

Warren Planning & Zoning Commission
50 Cemetery Road, Meeting Room 1st Floor
Minutes of the Hearing held on
July 8, 2014

Hearing was called at 7:30pm by Bob Bolte, Chairman for Planning and Zoning

Present: B. Bolte, R. Kasler, S. Bates, H. Lethbridge, P. Good, and J. Miller

Alternates: M. Worden, B. Coyle

ZEO: Stacey Sefcik

Recording Secretary: C. Frisbie

Regrets: C. Fischer, C. Brodhead

B. Bolte turned the chair over to H. Lethbridge due to a conflict of interest with the first item on the Hearing Notice. B. Bolte removed himself from the room.

H. Lethbridge asked S. Sefcik to read the Hearing Notice for the record. S. Sefcik also noted that the notice was in the paper on June 24th and July 1st and all proof of letters to abutting neighbors was completed.

1. Construction of Veteran's Memorial: members were given a letter from the VMC and it was entered into the record. Review of letter by W. Wilson stated: we are one of the few towns in CT that does not have a formal memorial of veteran names on a monument: a sketch of the project is available for viewing in the Town Hall: Wetlands permits acquired: an outline of how the project came to being and why Cemetery Road is the perfect area for this memorial.

Motion (Kasler/Bates) to close hearing on Veteran's Memorial item

All Approved

B. Bolte was asked to rejoin the hearing. H. Lethbridge turned the chair back over to B. Bolte

It was suggested that items B & C from the hearing be combined since they interact with each other. B. Bolte asked for those speaking at the hearing to please state their name and address for the record.

2. Amendment to Section 3 and Amendment to Section 16.2 of the P&Z Regulations: Tom McGowan executive director of the LMTF 19 Sackett Hill Rd thanked the Committee for their efforts in amending these sections. He spoke regarding storm water run-off, pervious and non-pervious pavers and how they are not good for the water and how it doesn't help with the algae in the lake.

Before any more comments were heard, S. Sefcik wanted to clarify Section 16.2.1f to state "A" patio of 80sq.ft. may be approved by the Committee - - just ONE patio. Also noted that all

information was submitted to the NWHCOG and we received back and acknowledgement of the amendments with no comments.

A letter from D.R.Wilson, PE was entered into the record. Mr. Wilson, 552 Milton Rd, is a certified erosion control and storm water control professional and spoke on the specific terms of “a patio”: the difference between pervious and non-pervious pavers: opinion on size specification (80 sq. ft.) isn’t large enough to put a chase lounge on – would like to see the area expanded to 350 sq. ft.: spoke on the definition of a shoreline frontage: the 80 sq. ft. area was picked because that is the size of a shed allowed at the lake area with a 12 ft. height cap (so it would not block the view of the lake): spoke on Universal Soil Loss Equations: eliminate settlement: surface treatments & SOP factors.

T. McGowan noted that the opinion of the LMA and LMTF is standing firm regarding the vegetation pattern of the area.

R. Kasler asked “what do Washington and Kent have in place for setbacks in the lake area”? McGowan said Washington as 75ft setbacks and then basically the same regulations as Warren. Washington does not distinguish between paved or unpaved driveways – maximum of 10% pervious throughout the Town, just not at the lake. McGowan said if the Committee would like to continue the hearing, he would get more information to present.

B. Bolte asked the Committee if they would like to continue or act on the items? No Answer from members

D. Wilson, rebuttal - -Washington made an interpretation, not a regulation of impervious ratio – no more than 10%: Warren has 20%. Wilson also stated the difference in Lake Area between Washington and Warren

R. Kasler asked if the members would consider changing the 80 sq. ft. area to something large, but not as large as the 350 sq. ft. Mr. Wilson recommended? Attorney Branse said that would be allowed (can modify the amendment).

B. Bolte asked the members if they would like to continue the hearing or close?
4 close 1 continue (Lethbridge) Motion (Bates/Miller) to close the hearing
5 approved 1 no (Lethbridge)

The Hearing was closed at 8:15pm