





Chairman Finaldi said despite them receiving a draft resolution only four of the members present this evening are eligible to vote, so they might want to postpone the vote until there are five eligible members present. Mr. Manuel said he has listened to the tapes from both meetings and reviewed the file. Mrs. Emminger asked that they discuss the draft resolution so she can be sure it is satisfactory to all of the members.

Mr. Manuel said he has visited site and examined the area. He added that he lives on this road, and is prepared to vote to approve it with some additional conditions: (1) if they add a double line of trees to totally screen it from the road; (2) if they agree to have a re-forestation or re-planting clause in the plan for whatever plantings they have to remove during the construction process, (3) if the tank is vandalized and graffiti appears, they agree to correct it immediately, and (4) the screening and landscaping is to be subject to final approval of Planning Dept. staff. Mrs. Emminger clarified that they had discussed adding more screening at the previous meeting. Mr. Manuel said looking at the plan now; he feels it needs additional screening on all sides except the west. Mrs. Emminger explained that the Commission had expressed that they would like additional screening because a portion of the site will be graded out to install the tank. Mr. Manuel said that is why he thinks it should be a double row of trees and maybe even a little more. Mrs. Emminger pointed out that in her staff report, she had described exactly what the buffer should consist of but she is sure there is room for negotiation regarding the screening. She pointed out that in the draft resolution there is a condition that ZEO will not issue permits until the Planning Dept. issues a letter saying that all outstanding comments have been addressed. Mr. Urice said his concern about buffering is that where the tree line to east is being removed needs to be replaced with adequate replacements. He said although this is a permitted non-residential use, the Commission needs to maximize the required buffers.

Chairman Finaldi said he had walked this site but his concerns are about a public utility being located within a scenic residential neighborhood. Despite good intentions, this is a tricky situation, it would be difficult to hide or adequately buffer a 750,000 gallon water tank. He said he is concerned about the fact that the panels are constructed on the site and put in place by a crane, because that will require additional clearing beyond what is needed for the tank. He said he just does not feel this can be adequately buffered. He said he felt they had adequately demonstrated that safety is not an issue and this is a safe situation. He said he just does not feel comfortable with idea that they can hide a tank of this size; the other things located on the site are not visible from the road. In closing, he said they did discuss moving the tank back but that would require blasting because of the ledge.

Ms. Hoffstaetter said she concurs with Chairman Finaldi's comments and does not think this was the most ideal spot. She added that it seems more likely that it is a convenient spot. She said she had wanted to hear more about why it was the only spot; she did not feel that they presented enough information to demonstrate that other spots were considered. She also said she does not feel they gave good answers as to why they could not move it even slightly. She said she did not walk the site so would like to hear from the members who did. In closing, she said she does not know this is in the best interest of Danbury.

Mrs. Emminger said she is basing her comments on what is in the record and what she saw when she and Mr. Manuel walked the site. She said they saw the ledge and when she asked about moving the tank back toward that area, the applicant had explained that they would not be able to work with contours of land, so the tank would be higher and there would be blasting. She continued saying that because the proposed location is going down hill, they can place it into the berm. She said the record indicates that the applicant had said moving the tank back means they would have to do blasting which could damage the wells and septic. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if they could bury it even more. Mrs. Emminger said the Commission did ask that they bury it more and they did an additional 4 to 6 ft more on side that is more exposed. Also, the





