

BRISTOL PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2009

ATTENDANCE: Chairman William Veits
Commissioner John Soares (VC)
Commissioner Marie Keeton
Commissioner Brian Ewings
Commissioner Anthony Dell'Aera
Joseph Kelaita (Alternate)
Charles Cyr (Alternate) (departed at 8:45 P.M.)
Angelo Cannici (Alternate) (departed at 9:05 P.M.)
City Planner, Alan Weiner
Assistant City Planner, Christopher Beauchemin

ABSENT: City Engineer, Paul Strawderman

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M.

Chairman Veits designated Commissioners Dell'Aera, Ewings, Keeton, Soares, and himself as voting Commissioners. Also, he noted the next meeting of the Planning Commission is October 28, 2009.

I. Minutes

1. Regular Meeting of June 27, 2009.

Chairman Veits designated Commissioner Kelaita to sit in place of Commissioner Keeton in her absence at the June 27th meeting.

Motion was made by Commissioner Ewings to accept the minutes of June 27, 2009 as presented.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Kelaita.

Motion carried 5-0.

II. Pending Applications

None.

III. New Applications

None.

IV. Zoning Commission Referrals

None.

V. City Council and Other Referrals

1. Sale of property
 - a. Lot 93, west side of Aldbourne Drive
 - b. Lot 63 (formerly Lots 62 and 63), east side of Belmont Street
 - c. Lot 207-1, south side of Brewster Road
 - d. Lot 106, north side of Pleasant Street
 - e. Lot 62-2, east side of Town Line Road
 - f. Lot 62-4, east side of Town Line Road
 - g. Lot 314-4, east side of Morris Avenue
 - h. Lot 102, north side of Kilmartin Avenue
 - i. Lot 106, north side of Kilmartin Avenue

The Commission acknowledged receipt of the following items: a letter dated September 10, 2009, regarding the City Council's request for proposals for Lot 102, Kilmartin Avenue; a letter dated September 10, 2009, regarding the City Council's request for proposals for Lot 106, Kilmartin Avenue; and a letter dated September 10, 2009, regarding the City Council's request for proposals for the disposition of city-owned property at: Lot 93 Aldbourne Drive, Lot 63 (formerly Lots 62 and 63) Belmont Street, Lot 207-1 Brewster Road, Lot 106 Pleasant Street, Lot 62-2 Town Line Road, Lot 62-4 Town Line Road, and Lot 314-4 Morris Avenue

After inquiry by the Commission, Mr. Weiner noted the referral pertained to the disposition of city-owned property. He explained the Commission's responsibility was to recommend whether the city should seek proposals from firms for the purpose of determining the most appropriate disposition of the properties. He noted this referral was different from past referrals in that the request involved whether the city should determine the disposition of city-owned property through a request for proposals process. He explained the request for proposals process and noted the Commission would likely be presented with another referral once the disposition for each property has been finalized. He reviewed with the Commission the state statutes pertaining to the disposition of city-owned property.

Councilman Kevin McCauley, 209 Center Street, representing the Real Estate Committee, explained the subject properties were surplus and the city would be seeking to sell them. Mr. McCauley explained the City Council was seeking recommendations from the Commission about whether to seek requests for proposals for the purpose of selling the subject properties. He explained the purpose of this request was to obtain the Commission's recommendations with regard to each property. He explained the Commission would likely review each property again in the future should the Commission make a recommendation to proceed with the request for proposals. Also, he confirmed that future referrals from the Real Estate Committee would include a brief narrative for each property for information purposes.

Councilman McCauley reviewed each property with the Commission describing its background and present status. He explained that many of the properties were non-conforming and the intention would be to merge these parcel with an adjoining property.

a. Lot 93, west side of Aldbourne Drive

Councilman McCauley explained the property was deeded open space and could not be considered for sale or merger. Due to its open space status the city must continue to maintain ownership of the property.

b. Lot 63 (formerly Lots 62 and 63), east side of Belmont Street

Councilman McCauley explained this property contained a deed restriction on behalf of the State of Connecticut. An offer was received to purchase the property in 2008 for \$30,000 however the state required at least \$65,000 for the purchase. He explained the city would seek a sale price of \$45,000 for the property with the anticipation the State would reconsider the deed restriction. He explained the lot was buildable however there were issues with overgrowth on the property.

After inquiry by the Commission, Councilman McCauley explained the deed restriction limited the use of the property to open space. He further explained that should the deed restriction be lifted, the property would become a building lot. He noted the State placed the restriction on the deed.

Councilman McCauley read aloud a letter from the Connecticut Department of Transportation concerning the state's rejection of the city's offer of \$30,000 to release the deed restrictions on the subject property.

After inquiry by Mr. Weiner, Councilman McCauley noted that a house formerly on the property was demolished and Lots #63 and #63 were merged. He further noted the state formerly owned the property and subsequently quit claimed the parcel to the city with the deed restriction. The state held the property at a time when Route 72 was being contemplated for the area.

c. Lot 207-1, south side of Brewster Road

Councilman McCauley noted this was a very small property and the intention will be to transfer it to an adjacent property owner for the purpose of merger.

d. Lot 106, north side of Pleasant Street

Councilman McCauley explained the property was held for the purpose of realigning the intersection of School Street and North Main Street however the project is no longer planned. He noted this property was also very small and the intention will be to transfer it to an adjacent property owner for the purpose of merger.

After inquiries by the Commission, Councilman McCauley explained the Office of Corporation Counsel will determine the process for undertaking merger of properties.

In response to an inquiry from the Commission, Mr. Weiner indicated the property could be a potential location for signage related to the West End neighborhood.

e. Lot 62-2, east side of Town Line Road, and

f. Lot 62-4, east side of Town Line Road

Councilmen McCauley explained both properties on Town Line Road were landlocked and the city would seek potential buyers through the request for proposals process with the purpose of merging the two lots. He explained that should no potential

buyers come forward the proposal would be to merge the property with an adjacent parcel. He noted there was a previous request for proposal on these properties however no suitable offers were submitted. He noted the City Council would attempt to solicit additional proposals for the two properties and negotiate a sale of the lots. Lastly, he noted he did not have any information with regard to open space deed restrictions for either property.

g. Lot 314-4, east side of Morris Ave.

Councilmen McCauley explained the Board of Education considered the disposition of this property and ultimately determined there were no plans for its use either now or in the future. The Board acknowledged there were no plans for expansion of Stafford School and that any expansion would not include the area of the subject property. He further acknowledged that a client of a local real estate agent expressed interest in purchasing the property for the purpose of building a house on the lot. He noted there would be a proposal presented to the Commission.

h. Lot 102, north side of Kilmartin Ave.

Councilmen McCauley noted this property was non-conforming in that it has road frontage of 55-feet. He noted that should there be no interested buyers of the property it will be transferred after negotiation to an adjacent property owner for the purpose of merger.

i. Lot 106, north side of Kilmartin Ave.

Councilmen McCauley noted this property was also non-conforming having road frontage of 37.5-feet. He noted that should there be no interested buyers of the property it will be transferred after negotiation to an adjacent property owner for the purpose of merger.

Mr. Weiner noted that Lot 93, west side of Aldbourne Drive, was open space property and could not be sold. He suggested the Commission discuss Lot 106, north side of Pleasant Street because the city could potentially place gateway related signage on it for the West End neighborhood or the lot could become part of a roundabout project to manage traffic at the intersection. Also, with regard to Lot 314-4, east side of Morris Avenue, he explained that while the Board of Education may have no interest in the property, the Planning Commission might have a different view of the property from a future planning perspective. He noted there are other city's that would be extremely hesitant of selling properties located adjacent to school grounds. He acknowledged that disposition of the remaining properties on the list would be a relatively straightforward decision.

After inquiries by the Commission, Mr. Wiener explained that Lot 63 (formerly Lots 62 and 63), east side of Belmont Street, may have value as a means of access to the owner of Lot 119 which is adjacent. He noted the property owner of Lot 119 would have the opportunity to place a bid on Lot 63 if so desired.

Councilmen McCauley read aloud the map description from the deed for Lot 63 Belmont Street.

Chairman Veits noted he appreciated the councilman's presence to present the requests

Councilmen McCauley noted the City Council would establish a policy to provide the Commission with presentations similar to the presentation made this evening.

Mr. Weiner recommended the Commission review and discuss the disposition of each of the properties and then take action on the referrals accordingly.

The Commission agreed that Lot 93, west side of Aldbourne Drive was open space land and could not be sold. Mr. Weiner suggested the Commission take action on this property separately.

The Commission agreed that Lot 63 (formerly Lots 62 and 63), east side of Belmont Street was acceptable for inclusion in the request for proposal process.

Mr. Weiner noted the Commission should not consider a selling price as part of their decision.

Regarding Lot 207-1, south side of Brewster Road, the Commission agreed it was a small property and should be sent out for request for proposal.

Regarding Lot 106, north side of Pleasant Street, the Commission agreed the City should retain this property as it may have value for either parking or possible gateway signage for the West End neighborhood. Also, the property may have even greater value for public use if combined with the purchase of the adjacent property.

After inquiries by the Commission regarding Lots 62-2, and Lot 62-4, east side of Town Line Road, Mr. Weiner noted these lots were part of an old subdivision and likely involved variances. He noted the lots were land locked and have no practical value to the city. He further noted there was no open space land adjacent to either property. Also, ownership of the adjacent properties was not known.

Regarding Lot 314-4, east side of Morris Avenue, the Commission's view was located adjacent to a school and was of such a size that it may have value for possible expansion of Stafford School at some point in the future. The Commission agreed the city should retain this property.

After inquiry by the Commission, Mr. Weiner noted that in the event the Planning Commission recommends not to proceed with a request for proposals for any property, a two-thirds or super-majority vote by the City Council would then be required to over-ride the Commission's recommendation.

Next, the Commission assessed Lot 102 and Lot 106, north side of Kilmartin Avenue and agreed the City should proceed with a request for proposals for both lots.

Mr. Weiner reminded the Commission the method the city uses to dispose of the properties is not for the Commission's consideration. He noted the Commission should consider whether or not the city should proceed with a request for proposals in for the disposition of each property.

Commissioner Cyr suggested the Commission provide an explanation stating the Commission's reason for making each recommendation.

Motion was made by Commissioner Ewings that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that Lot 93, west side of Aldbourne Drive remain as open space and not be submitted for request for proposals.

Commissioner Soares seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0.

Motion was made by Commissioner Dell'Aera that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council not seek request for proposals for disposition of property located at Lot 106, north side of Pleasant Street because it has potential use for the West End and other municipal purposes related to recommendations that are forth coming in the West End Neighborhood Planning Study.

Commissioner Ewings seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0.

Motion was made by Commissioner Dell'Aera that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council not seek request for proposals for disposition of the property located at Lot 314-4, east side of Morris Avenue because it has a future potential use for the adjacent school property and given its size it offers considerable potential for usage at a later date.

Commissioner Soares seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0.

Motion was made by Commissioner Keeton that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council seek request for proposals for the following properties:

- Lot 63 (formerly Lots 62 and 63), east side of Belmont Street
- Lot 207-1, south side of Brewster Road
- Lot 62-2, east side of Town Line Road
- Lot 62-4, east side of Town Line Road
- Lot 102, north side of Kilmartin Avenue
- Lot 106, north side of Kilmartin Avenue

Reasons for this recommendation are the properties were either better utilized by adjoining property owners or some other means than what the City planned on using the properties for.

Commissioner Ewings seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0.

VI. Old Business

1. Status report – 100 Oakridge Rd. (App. #316)

Mr. Weiner noted the Commission met with the developer of this project at the June meeting over concern with the lack of progress. He provided a brief summary of the reasons this item continued to be monitored by staff.

Mr. Beauchemin explained that a public works inspector conducted an inspection of the project earlier in the day and reported that work associated with topsoil, backfilling of the curbs, and grass seeding has not yet been completed. The city surveyor, Peter Forrest, indicated this work should have been completed by the end of September. He reported that Mr. Forrest was concerned the end of the growing season was fast approaching and as a result vegetation would be difficult to establish. He noted that Mr. Forrest suggested the developer should appear at the regular October meeting and provide the Commission with an update with regard to the status of the project.

The Commission agreed to request the developer of the subdivision to appear at their next meeting to discuss the status of the project.

VII. New Business

1. Request for extension of subdivision approval – Cold Springs Farm, Sec. 5, east side of Village St. (App. #274)

Mr. Weiner suggested the Commission consider taking item #2 under New Business and item #2 under Staff Reports out of order because they were related to this item.

The Commission agreed to take the following two items out of order:

1. Expiration of 5-year subdivision approval – Cold Springs Farm, Sec. 4 (App. #268) (Item #2 under New Business), and
2. Extension of conditional subdivision approvals beyond 5-year expiration date (Item #2 under Staff Reports).

The Commission acknowledged receipt of a letter dated September 15, 2009, from Industrial Builders & Realty Company, regarding the request to extend the subdivision on Application #274 and a copy of Subdivision State laws, Section 8-25 ("Subdivision of land"), CT General Statutes, revised to 1/1/09, Section 2.08, Bristol Subdivision Regulations, amended to 7/14/08, and Section 2.09, Bristol Subdivision Regulations, amended to 7/14/08.

Mr. Weiner read into the record the letter dated September 15, 2009, from Mr. Delfino.

Mr. Weiner explained the subdivision associated with Application #274 will expire at the end of December 2009 and Application #268 expired at the end of this past July. He noted the Commission's policy with regard to expiring subdivisions explaining that if a request for extension of an expiring subdivision was not received by the Commission, then the subject subdivision would be considered null and void. The city surveyor would subsequently file all necessary documents on the city land records.

Mr. Weiner explained the existing subdivision regulation pertaining to the initial five-year approval period, conditional approvals and final approvals. He noted Staff reviewed state statutes and there was a question on the extension of conditional subdivision approvals beyond the 5-year expiration because of Application #268. He noted Staff spoke with the developer, Bill Delfino, about posting a bond or whether to let the subdivision expire. The developer preferred not to post a bond which would have meant continuing to pay taxes on individual building lots. He was concerned about the current state of the economy and would rather let the subdivision expire. Mr. Weiner explained that Mr. Delfino did not request an extension and the only option that he had available to keep the subdivision active would require the posting of a bond. After reviewing the Section 8-25 of the Connecticut General Statutes pertaining to subdivisions, Mr. Weiner indicated that extension of conditional subdivision approvals was possible without the need to amend the Subdivision Regulations. The statute allowed the Commission to extend a conditional approval beyond the initial five years for an additional five year period. He further indicated the statutes allowed the Commission to grant extension of conditional approvals for shorter periods of time however the Subdivision Regulations would have to specifically state such a provision. He noted presently the city's Subdivision Regulations do not contain such a provision and to add one would require an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Weiner noted the Commission should determine whether consideration would be given for extending the conditional subdivision approval for Application #268 in light of the new information and the fact the subject subdivision expired in July. He acknowledged that city staff might not have provided the developer with the most accurate information and thus he did not have all of the facts available to him when he decided to allow the subdivision approval to lapse. He noted the developer has since spoke with Tom Denoto, Assessor, and acknowledged that he would have preferred keeping the subdivision active. Mr. Weiner noted that should the Commission be open to retroactively extending the subdivision's conditional approval beyond the initial five-year approval period the Commission could do so without an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations.

However, consideration of an extension period less than five years would require an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations. He indicated that staff would draft a Regulation proposal for the Commission's consideration and place the item on the agenda for the next regular meeting. He noted that adoption of such an amendment could be in place prior to the expiration of the subdivision associated with Application #274. Further, he indicated the Commission could retroactively consider Application #268 and grant such an extension for that subdivision.

The Commission suggested they would consider extending the conditional subdivision approval for Application #268 due to staff's current interpretation of the statutes. Some concern was raised about retroactive conditional approvals and the appearance that such an approval may carry; however the Commission commented they did not hold regular meetings in either July or August subsequent to the expiration of Application #268 and the developer was not aware of the options possibly available to him. It was the Commission's view the regulation should be amended to allow conditional approval extensions of periods less than five-years and the new regulation should contain the same time periods contained in the current Subdivision Regulations pertaining to conditional approvals.

After inquiries by the Commission, Mr. Weiner noted the Commission could approve an extension for Application #268 due to a misinterpretation of the regulations. He explained the extension could only be for a period of five years based on the current Subdivision Regulations and the authority granted to the Commission by state statute. He further noted the developer has not yet submitted any correspondence to the Commission with regard to the matter. He explained that staff could discuss the matter with Mr. Delfino and request that he send a letter to the Commission to be placed on the agenda of the Commission's next meeting. Lastly, he noted subdivisions were valid for a maximum of ten years.

Mr. Weiner explained that although the developer was given incorrect information; he chose not to post a bond for Application #268 and request an extension of the subdivision's conditional approval. He noted that staff will draft an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations for the October meeting. He noted that such an amendment could be effective by the Commission's December meeting, and prior to expiration of Application #274. He explained the process involving expired subdivisions which involved the city surveyor placing a document on the Land Records stating the subdivision was null and void. He noted that such a procedure has not yet occurred for the subdivision associated with Application #268. Lastly, with regard to the Commission's concerns about the possible implications associated with a retroactive approval, he explained the effects of a poor economy should be taken into consideration along with the fact the developer has not yet commenced any work on the subdivision. Also, the Commission should take under consideration the fact that staff provided incorrect information to the developer.

Motion was made by Commissioner Ewings that the Planning Commission continue the following items to the October 28, 2009, regular meeting of the Commission:

1. Request for extension of subdivision approval, Cold Springs Farm, Sec. 5, east side of Village Street (App. #274), and
2. Expiration of 5-year subdivision approval, Cold Springs Farm, Sec. 4 (App. #268).

Commissioner Keeton seconded the motion.

Motion carried 5-0.

After inquiries by Mr. Weiner, the Commission agreed to consider an amendment to the Subdivision Regulations which would allow the Commission to consider extensions of conditional approvals beyond the initial five year time period using the current schedule for conditional approvals that consists of a 24 month period followed by three, one year periods.

After inquiry by the Commission, Mr. Weiner noted that he would speak with Mr. Delfino on these matters.

2. Expiration of 5-year subdivision approval – Cold Springs Farm, Sec. 4 (App. #268)

This item was taken out of order under item #1, New Business.

VIII. Staff Reports

1. Monthly Subdivision Status Report

The Commission acknowledged receipt of the Monthly Subdivision Status Report dated September 23, 2009.

Mr. Beauchemin explained the following:

- Application #268: previously discussed.
- Application #300: a bond is in place, the City Council accepted the street in August, and there has been work completed.
- Application #316: previously discussed, the developer would be sent a letter to appear at the October meeting.
- Application #324: phase I work has been started. Phase II some work has been completed, the open space (14.6 acres) required correction and is not yet deeded to the City, which would be on the Commission's agenda next month.

2. Extension of conditional subdivision approvals beyond 5-year expiration date

This item was taken out of order under item #1, New Business.

3. West End Neighborhood Planning Study

The Commission acknowledged receipt of a memo dated September 24, 2009 with the first preliminary draft of the West End Neighborhood Planning Study, dated September 30, 2009.

Mr. Weiner explained the study has taken longer than anticipated to complete due to a series of draft revisions necessary to find a unified voice for the plan. Much work has been undertaken to include a thorough history of the area in the plan. He noted the plan belonged to the city and the Commission was the lead agency. As such, the Commission should review and comment on it with regard to the current draft. He explained the neighborhood's history was a vital component of the plan in order for people to understand how the neighborhood developed to produce the development pattern we see today. He explained the use of the "Great Neighborhoods" concept in the draft plan noting it was a concept that has taken hold in neighborhood planning efforts throughout the United States. He noted there are many other cities throughout the country that contain areas such as the West End that are important to those communities and possess similar challenges.

The Commission commented the report was rather technical and should contain more highlighted sections that personified the neighborhood and that added a sense of character to the document. Such additions could be in the form of anecdotal information about the neighborhood or quotes attributed to people who live there. The study should also be more specific about where the neighborhood is located within the city and address the issue of signage identifying the area. Reference was made to Forestville and the Parkville section of Hartford as templates for places that are readily identifiable when within their limits and that provide people with a sense of place. The study should contain more about what the area should be and could be in the future and should adequately address the issue of safety in the neighborhood. The issue of safety was viewed as vitally important to the neighborhood's resurgence and should be promoted in the plan.

Commissioner Keeton commented the plan should contain more material that could be attributed to the residents of the neighborhood. She felt the plan should contain information that gives people a sense about what could happen in the neighborhood and the process to make such changes happen. Also, she suggested placing the vision statement at the beginning of the plan and then proceeding to the neighborhood's history and how the area became developed. She felt that it was important to place the vision at the beginning of the document to learn what the neighborhood's intentions are going forward. She also expressed the view that the plan should help to understand the past and present and have a vision or message toward the future.

With regard to the vision statement, there was concern that it did not effectively encapsulate the purpose as described in the text of the document. There was also concern expressed among Commission members that the vision statement was written in a style that was more retrospective rather than prospective. Also, the inclusion of an executive summary was suggested to accomplish the purpose of an introduction without interrupting the flow of the document.

Commissioner Ewings noted that he attended all of the Advisory Committee meetings and indicated the vision statement accurately represented the discussion that took place when the statement was being created. He also added that placing the vision statement in the beginning of the documents may give the inaccurate perception of describing the past.

Mr. Weiner commented that prior drafts contained quotations from neighborhood residents about the West End that were collected by the consultant. He noted that such quotes would fit very well in the plan and that staff will follow-up and include them in the next draft. He noted that a shortcoming of the West End was the lack of identifying signage that informed people when they have arrived in the neighborhood. He indicated the matter of signage will be addressed in the plan with a recommendation about way-finding signage and street banners. He further noted that with regard to the identifying the neighborhood, the final plan will contain maps and drawings that outline the exact location of the neighborhood in its context within the city. He explained the current draft does not contain any drawings or maps only text for simplicity purposes.

After inquiry by the Commission, Mr. Weiner noted the vision statement contains the voice of the people that attended the Advisory Committee meetings. He noted the draft plan is a product of many meetings with this group which was comprised of residents and other stakeholders from the neighborhood. He explained the Committee developed the vision statement for the purpose of communicating how the Advisory Committee envisioned the neighborhood ten or twenty years into the future. He further noted that if the message contained in the vision statement was not effectively conveying this message then perhaps the statement could be revised by changing its tense so that readers of the document understand the neighborhood's vision for the future. He explained that some of the best things about the neighborhood that made it great were elements from the past that should be brought back and made part of its future. He also cautioned about making extensive changes to the vision statement because it was created by people from the neighborhood not the Commission. With regard to the number of

recommendations, he pointed out they were of various sizes but they were all necessary to address the opportunities, concerns, and weaknesses in the neighborhood all with the goal of improving the West End. He expressed the position the section on history is very important and placed the rest of the study in context and should be at the beginning of the document. He had concern about placing the vision statement at the very beginning of the document but will consider such a rearrangement of the plan. Lastly, he indicated that only one bus serviced the neighborhood and it stopped at Gaylord Towers. Changes to bus service could not be implemented by the city, but possibly by the bus-company.

Mr. Weiner noted that he would provide the Commission with another draft that contains visuals such as photographs, maps, and tables. Staff could also possibly rearrange the manner in which the study is presented and review the introduction of the document. Also, after the Commission is comfortable with the draft, an Advisory Committee meeting will be held to review the plan before returning to the Commission again to review and finalize the document.

4. Possible Amendment to 2000 Plan of Conservation and Development – reclassification of a portion of Ronzo Rd. (Chapter 6 – Transportation)

Mr. Weiner mentioned there will be a future memo from the Board of Public Works with regard to abandonment of a portion of Ronzo Road. He noted the Commission will need to amend the Plan of Conservation and Development as a result of the abandonment.

5. Discussion of Connecticut Supreme Court decision re sidewalk installation in subdivisions on existing streets (Buttermilk Farms LLC v. Plymouth Planning & Zoning Commission)

Mr. Weiner mentioned that at the Commission's June meeting a memo was distributed regarding this subject. He recommended the Commission consider amending the Subdivision Regulations to address the court decision.

IX. Communications

1. The Commission acknowledged receipt of a memo dated July 15, 2009, from Therese Pac, Town and City Clerk, notifying the Board of the City Council's re-appointment of William Veits as a regular member of the Commission.
2. The Commission acknowledged receipt of the following item: a copy of an City Council Ordinance, dated August 11, 2009, effective date August 28, 2009, regarding Boards, Commissions and Committees to review service and permit fees.

Mr. Weiner explained the City Council recently adopted a new city ordinance that requires all city boards and commissions that charge fees conduct a review of such at least once every three years. He explained the Commission will be required to conduct a review of its fees in 2012 and then send a report of its findings to the Mayor and City Council.

Motion was made by Commissioner Ewings to adjourn.

Motion seconded by Commissioner Soares.

Motion carried 5-0.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

These minutes represent the proceedings of the meeting.

This meeting was taped.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy King

Marie Keeton
Secretary
City Planning Commission