

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

## MINUTES OF THE November 20, 2014 Meeting of the Easton Planning & Zoning Commission

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

Members Present: Dick Tettelbaum, Chairman, and members, Debbie Renshaw, Don Hilderbrandt, and Terry Dell.

Members Absent: John Atwood.

Staff Present: Lynn Thomas, Town Planner and Stacie Rice, Planning Secretary.

Mr. Tettelbaum called the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission to order at 1:00 p.m.

The first item on the agenda was **346 N. Aurora Street** requesting a parking waiver. Bill Stagg with Lane Engineering and Emily Chandler with Piazza Italian Market were present at the meeting. Mr. Stagg explained he is requesting a Parking Determination/Waiver/Deferral for 346 North Aurora Street. The subject property is located near the southeast corner of the intersection of North Aurora Street and North Washington Street. It has been used for a number of enterprises over the years, most recently as Chessie Sales, a restaurant equipment sales establishment. The space is currently vacant. The contract purchaser/applicant (Haskins Cove Holding, LLC), is proposing an adaptive reuse of the building. The applicant would like to use the front half of the building (3400 sq. ft.) as a commercial kitchen for catering. In addition, they would like to hold cooking school demonstration events, perhaps including wine tasting events as well. The "back half" of the building would primarily be used for storage in support of the activities occurring in the front half, and longer term might also be used for event space, but in no case would the two halves be used simultaneously

Mr. Stagg is requesting that the Planning Commission determine that due to the uncertainty of how the mixed use and after normal business hour function interplay will occur, and based on the applicants reasonable assertion that parking demand will be limited (minimal) during normal business hours; the applicant request that the Planning Commission determine that the current improved parking spaces (18 ±) are initially adequate for the land uses herein and that any additional parking space improvements are deferred until parking demand increases and/or impacts adjoining properties or streets.

Mr. Zachary Smith, with Armistead, Griswold, Lee & Rust explained he is before the Commission on behalf of the adjacent property owner (Lot 1). He stated that his client does have concerns with the shared parking and that while they are not opposed to the proposed use of the property, they do not want to see anything approved or agreed to which would negatively impact their parking rights or the amount of parking allocated for their use.

Upon motion of Ms. Renshaw, seconded by Mr. Hilderbrandt the Commission voted 4-0 to approve the application as submitted with the understanding that the subject property will have a dual use (half for assembly area for future events and half for catering) 3 full time employees on site. This equates to a parking requirement of 18 spaces, which is what is provided at the present time and therefore, at present, no waiver is required.

The next items discussed was from staff regarding **Zoning Ordinance Updates**. Mr. Thomas explained that earlier this year he worked with Mr. Tettelbaum to produce a list of

51  
52  
53

1 the relatively few significant issues that need to be discussed/addressed in the Ordinance  
2 Update. In fact the list consisted of six such issues, and we have completed the first  
3 (reclassifying I-1 zoned land as either BC or I).  
4

5 Mr. Thomas explained that in light of the recent proceedings concerning the Brant  
6 Court PUD, he has heard a number of comments concerning the need to make revisions to  
7 the PUD provisions. At least one elected official would like to eliminate them completely.  
8 Mr. Tettelbaum raised the issue a few months ago as to whether or not the Zoning  
9 Ordinance in general, and the PUD specifically, is producing/enabling the type of  
10 development we want to see as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan. While this issue  
11 was not specifically identified as one of the six on the aforementioned list, it is part and  
12 parcel of two, if not three, of the issues that are on the list. The Commission discussed at  
13 length the issue of the PUD and its future role in Easton. The consensus seemed to be that  
14 while the concept seemed good, there ought to be a way to improve it from a procedural  
15 perspective. The Commission expressed concern that their role was insignificant if  
16 relegated to making a determination that the PUD is consistent with the Comprehensive  
17 Plan as is now the case. There was also a concern that the time of all parties involved in the  
18 process can be wasted if the Planning Commission and staff spend time and energy  
19 reviewing a proposal that ultimately the Town Council either does not like at all and denies,  
20 or changes so significantly that it sent back to the Planning Commission for repeated  
21 iterations of the process. Mr. Thomas stated he thought that the Commission had given him  
22 sufficient input for him to look into whether any other jurisdictions review PUD's in a  
23 manner closer to what they have described and he will be back with something at the next  
24 meeting.  
25

26 There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m. by motion  
27 of Mr. Dell seconded by Mr. Hilderbrandt,  
28

29  
30 Respectfully submitted,  
31

32  
33  
34 Stacie S. Rice  
35 Planning Secretary  
36  
37