



TOWN OF WARRENTON

POST OFFICE DRAWER 341
WARRENTON, VIRGINIA 20188-0341
<http://ci.warrenton.va.us>
TELEPHONE (540) 347-1101
FAX (540) 349-2414
TDD 1-800-828-1120

**MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
TOWN OF WARRENTON
February 18, 2014
7:00 PM**

The regular meeting of the Town of Warrenton Planning Commission convened on Wednesday, February 18, 2014 at 7:00 PM in the Municipal Building.

The following members were present: Ms. Elizabeth Scullin, Chairman, Mr. Ali Zarabi, Mr. Lowell Nevill, Ms. Susan Rae Helander, Dr. John Harre, Mr. John Kip, and Ms. Brandie Schaeffer. Mr. Yakir Lubowsky, Town Council Ex-Officio member was present. Ms. Sarah Sitterle, Director of Planning and Community Development, attended the meeting as Staff support.

Chairman Scullin called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM and a quorum was determined. Chairman Scullin stated election of officers was to take place.

Ms. Sitterle asked for nomination from the Board for someone to serve as Chair. Dr. Harre nominated Ms. Scullin, Mr. Kip seconded it, and the vote was unanimous.

Ms. Scullin asked for nomination from the Board for Vice-Chair. Ms. Scullin nominated Dr. Harre, Mr. Kip seconded the motion, and it was unanimous.

Approval of Minutes

Chairman Scullin called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the December 18, 2013 meeting. Mr. John Kip made a motion for the minutes to be approved and it was seconded by Mr. Nevill. The minutes were approved unanimously.

Public Hearings

A. Special Use Permit #13-06 – Automotive Sales at 50 Sullivan Street

Ms. Sitterle stated this was a request for a Special Use Permit in accordance with Article 3-4.10.3 and Article 11-3.10.3 of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant was requesting a Special Use Permit to allow Automotive Sales in the Commercial District at 50 Sullivan Street. The subject property currently houses an 11,948 square foot two-story commercial building and no

construction was planned, as the applicant will utilize Suite E of the existing building. Suite E is approximately 1,898 square feet. Ms. Sitterle stated approximately 1,284 square feet of the space will serve as a display/enclosed sales area. The property is bordered by commercially zoned properties on the north, west and south. Properties to the east across Sullivan Street are zoned Residential Office (RO). The parcels zoned RO are all used for office purposes.

Ms. Sitterle noted that the business would be primarily conducted on line with a few walk in customers. No Vehicles would be stored or displayed for sale outside. The hours of operation proposed will be 9 am to 3 p.m. Monday through Friday and 9 am to 2 pm on Saturday. No noise impact is anticipated due to the indoor display and sales area for vehicles. Two employees would be located on site to operate the business.

Staff mentioned that the existing building on site currently has tenants using the upper floor for professional offices. The lower level accessible from the south side of the property consists of service and retail uses. There is a commercial entrance from Sullivan Street that would be used to access the business. A site development plan for the commercial building was approved in January 2006 prior to the 2006 Zoning Ordinance update. Because of that the 1991 Zoning Ordinance used to determine the required off street parking spaces for office use and there is a discrepancy between the current code and 1991 Code for spaces and because of that this current use will have to meet those required spaces.

Ms. Sitterle noted that per Article 7-6, one space per five hundred square feet enclosed sales area, plus three (3) spaces per service bay, plus one space per employee, and one space per twenty-five hundred square feet of open sales area would be required. This would equal to five spaces for customer and employee parking. There would be five parking spaces available for the use, as two exist in front of the unit including one handicap space and eleven additional spaces are divided among the lower level tenant areas. The applicant has indicated that more than five spaces have been assigned to them for use.

Staff stated that there were no immediate residential uses that would require the property to have additional landscape screening per Article 8 of the Zoning Ordinance. The existing landscaping plan will be evaluated when the site plan amendment is submitted for use. It currently includes perimeter landscaping and street trees. In addition, the existing landscaping would be counted toward any Ordinance requirements and may not need to be supplemented.

Ms. Sitterle noted that there was no additional proposed lighting for the new use. The current site lighting should be appropriate.

Staff had reviewed the application, found that the use would be permissible with approval through the Special Use Permit process in the Commercial District, and noted that it appeared to meet all code requirements of the Town of Warrenton. The proposed vehicle sales use with indoor display and sales did not appear to have an impact on the surrounding tenants or businesses. The long-term consideration of this special use should take into account that future vehicle sales use for the property would need to be restricted to avoid an impact on off-street parking.

Staff recommended approval with the following conditions.

1. A site development plan amendment for the special use is submitted for review and approval by the Director of Public Works and Utilities and the Planning Director.
2. The vehicles sales use is limited to indoor display and sales only. No outside display and sales will be permitted as off-street parking requirements per the Zoning Ordinance must be met for the building and tenant spaces.

Mr. Ali Zarabi stated he was not clear as to what long term consideration for special use for future use and asked Ms. Sitterle to explain.

Ms. Sitterle stated normally the impact for auto sales is off street parking and that would not be appropriate and what staff is suggesting is that in determining this for long term and perhaps even for the current user that this is restricted to indoor.

Ms. Scullin stated that that was not identified as a condition in the staff report

Ms. Sitterle stated that it is outlined as a recommendation that it be limited to indoor display and sales.

Mr. Nevill asked if the zoning for this type of parcel restrict types of parking.

Ms. Sitterle stated that it limits outdoor storage, which includes vehicles.

Mr. Nevill asked if any outdoor storage of inventory of auto sales would be considered in violation of this zoning.

Ms. Sitterle stated that is not necessarily the case depending on turnover of vehicles and she would need to look into it for a determination but it is different from a storage lot.

Mr. Nevill asked for a definition of storage and how long does vehicle have to be parked before being moved.

Ms. Sitterle stated it was more than one week.

Mr. Nevill stated that due to the nature of auto sales one week for turnover was not realistic.

Ms. Scullin stated that the nature of this business is that no one will be coming to buy a car unless it had already been ordered.

Public Hearing Opened 7:10

Mr. Mike Wells, 74 Broadview Avenue, Warrenton, Virginia. Mr. Wells indicated he had enough turnover and outside storage will not be an issue and for the past three years there had not been any walk in traffic because the internet has taken over and buying vehicles has gone on line. Mr. Wells indicated he was confident he would not need to have any vehicles outside.

Mr. Kip asked Mr. Wells if the Sullivan Street was a second location.

Mr. Wells indicated he was relocating to Sullivan Street and that would be the main location.

Mr. Kip stated that Mr. Wells current location has a lot of outside storage but had indicated he did not need it because of online sales, but in this location the amount of space available is much less.

Mr. Wells indicated he currently has six vehicles in stock and he never keeps more than ten, and he has off site area where they work on the cars.

Mr. Ali Zarabi asked why he needed two locations.

Mr. Wells indicated the off site location was a repair facility located off Fifth Street.

Mr. Wells stated that Department of Motor Vehicles required an on-site facility in order to be able to get a DMV Automotive Sales Permit.

Mr. Nevill asked how the vehicles would be transported from the off site location.

Mr. Wells indicated it depended on the weather but most times the vehicles would be driven.

Public Hearing Closed at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Nevill requested the Commission consider a sunset clause.

Ms. Scullin asked if the SUP went with the land since Mr. Wells was renting.

Ms. Sitterle indicated the approval went with the whole parcel.

Mr. Nevill stated that in addition to staff recommendations, he would recommend a 5-year sunset clause.

Ms. Scullin informed Mr. Wells that if the Commission approved this SUP that at the end of five (5) years; he would have to reapply for renewal if the business was still there at the same location. She indicated this was being done so if he moved out and someone else moved in they would not be able to take advantage of the SUP.

Mr. Wells asked what would occur if he were still in the same location after 5 years.

Ms. Scullin stated he would have to apply for a SUP renewal or come before the Commission and then it will be extended.

Mr. Nevill made motion to approve the staff recommendations with the condition to include a 5-year sunset clause. Mr. Kip seconded the motion and the vote was unanimous with 7 in favor and none against.

B. 2015-2020 Capital Improvement Program (DRAFT) - Six year program of public improvements to coordinate infrastructure, available financial resources and the Warrenton Comprehensive Plan. This is the draft listing of projects for the new program

Ms. Sitterle stated the Draft Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for the Fiscal Years 2015-2020 represented a significant investment in Town infrastructure. The Draft contained fifty-nine (59) projects that were scheduled for six or more years. These included utility replacements or improvements, road maintenance, recreational development, storm water facilities, vehicle replacement (police, utility and public works) and other projects to maintain or expand the Town public facilities. The total for these projects would be \$16,317,340 for the six-year term and funded from a number of financial accounts. This program represented a 6.3% decrease in project funding from last year.

The first year of the program would be the implementation year that will be adopted as part of the annual Town Budget (FY 2015). There are eighteen (18) projects proposed for the 2015 fiscal year compared with sixteen (16) last year. These total \$1,259,313, which represents a decrease of 3.3%. Some of the projects were a completion of prior year improvements that due to their scope or amount required more than one year to execute, such as the water treatment plant improvements. Others are continuing projects such as the VDOT Urban Funds Program (annual local share). Also included are remediation projects like the sanitary sewer rehab/replacements and drainage projects.

Mr. Edward “Bo” Tucker provided an overview:

Utilities

This would include the replacement of the original equipment at the Water Treatment Plant. Taylor Middle School has force main maintenance proposed because it was discovered that the lines were not sufficient and the lines were upgraded along with the pumps.

Public Works

The Urban Program basically consisted of the Broadview Avenue improvements project. VDOT has selected a design firm and will be giving authorization for them to start in the months ahead. Our match for construction is 2% (\$30,000) over a two-year period.

The PW Department Alarm needs replacement.

MS-4 – Municipal Small Sewer System – The Town will be under these rules shortly and will have to implement a program within the next five years.

Boundary Lane – This was the only gravel road in Town and residents wanted it paved. Revenue sharing with VDOT will be 50/50.

The cost of the Broadview Avenue improvements project for design work is estimated to be at \$3 million.

Ms. Scullin asked Mr. Tucker to explain the \$281,000 as fifty percent to cost sharing.

Mr. Tucker stated that \$281,000 was the full price and fifty percent would be half of that. Mr. Tucker stated that on the revenue side it showed \$140,000 coming from VDOT. Mr. Tucker stated that in the past, the budget would show what was needed but now accounting wanted to reflect what funds would be coming in.

Mr. Nevill pointed out that on the first line the VDOT Urban Fund was \$30,000 and it was indicated that was 2%.

Mr. Tucker indicated that was 2% of \$3 million spread over a two-year period.

Mr. Nevill asked why it was shown differently.

Mr. Tucker indicated the VDOT estimate for Broadview Avenue was \$3 million, there was only \$1.5 million in the Urban Program, and Council will have to decide how to proceed unless some other funds became available from the State.

Mr. Nevill stated that part of the process for the Town to get the monies from the State is to validate the money through this process.

Mr. Tucker stated that was correct and indicated that if the Urban Project became fully funded that project would disappear and it would be funded through the 2% percent funds as opposed to the 50% funds.

Mr. Nevill stated that the State would not provide funds until the Town showed its commitment to pay and this demonstrated that commitment.

Mr. Tucker stated that the Town has been doing urban projects for approximately 10 to 15 years. For the past three years there have not been any funds allocated to that program because of the economy.

Police Department

The Department is proposing replacement of two vehicles.

Planning & Development Office

The Department is proposing a replacement of the large format printer.

Ms. Scullin stated that last year the Depot Park, Phase I was identified to be funded at around \$100,000 and asked what had happened to the project.

Mr. Tucker indicated that \$183,000 was approved last year for that project. He indicated that a Recreation Committee meeting will be taking place soon and the funds were still available. Phase One would include landscaping, a playground, terrace, and railroad modifications. Phase

Two would include bathrooms.

Ms. Scullin asked how the cost of \$183,000 was determined.

Mr. Tucker indicated that the estimate was made based on the two conceptual plans.

Mr. Kip indicated he could not find any mention about the Timberfence Trail, that runners/walkers wanted to go in around the high school to the WARF.

Mr. Tucker stated that last year the Council allocated some money for different alternative routes to be considered to get to the WARF.

Ms. Scullin asked if there was money available to actually build a trail.

Mr. Tucker stated there were no funds at this point. Cost sharing between the Town, the County and the School Board has to be determined. Grant Money would be sought and a Memorandum of Agreement would have to be developed and many other details that were yet to be determined and finalized.

Mr. Tucker indicated this project could be put in subsequent years and that Council can make allocations similarly to what was done last year. Mr. Tucker indicated that Council allocated \$15,000 the previous year.

Mr. Lubowsky asked if there were other trails planned.

Mr. Tucker indicated no big ones had been included.

Mr. Nevill stated there were sidewalks that exist from Lee Highway, Broadview Avenue and Shirley Avenue where some property owners have them and others do not, and he asked if the Town had the easement and would be able to fill in the gaps.

Mr. Tucker indicated that the Town does have the easement from Blackwell Road to Culpeper Street and from Walmart to Old Town, Menlough to Old Town, Giant to Old Town, and Winchester Street to Old Town that have been completed.

Ms Scullin asked if any of the gaps could be covered by VDOT.

Mr. Tucker indicated that the work was done by a Federal grant.

Mr. Nevill stated that wherever the Town has the most pedestrian traffic that was where sidewalks should be located. He asked if that included painting and lines and to have the business owners bring their parking up to sight distance.

Mr. Tucker stated the sidewalk on Broadview is fifteen (15) feet from the curb.

Mr. Nevill asked about the signage especially for walkers coming from the high school and going to the Carousel.

Mr. Tucker stated that is maintenance and is continuously re-marked.

Ms. Scullin asked if the Town has to pay for a portion of the trail extension.

Mr. Tucker indicated Town has not been approached.

Mr. Lubowsky indicated several years ago Council discussed interconnections and by-ways and noted that we are not progressing enough, and obviously it is not coming from the man on the second floor because he does not like trails, and asked if the Recreation Committee needed to make this happen, because it is not identified on the CIP.

Mr. Tucker indicated the Recreation Committee would be the place to start but there are some things that have been done and perhaps there needs to be a prioritization of events. Two priority projects are on the outskirts of town. When you talk about the inside of the Broadview Avenue bypass, citizens are vocal relating to cut through in a neighborhood to get somewhere. Mr. Tucker indicated the only place for a possible cut through would be at the end of Old Alexandria Pike, where people could go from Walker Drive to Blackwell Road but that berm and row of trees were put there for a reason, because of the residents.

Mr. Lubowsky indicated no one is riding shotgun to implement the plan that had been approved by Town Council and we are not getting leadership.

Mr. Tucker stated he thinks one of the hardest ones was identified as the first and perhaps there is an easier one to begin with and think Recreation Committee is the place to start. If you get from Oak Springs to downtown Warrenton by sidewalk and get from downtown Warrenton to Walmart and that has been the focus for the past 15 years is to get those residents to downtown by sidewalk.

Mr. Nevill stated there was another angle, that is the issue of the people that have to walk to businesses, their offices that do not have cars, and we need to manage this foot traffic the same way we manage vehicle traffic. Mr. Nevill asked if there had been a study done similar to traffic studies, where someone sits and watches in areas such as Blackwell Road and Lee Highway, Winchester Street and Lee Highway, and there should be concentration on the heavy pedestrian traffic and accidents.

Ms. Brandie Schaeffer indicated there was a new Federal guideline called the Complete Streets Program that has been adopted by over 500 major and small cities. The guideline outlines principals that are practiced each time that a new road, road improvements or paving was being evaluated. The concept identified that all modes of traffic were to be considered. The City of Manassas just recently conducted a pedestrian traffic study and made changes by putting the car second and the pedestrian first. Perhaps there would be a section of Town that could be designated as a preference for a Complete Street Study as we move forward.

Mr. Nevill stated that it all comes back in that we have the Recreational interconnectivity that is envisioned in the plan and the infrastructure identified needs to be done and is obvious but this is something that also needs to be done. We are dealing with outdated infrastructure with

1950/1960 layout of Broadview and every chance we have to improve the layout we need to dedicate the funds to make it happen, that includes landscaping, signage, etc.

Ms Susan Helander asked if there is anything identified in CIP for landscaping. When was the last tree planting done?

Mr. Tucker responded and noted that the Tree Board had done a large planting of trees near the sewer plant for Arbor Day a few years prior. He added that whenever there are extra trees to be had from the Virginia Department of Forestry; those are planted at various points in Town.

Mr. Nevill indicated that he considers traffic calming measures as landscaping such as narrowing lanes as part of the crosswalks that are long term systematic infrastructure and some of this would occur through the VDOT Broadview project.

Mr. Tucker indicated that the VDOT Broadview project would be all-inclusive and bring everything up to standards.

Ms. Scullin suggested that more pedestrian activities be looked at which was discussed at length last year and that is how the Timberfence Parkway became part of the CIP. She added that apparently nothing has been done, so the Commission needed to recommend that the Parks & Recreation Committee look at the report that was done and accepted and adopted and recommend one of those trails or put in money for the Timberfence Parkway trail.

Mr. Yakir Lubowsky asked Ms. Sitterle if the CIP had to go to Council or if it could stay here for one more meeting.

Mr. Tucker indicated CIP does not go to Council but that it was part of the budget that would be moving forward. The public hearing for the CIP will occur in April or May.

Mr. Lubowsky stated there are many good, sound ideas for the trails and recommended the panel go forward and state there were specific things in the plan that needed to go forward. The plan needed to address what young folks want because they are much more creative, have businesses here and are very interesting and they enjoy their bicycles and are not buying cars. As a Council member, he would like to see the Planning Commission spend time on the CIP and make very specific recommendations to the political branch outlining what needed to be done this year, next year and future years to implement in some coherent fashion what this community will be like. He stated that the newest member of the Planning Commission has a true awareness of innovative practices, knows how to get things done, and is a part of that generation that we need to listen to. He encouraged the Planning Commission to hold the CIP and not rubber-stamp it.

Mr. Nevill indicated that line items were needed that accomplished the vision of the plan and the Commission did not have to agree with the vocal minority issue. He noted that resulted in parks that are not connected, and one in particular was getting access to the WARF. Mr. Nevill indicated that recreation is great but he still looks at public safety as necessary and recreational trails were not as critical as public safety.

Ms. Scullin asked if at the next meeting if Ms. Sitterle, Mr. Tucker and Margaret Rice could get

together and bring something from the plan that has been adopted by looking at priorities and seeing what was affordable, or at least put money in for the Timberfence Trail. She added that as it was now, nothing will be done in the next year and if an alternative was chosen, there should at least be money for something to be done. She also noted that Mr. Tucker had identified some easier projects to do and perhaps those could be done as well.

The Public Hearing was opened at 8:05 PM.

There were no comments.

The Public Hearing was closed at 8:06 PM.

Mr. Lubowsky stated that perhaps public hearing should remain opened if in fact the CIP will remain for the next meeting and advocated that the Planning Commission take another look at this before it went forward to the Town Council.

Ms. Sitterle stated the CIP was made part of the budget review process that occurs in May.

Ms. Scullin asked if it would be possible for the Commission to have a work session in April and have another public hearing following the work session.

Ms. Brandie Schaeffer asked if there had been any consideration of having a justification/priority code, such as mandated, nice to have, etc. identified in the CIP for projects not yet funded.

Ms. Scullin indicated that would help set priorities with criteria.

Mr. Nevill indicated the CIP is at the five year mark and in the update an assessment module just described by Brandie should be included so that when the Commission is looking at the CIP we can grade its implementation effectiveness based on the vision of the CIP and elements that will be used to do the grading, such as public safety, and increased efficiency that would be easy to identify.

Mr. Nevill asked if it was necessary to bring in a consultant to do a full assessment of pedestrian walkways.

Ms. Scullin indicated that the Town already has such a study.

Mr. Nevill asked if it could be used as a tool for the next session and he suggested that annual crime reports for police and fire be included in the next work session.

Mr. Tucker indicated Warrenton Traffic Safety Committee (WTSC) meetings address the police and fire issues and their reports would be available.

Mr. Lubowsky indicated the WTSC committee is good but it does not focus on looking forward.

Mr. Nevill indicated basic summaries from the WTSC committee reflecting crash reports, and other incidents involving pedestrians could be used to evaluate usage.

Mr. Lubowsky praised the Public Works & Public Utilities Department of the Town of Warrenton and was very grateful for Mr. Nyhous having been on the Council. He added that during the analysis of revenue sources for the Town, it was enlightening and took his hat off to those that manage business where the Town was not in debt and was able to contemplate new projects; however, there are some disconnects in the community. He noted that it was our task to go to those people and let them know where money was being spent but as was occurring with Winchester Street issues, it was frustrating to spend so much time and effort on those projects and not have all the information in order to make decisions. He added that the Commission sometimes contradicted itself and then the Town Attorney had to get involved.

Mr. Nevill asked about getting a summary of the Warrenton Traffic Safety Commission reports.

Mr. Tucker stated that pedestrian accidents were perhaps one within five years.

Mr. Nevill indicated that someone in the Police Department that has been working here for 20 years that can identify the worst intersection, the worst pedestrian walkway, signage consistency and branding should be involved in the upcoming work session.

Mr. Nevill stated that staff analysis for the CIP should include the following: Branding, Connectivity, Walkability, and Complete Streets

Ms. Scullin indicated VDOT has recently published an Urban Street Standards.

Mr. Tucker stated the Town was required to adhere to VDOT standards with VDOT projects such as Broadview Avenue and include pedestrian and bicycle facilities. If the facilities are not feasible, an explanation is required for why they are not able to be provided.

Mr. Nevill indicated that it was worth spending the money on because it would save money in the long run. He added that it was worth spending money on because we are projected to reach capacity.

Mr. Tucker added that a lot has been asked for and that would be appropriate for a future CIP. To rework the CIP at this time would be a challenge.

Ms. Scullin indicated that it would be for a future CIP.

Mr. Nevill indicated that it was not being asked for now. Mr. Nevill stated that what the Commission was requesting was for staff to develop a couple of tools/resources that can be used to propose to Council that money would be set aside to achieve what was perceived as being a gap. He added that it came back to connectivity and the complete streets issue.

Ms. Scullin stated that next year instead of the CIP being presented to the Commission, that staff provide to the Commission what was mandated and necessary. She noted that then it could be seen what money was available for the Commission to be proactive with for other priorities.

Mr. Lubowsky had a suggestion that however it had to be adapted/adopted by action of the

Council itself that we operate the way the County does. The way the County operates is that the CIP comes from the Planning Commission not by staff. He stated that it needed to be made clear that at the County, the CIP comes out of the Planning Commission and as result whatever the Supervisor's voted on or has hearings on, it was the Planning Commission's CIP, not staff's. For example, the Timberfence guidance was clear and there was considerable discussion here about it and there were priorities it was identified as a priority and it went nowhere with Council. Mr. Lubowsky indicated if he had not been there and alerted his colleagues that it was from the Planning Commission they would not have had a clue because the one that he sends to Council is his with maybe some notations about what the Planning Commission wanted. Mr. Lubowsky indicated that it was not right and that this group needed to take a hard look at this and be Planners. He added that it was their CIP that should go to Council not staff's. He added that then the conversation would shift to what this group did and what this group was proposing. He noted that at the moment, Council was pretty much ignoring the Commission.

Ms. Susan Helander indicated that in looking at the future it would be easier if the Commission started a system of grading or what line items were required and that would give the Commission more flexibility.

Ms. Scullin indicated that the Commission could start in September and Mr. Tucker can compare his listing first so it was known what was being dealt with, because the Commission would not question the needs of Public Works and the Commission could then determine how the Parks and Recreation money would be prioritized.

Mr. Nevill indicated it was a percentage issue. Approximately 90 percent of the total budget was maintenance costs, that should be a part of the plan as well, and this was more the political side in conjunction with the fiscal policy, tax rates, etc. He added that the Commission wanted to have the annual budget include at least X percentage dedicated to community development and implementing the CIP over the long term, that we would stay lean, but dedicate 10% toward community development.

Mr. Lubowsky indicated that we would stay lean, but it would be a great value to the community to enable to do the things that cry out to be done.

Mr. Nevill indicated it was done for the WARF and it was very project oriented.

Mr. Lubowsky indicated that he was not there to state things should be sent to Council to raise taxes. He added that to the extent there is a municipal religion in Warrenton is do not spend money. He said this plan and where the money goes is a roadmap of what the community is and where it is going. He noted that they were beating the life out of the infrastructure and doing a great job and it is known who the heroes are. He added that it was a shame if we are expecting staff to use the old Ford garbage truck and add another 3,000 miles, and that we are asking way too much. He indicated that his friend, Chris Granger at the County, has been pushing with their Comprehensive Plan that it should have a strategic plan similar to what neighboring communities have done, and in the end, a strategic plan would simplify the Comp Plan. Mr. Lubowsky noted that it was already known what the priorities are and where the community wants to go, and what matters. He indicated that now the action plan would be reconciled with that and citizens and constituents and citizen groups should be involved, and have a transparent process.

Ms. Scullin stated that it appears the Comprehensive Plan needed to be updated or at least started this year.

Mr. Nevill indicated that a worksession was needed to modify the CIP review process moving forward so there was an opportunity to work on it during more than one worksession. He suggested it be incorporated into the mandatory five-year Comprehensive Plan update and have a standard operating procedure on how business is done.

Mr. Lubowsky stated that the Comp Plan would be reviewed by the Commission for a while and there would be multiple opportunities for citizen input and advertising. When it comes to Council and can say that it looks about right because it has been massaged considerably by the community and filtered through appointed people that bring their experience and talents and are extremely adept and this group can do a lot and wants to do a lot.

Mr. Nevill asked for time to be allocated on the meeting agendas for reviewing relevant Commission and committee reports, and if it was a quarterly meeting for the WTSC that could be incorporated as well. If the WTSC just met last week, then it would be a standard agenda item. He suggested that the Commission would have a staff report on that meeting the next time they met.

Mr. Nevill suggested having an agenda (calendar time line) for the year and identified by month those that are invited to attend and list of inputs for each meeting.

Ms. Schaeffer asked if it would be possible to automate reports and minutes and post the Commissioner's packet to the Town website.

Ms. Sitterle asked for clarification for next month to confirm that the worksession for the CIP will be held in March and the following month would be a continuation of the public hearing in April. She added that worksessions were not advertized.

Ms. Scullin confirmed that was the case.

Ms. Sitterle indicated that a request for a 30-day deferral for the telecommunication facility was received and if the Commission accepted it, they would continue. She indicated there might be a change coming forward but nothing had been submitted.

The Commission voted to approve the deferral, with all voting in favor and none against.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.

Minutes taken by Evelyn Weimer, Town Clerk and transcribed by Dee Highnote