrs. Hill responded that the Planning Commission minutes regarding its review of the proposal under Section 8-24 were in the file. Mrs. Friedman noted there are already motor boats of all sizes using the lake.

Mr. Kozak gave a lengthy presentation regarding how the proposed facility was not large enough or designed properly to accommodate the amount of traffic that would be generated or the size of the boats and trailers that would use the facility. (His 1/2/07 letter is attached.) Though he noted the DEP had done a good design considering the small size of the property, he said it did not satisfy "form or function." He discussed the difficulty boaters would have maneuvering the driveway/parking area and feared there would be lines out in the road of boaters waiting to enter the facility. He suggested several possible changes, but found none of them to be totally satisfactory. 1) Change the angle of the parking spaces from 60 to 40 degrees.. This would make the spaces easier to pull in and out of, but 2 spaces would be lost. 2) Have someone on site to direct traffic. This would not be adequate to help someone back out of the parking space. 3) Bring in additional fill so the parking area could be larger. He said the Selectmen had declined to discuss this option with him. Mr. Kozak was also concerned there would be early morning lines outside the facility waiting for it to open as there were only 9 parking spaces and they would be used on a first come/first served basis. He thought this would be a dangerous situation on East Shore Road since the existing gravel pull off area would be grassed and fenced off. He said he believed out of towners should be able to boat on the lake, but that the Washington taxpayers had to get a workable plan for their money. He also noted there are no other parking areas within 600 ft. as required by the Zoning Regulations. Mr. Owen responded that particular parking requirement was for the commercial districts only. Mr. Owen thanked him for his thoughtful letter and his investigation of the problems and said it was a model that could be used by the public in the future. In response, Mr. Wilson read Mr. Payton's 1/19/07 email, which stated the plan had been approved by the DEP. Mr. Wilson noted that larger rigs could hang over the curb when pulling out of a space and said this was the best design possible for such a small area. He said the state would not have approved it if it would not work. He explained the standards that both he and the state had used to calculate the space needed and to draft the proposed layout. He then reviewed the number of vehicles that had used the launch the previous year and the busiest times of the year. The busiest day last year had been 16 vehicles and the busiest 2 hour period had 7 vehicles. As to whether enough parking had been provided, he stated that based on the agreement with the state, more parking had been provided than was required. Mrs. Friedman asked if there had been any discussion about limiting the size of the boats or trailers that could use the ramp. Mr. Wilson said there had not and that the proposed facility met the state standards for access.

Ms. Linda H_____ thought the public should have access to all future plans before Phase I was acted on. She objected that the overall goal for the entire beach was not known at this time. She thought a garden designer should review the landscaping plan, especially for the areas near the road where she thought fescue grasses were inappropriate because they were too tall. She also asked about the proposed "sump." Mr. Owen responded the site plan for Phase I was on file and that all the information required by the Washington Zoning Regulations had been submitted by the applicant. Mr. Wilson explained the sumps were located in the catch basins and would trap sediment before it reaches the lake. He also noted the grass near the road would be kept mowed because it could not obscure the sight lines.

Ms. Dupuis stated she had a problem with Phase II, which, she said, included plans for a 30 ft. X 50 ft. structure in the beach area. She noted the picnic area had already been lost so it was essential to save the beach. She asked if the Commission could not consider Phase II at this time, that it act on Phase I including the condition that any building in Phase II must be constructed on the existing footprints. Mr. Owen responded that the Commission could not prevent an applicant from applying for what he is legally allowed to. He said Phase II would be a separate application process and noted the Commission could not judge hypothetical issues.

Ms. Dupuis noted her concern about the impact of traffic on New Preston and asked that a DOT traffic study be conducted before the Commission acted on the application. She also wanted information on what impact use of the new ramp would have on air quality. Mr. Owen said air quality was not governed by the Zoning Regs and Ms. Dupuis responded health and safety were under the Commission's jurisdiction. She said there would be smog and noise from high powered boats and asked the Commission to make sure that all concerns were addressed before acting.

Mrs. Friedman asked if there had been any proposal to limit the horsepower permitted on the lake, both for residents and day users.

At this point Mr. Owen called a five minute recess.

Mr. Frank responded to Mrs. Friedman's question that the Lake Waramaug Assn. had been discussing a limitation for a long time and would examine it again when the boat launch issue had been resolved. He noted the DEP would have to approve any such limitation and also that public input would be sought.

Mr. Frank asked the Commission to keep in mind that the alternative to approving the application for the new boat launch would be a major state boat launch at the park, which would destroy the balanced recreational use of the lake.

Mr. Mustich said he agreed with the statements by Mrs. Weber and Ms. Dupuis that the Commission should have all the facts about Phases II and III before acting on Phase I and submitted a letter, which, he said, raised many questions about the proposal.

Mr. Cornet thought there was a conflict of interest because a Town commission would act on the Town's application. He asked about the funding for Phase I and Mr. Owen said this was not a zoning issue. Mr. Cornet asked if Phase I would be fully completed before Phase II was approved and said the public had the right to know what the future plans would be. Mr. Owen noted the Commission was concerned only with Phase I at this time and Mrs. Friedman agreed.

Mr. Cornett stated many townspeople were upset with how the application was being presented because there was no place where they could go to see the entire picture. He asked that the Commission not approve the application until the public was satisfied with the cost of the entire project and how it would look.

Mr. Nicholas thought the proposed boat launch was the "lesser of two evils," but said Phase II was implied. He noted the proposed site was an environmentally sensitive area and that potential demolition and reconstruction could impact the lake and so must be considered. He feared a year from now the Town would find out that Phase I was inadequate.

Mrs. Mestre stated the alternative to the proposed boat launch was much worse as there would be 80 more boats permitted if the ramp was located at the state park. She said this would result in much more noise and pollution than the current proposal.

Mr. Fraley urged the commissioners to lay out the proposed parking so they could see for themselves that it would not work. He said 6 additional feet of the lake would have to be filled to properly accommodate the vehicles using the ramp. He said there would be accidents if the proposed layout was implemented.

Mr. Robinson of Warren stated if the ramp was constructed at the state park there would be bass tournaments held on the lake and the boats used in these fishing tournaments were very fast and high powered.

Mr. Canal stated the most important consideration should be the health of the lake and its ecosystem. Without the proposed launch, he said, the condition of Lake Waramaug would deteriorate resulting in costly maintenance so it could continue to be used recreationally. He said not only was the lake an important resource to protect, but it contributed to tourism and the high property values in the area. He received a round of applause from the public.

Mr. Cornet noted in the 12 years since plans for the boat launch were first debated there has grown an overwhelming public environmental awareness. He thought it was inconceivable that the DEP could ignore this and construct a ramp at the park that would destroy the Town's natural asset. He urged the three towns to continue to fight against it.

Mrs. Bouquillon noted a right of way had been reserved for those property owners entitled to it, but asked if they would be given a map or literature to show them where it is located. Mr. Wilson said the Town would support the existing rights of access as shown on a map from 1964. He said the access would be next to the driveway. Mrs. Bouquillon wanted to be sure her right of way was protected, she could use it whenever she wanted, and she wanted assurances in writing. Mr. Frank stated the Town would provide her with whatever she was legally entitled to. Mr. Wilson said the pedestrian gate would not be locked.

Mr. Frank submitted the 1/19/07 letter from the Lake Waramaug Authority in support of the application.

Ms. Linda H_____ asked if the picnic area would be replaced. Mr. Solley stated if after the work was completed a suitable location was found, the Town would consider it.

Mr. Abella asked Mr. Wilson if he had considered decreasing the number of parking spaces from 9 to 7 to increase maneuverability. Mr. Wilson stated 1) 7 was too few spaces, 2) many factors such as getting all parking out of the state ROW, sizing the spaces according to DEP and Army Corps of Engineer standards, and general traffic safety guidelines figured into the design, and 3) many configurations had been considered and this was the one that worked the best. He stressed that the DEP was contributing \$100,000 for construction and had approved the plan.

Mr. O'Lear noted the state would not conduct inspections at the park and asked why the Town could not do them instead. Mr. Owen responded inspections by the Town were included in the proposal.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider the Special Permit Application: Section 6.4.4 submitted by the Town of Washington to construct a boat ramp and parking at 59 East Shore Road. By Mrs. Friedman, seconded by Mr. Abella, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Owen thanked the public for attending. He closed the hearing at 10:00 p.m.

This public hearing was recorded on tape. The tape is on file in the Land Use Office, Bryan Memorial Town Hall, Washington, Ct.

REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Owen called the Regular Meeting to order at 10:00 p.m. and seated Members Averill, Friedman, and Owen and Alternates Abella and Shapiro.

MOTION: To add the following subsequent business to the agenda: 1) New Application: Sachs/104 Kielwasser Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11/Detached Accessory Apartment, 2) Other Business: Scheduling of Verizon Telecommunications Tower Public Comment Session, 3) Communications: Circulation of Proposed Rural Roadscape Zone, and 4) 12/22/06 Letter and Brochures from HVA re: Protecting Water Quality. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mr. Shapiro, and passed 5-0.

Consideration of the Minutes

The 12/18/06 Regular Meeting minutes were accepted as amended.

Page 2: Mr. Shapiro pointed out minor corrections that would have to be made to the proposed lighting regulations, but Mr. Owen said these would be addressed during the public hearing.

Page 4: White/Parsonage Lane: The original paragraph was deleted and the following sentences substituted: "Mr. Ajello had informed the Zoning Commission that Mr. White had appealed the ZEO's decision, but actually, no action had been taken on the application. The appeal was premature and Mr. White subsequently withdrew it."

MOTION: To accept the 12/18/06 Regular Meeting minutes as amended. By Mr. Shapiro, seconded by Mr. Abella, and passed 5-0.

New Applications

2 Wheaton, LLC/2 Wheaton Road/Special Permit: Section 9.4.1.f/ Professional Offices: Mr. Distell, owner, was present. Mr. Ajello reported the coverage would depend on the amount of on site parking required. He said he had asked the applicant to attend to address the office use and the number of spaces that would be required. He noted there was no sign off from the Health Department. A public hearing was scheduled for Monday, February 26, 2007 at 7:30 p.m. in the Land Use Meeting Room.

Sachs/104 Kielwasser Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11/Detached Accessory Apartment: Mr. Ross, contractor, represented the property owner. A public hearing was scheduled for February 26, 2007 in the Land Use Meeting Room immediately following the 2 Wheaton, LLC. hearing.

Other Business

Preliminary Discussion/Piscuskas/New Milford Turnpike/Light Manufacturing: Mr. Piscuskas was interested in purchasing the property at the corner of Mygatt Road and Rt. 202. Mrs. Hill explained the issue was that Mr. Piscuskas proposed a commercial building larger than the maximum 7500 sq. ft. allowed in this district and he was looking for direction from the Commission regarding whether it would consider a revision to the Marbledale District regulations. Mr. Piscuskas presented photos of the existing large structures in this section of Marbledale to show that the size building he proposed would be in keeping with the immediate surroundings. He said he was aware of the Commission's goal to preserve the Town's rural character. Mr. Owen advised Mr. Piscuskas that he could petition to revise the Regulations, but this would be unrelated to the specific project he would propose if the revisions were approved. The revisions would apply to the entire district, not just the property Mr. Piscuskas was interested in. Mrs. Friedman advised him that any petition had to be specific. Mr. Owen noted a public hearing would be required and the proposed language would be referred to the Planning Commission and surrounding councils of government.

Pending Application

Town of Washington/59 East Shore Road/Special Permit: Section 6.4.4/Boat Ramp and Parking: The Commissioners expressed their views about the application. Mrs. Friedman thought the public had raised valid points, but thought the Commission had to consider the alternative in the broader context. She noted it had taken years to reach the current Agreement and she feared if the application was not approved, a far less satisfactory project would result. Mr. Shapiro noted the Commission had been presented with contradictory evidence regarding the feasibility of the proposal, but that the Town had made convincing arguments that had been backed by the state that the plan would work. He thought it was feasible. Mr. Abella said he understood Mr. Kozak's concerns and he knew the property was limited in size, but he accepted Mr. Wilson's explanation that the number of parking spaces could not be decreased. He thought the Commission should "deal with the bigger picture" because approval of the application would be a major step to protect Lake Waramaug. Mr. Averill was in favor of the plan as presented. He said the issues raised about the proposed launch were minor compared to the bigger picture of saving the entire lake. He also noted the purpose of the ramp was not to make the lake more accessible to more and larger boats, but to control what happens to the lake and to protect it. Mr. Owen stated that considering Dr. Kortmann's review of the alternatives, he did not see a feasible alternative to the application presented. He agreed the proposed parking was a difficult situation, but did not necessarily think that was a bad thing. He thought perhaps if traffic got backed up the boaters would go elsewhere and that the Town could never increase the capacity enough to solve all of the problems raised. He thanked the public for its intelligent and forcefully made objections, but noted again the Commission could consider only Phase I at this time.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application: Section 6.4.4 submitted by the Town of Washington for a boat ramp and parking at 59 East Shore Road. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mr. Abella, and passed 5-0.

Other Business

Revision of the Regulations/Outdoor Residential Lighting: It was noted the public hearing would be the third hearing on Monday, February 26, 2007.

Revision of the Regulations/Prohibition of Outdoor Wood and Other Fuel Burning Furnaces: This revision will also be considered at the public hearing on February 26. Mr. and Mrs. Buonaiuto asked the Commission why it was concerned about outdoor wood furnaces. Mr. Owen said the Commission had based its proposal on the nuisance to neighbors caused by these furnaces. Mrs. Buonaiuto submitted the article, "Emission from Outdoor Wood Burning Residential Hot Water Furnaces," by Valenti and Clayton, dated February 1998. Mr. Buonaiuto also asked if the Commission was aware that the Ct. legislature had tried unsuccessfully to regulate their use. Mr. Owen advised them to attend the public hearing.

Revision of the Regulations/Restaurants and Eating and Drinking Establishments in All Commercial Districts: Mr. Owen suggested the Commission move ahead now and schedule a public hearing for the provisions it had already agreed upon, while continuing to work on those that do not yet have a consensus. It was agreed to schedule a public hearing at 7:30 p.m. on Monday, March 26, 2007 in the Land Use Meeting Room to consider the following revisions:

New Section 13.20: Eating and Drinking Establishments.

13.20.A Food and beverages shall not be sold or served to customers while customers are in motor vehicles.

13.20.B The establishment shall be closed to the public for no less than 10 hours during any 24 hour period.

Communications

Application for Verizon Telecommunications Tower: A public informational and comment session was scheduled for Monday, March 5, 2007 at 7:30 p.m.. It was noted this was not a Zoning application and the Zoning Commission would have little input other than perhaps expressing a preference for one of the two sites proposed.

Rural Roadscape District: Proposed language to create a rural roadscape district with regulations to help preserve the rural character along the Town's roads was circulated. At its next meeting the Commission will discuss whether it would like to pursue this matter.

Commission Vacancies: Mr. Owen noted Mr. Abella would be moved up as a Member to replace Mr. Martin and so an Alternate would have to be found for his seat. Also, he noted Mr. Wyant had not responded to his letter asking him to resign due to poor attendance. Mr. Owen said he had discussed the need for new members with the chairman of the Republican Town Committee. Mrs. Friedman suggested that unaffiliated voters also be considered if the R was having difficulty recommending replacements.

HVA - Protecting Water Quality Information: Copies of brochures for applicants and land use commissions were distributed for review.

Enforcement

Moore/25 Litchfield Turnpike: Mr. Ajello reported that enforcement procedures by the Inland Wetlands Commission were not progressing well. He noted there are several zoning violations on this property including shop and storage use on a residential lot without a Special Permit. Mr. Owen advised Mr. Ajello that if it becomes necessary to fine Mr. Moore, the Commission will vote to do it.

Denscot Pools/269 New Milford Turnpike: Mr. Ajello noted much of the material had been cleaned up and said he would continue to monitor the property.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. By Mr. Owen.

Mr. Owen adjourned the meeting at 10:48 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill, Land Use Coordinator