Members Present:       David Grigsby, Peter Goletz, Kimberly Bailey
                      Michael Sessine (Secretary), Tom Cost (Vice Chairman/Chairman ProTem)
(6 Voting)
Alternates Present:      Frank D'Andrea
Staff Present: George Kral (Town Planner); Kevin Magee (Environmental Planner); Regina Reid
                      (Zoning Enforcement Officer joined the meeting in progress); Donnette (Administrative
                      Assistant)

Video:
Shannon Gale
Audio Recording: Digital

There were 35 people in attendance.

Vice Chairman Cost called the meeting to order at 7:35 P.M. and explained meeting procedure to those
present.

He then introduced the members of the Commission and staff: Grigsby (V), Sessine (V), Cost (V), Goletz (V),
Bailey (V), D'Andrea (alt)(V): Staff: Kral, Magee, Donnette. Secretary Sessine read the legal notice.

Decisions of this meeting are available the day after the meeting by calling the Planning & Zoning Office
(203-453-8039) after 10:00 AM.

PUBLIC HEARING – 7:30 PM – Guilford/Whitfield Room

1. Town of Guilford, Jacobs Beach: property located at Seaside Ave., Map 24, Lot 6, Zone R-3. Coastal
   Area Management Site Plan Revision. §273-91. Continued from 10/17/12

EP Magee -

RE: Coastal Area Management Review
   Town of Guilford
   Jacobs Beach
   Seaside Avenue
   Guilford, Connecticut 06437
   Assessor Map 6 Lot 9

At the public hearing regarding Jacobs Beach, a resident raised concern regarding the State of Connecticut’s
Coastal Management Act and “Connecticut Department of Environmental Protections Office of Long Island
Sound Program Fact Sheet for Beaches and Dunes and for Adverse Impacts”. Attached are copies of the fact
sheets and below a comparative review of the Jacobs Beach plans to the fact sheets and to the Coastal
Management Act.

Why are beaches valuable?
Beaches and dunes provide critical nesting habitat for some shore birds and unique habitats for plant species
and communities. They act as a buffer to coastal flooding and erosion and dissipate wave energy. Beaches
and dunes provide recreational opportunities, including fishing, swimming, sunning, hiking and sight-seeing.
They are areas of scientific and educational value. Dunes and dune ridges act as reservoirs for sand supply to beaches.

**What are the statutory policies that apply?**

**Beaches and Dunes**
To preserve the dynamic form and integrity of natural beach systems in order to provide critical wildlife habitats, a reservoir for sand supply, a buffer for coastal flooding and erosion, and valuable recreational opportunities; to insure that coastal uses are compatible with the capabilities of the system and do not unreasonably interfere with natural processes of erosion and sedimentation; and to encourage the restoration and enhancement of disturbed or modified beach systems [CGS section 22a-92(b)(2)(C)].

**Adverse Impacts:**
There are eight adverse impacts defined in the Coastal Management Act the commission must consider as part of this application which are noted on the attached fact sheet “ADVERSE IMPACTS”. I will highlight three of the adverse impacts in relation to this application.

- Degrading **water quality** through the significant introduction into either coastal waters or groundwater supplies of suspended solids, nutrients, toxics, heavy metals or pathogens, or through the significant alteration of temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen or salinity [Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) section 22a-93(15)(A)].

- Degrading **tidal wetlands, beaches and dunes, rocky shorefronts, and bluffs and escarpments through significant alteration of their natural characteristics or functions** [CGS section 22a-93(15)(H)].

- Degrading **visual quality** through significant alteration of the natural features of vistas and view points [CGS section 22a-93(15)(F)]. (EXAMPLE: new construction that significantly obstructs coastal views from a scenic overlook or public park.)

During the coastal site plan review process, a determination must be made by the commission that adverse impacts have been avoided and unavoidable adverse impacts have been minimized in order to lawfully approve the application [CGS section 22a-106].

**What can a municipality do to minimize adverse impacts to these sensitive coastal resources?**
- Preserve or enhance the natural form, volume and stability of beach systems during development reviews through: 1) the maintenance, restoration and enhancement of natural beach and dune vegetation; 2) the control of pedestrian access so as to prevent the trampling or destruction of beach system vegetation (through proper traffic design, control, construction methods); and 3) the utilization of non-structural erosion control techniques such as the planting of native dune grass and placement of sand fill for beach nourishment.

In the current application, the plans show a boardwalk located on the back portion of the beach adjacent to the parking lot and playground with a portion of the beach being converted to a lawn area. A planted sand dune is proposed to be constructed on the waterward side of the boardwalk. No work is proposed in the lower portion of the beach in which the majority of the dynamic function of the beach occurs. During major storms such as super storm Sandy and last years tropical storm Irene additional sand was deposited in this portion of the back beach. The low profile of the boardwalk and the dune system would allow for the expansion of the beach into the grass area after these major storms.

- Employ low impact pile and timber construction for the siting of necessary and unavoidable structures on beach systems. Require mitigation of impacts of such structures through the planting of native beach vegetation and minimizing encroachments into the beach and dune areas.

The construction of the boardwalk for public access is on the upper portion of the beach and is proposed to be constructed with a low impact diamond pier pin type foundation with 7’ pins anchoring the board walk to the beach. This type of construction allows for the boardwalk to be relocated in the future if storms continue to deposit sand on the upper portion of the beach and as sea level rises. A planted sand dune is proposed to be constructed on the waterward side of the boardwalk.
- Employ construction techniques which minimize the necessary alteration of a beach system and its form, volume and vegetation. Such techniques include, but are not limited to: 1) placement of construction materials on elevated ramps so as to prevent soil compaction and destruction of beach vegetation; 2) storage of construction materials and equipment at a non-beach location; 3) scheduling of construction so as to avoid shorebird and shellfish breeding seasons; 5) restricting equipment movement to non-vegetated areas; and 6) restoring and revegetating areas disturbed by construction to predevelopment conditions.

Since construction of the boardwalk is located adjacent to the existing parking lot all construction materials should be stored in this area and not on the beach.

- Adopt a stormwater management ordinance or make other regulatory changes to improve stormwater management (see Water Quality fact sheet for more information).

The changes to the parking lot have incorporated a stormwater management system which has been designed to treat the first inch of rainfall that is in compliance with the zoning code.

- Preserve the natural dynamic relationships between littoral sediment sources and depositional areas of beach systems by avoiding structures and uses which divert or otherwise alter littoral drift volumes, patterns and directions.

No new structures were proposed on the sloping face of the front beach which would significantly affect the natural dynamic relationship between the littoral sediment sources and depositional areas of beach systems. The proposed improvements would continue to allow sand to be moved to the back beach area during coastal storms while minimizing erosion. The plans show a board walk located on the upper portion of the beach adjacent to the parking lot and playground. During major storms such as super storm Sandy and last years tropical storm Irene additional sand was deposited in this portion of the back beach. The low profile of the boardwalk and the low dune system would allow for the expansion of the beach into the grass area after these major storms.

- Degrading visual quality through significant alteration of the natural features of vistas and viewpoints [CGS section 22a-93(15)(F)]. {EXAMPLE: new construction that significantly obstructs coastal views from a scenic overlook or public park.}

The trees being planted are spaced so that the public parked in the parking lot can see between the trees. Once the trees start to grow the branches on the trees can be limbed up so that the tree canopy does not block the view from a parked car. The shade structure being constructed between the playground and the beach is proposed to be constructed with open sides to allow views towards the water from the playground. John Gaucher, Environmental Analyst with the CT DEEP Office of Long Island Sound Program, indicated to me during a phone conversation on November 29, 2012 that the visual quality standards in the Coastal Act are intended to protect views from a public location and have not been applied as a means of protecting personal or private views. A copy of a January 31, 2000 letter Clarifying the visual policies from John Gaucher to Norman Cole, Principal Planner, Stamford CT is attached.

- Degrading tidal wetlands, beaches and dunes, rocky shorefronts, and bluffs and escarpments through significant alteration of their natural characteristics or function [CGS section 22a-93(15)(H)].

The changes to the parking lot have incorporated a stormwater management system which has been designed to treat the first inch of rainfall on the parking lot. This stormwater management system will reduce the amount of fresh water entering the adjacent tidal wetlands and altering the salinity and temperature of the wetlands.

- Maintain or improve access to and along publicly owned shorefront, including public trust lands below the mean high water mark.

The construction of the boardwalk and the shade shelter was described by the Architect William Thompson, as way to improve access to the shorefront for the elderly and handicap population.
- Incorporate site planning and design features which limit or avoid negative visual and aesthetic impacts or which create positive visual and aesthetic impacts on the site and on the surrounding area. For example:
  - alleviate blighted or deteriorated conditions on-site;
  - blend the architecture, size, materials, color, and texture of new structures with the existing qualities and characteristics of the man-made and natural environment;
  - provide visual setbacks from the water based on consideration of structure, height, and mass for all structures which do not functionally require a shorefront location;
  - make extensive use of landscaping, plantings, and natural ground coverings;
  - maintain, improve, or enhance visual access to the coast.

The commission needs to review the information provided to determine if the site features create positive visual and aesthetic impacts on the site and surrounding area as noted in the consideration above.

Sue Robins (Park and Recreation Commissioner)
Overview and history of the Jacobs Beach Improvement Project
Presented at Planning and Zoning
December 5, 2012 – 7:30 pm

Good evening. I’m Sue Robins, a member of the Parks and Recreation Commission and a member of the Jacobs Beach sub-committee.

Before Architect Will Thompson, and Landscape Designer, John Cunningham begin their presentation of the Jacobs Beach Master Plan, I would like to provide this board with a brief history behind this project.

About four years ago the Parks and Recreation Commission began consideration of improvements to Jacobs Beach. One major factor was the publication of the Municipal Coastal Program report. It contained 15 recommendations to the Parks and Recreation Commission and Department for “providing public access to the waterfront as one of the cornerstones of coastal management, and maximizing the promotion and usage of existing (coastal) sites.” Chief among the recommendations was supporting and promoting usage of the beach and a nourishment project there.

In October of 2010 the Department conducted its own survey of participants in our many programs. Over 300 people responded with comments and suggestions for improvements. Some of the suggestions such as cleaner sand, shade, and improvements to the bathhouse are reflected in the Jacobs Beach plan that we are presenting tonight for approval. We have continued, the past several years, to conduct surveys of program participants with the latest being a survey of parents whose children were enrolled in Camp Menunkatuck this past summer. Some of these results called for more shaded areas for camp activities to protect children from overexposure and sunburn.

In February of 2011 there was a Town-wide Plan of Conservation and Development on-line survey whose results also called for new and improved beaches and more shoreline access. Jacobs Beach was specifically mentioned.

2011 Architect Will Thompson was hired through a competitive process to draft an improvement plan for the Commission.

An initial master plan was developed and approved by the Commission in the summer of 2011.

Architect Will Thompson and Landscape Architect John Cunningham were rehired in the spring of 2012 to draft a more detailed plan.

A state grant was requested in the summer of 2011 under the Small Towns Economic Assistance Program (STEAP) and received in late fall that year.
The plan was reviewed favorably by the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, the Parks and Recreation Commission, The Guilford Historic District Commission, and the Design Review Committee of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Summer of 2012 the Parks and Recreation Director met with the Whitfield South Neighborhood Association at one of their scheduled meetings and shared the master plan with about 12-15 people who attended, also the plan has been sent to neighbors via the Whitfield South Neighborhood Association.

In October of 2012, three non-Commission members were added to a committee providing guidance to the development and implementation of the plan for improvement.

A large rendering of the master plan has been on display in the lobby of the Community Center for over a year; the plan has also been on the Department website, on Facebook, and a smaller version was posted at the bathhouse at Jacobs Beach this past summer. The plans have been discussed at several events including the Summer Sizzler and at two evening meetings for parents of summer campers. This project has been on the agenda of the Parks and Recreation Commission during our monthly (GCTV televised) Commission meetings which are open to the public, as well as, advertised in articles in the Courier and New Haven Register.

September of 2012 The Parks and Recreation Commission held a public meeting at Jacob’s Beach with Will Thompson and John Cunningham, allowing the public to see the plan on site, ask questions, and seek clarification to the plan.

October 2012 a meeting was held at Town Hall for local residents to once again view the plan presented by Mr. Thompson and Mr. Cunningham and to discuss questions and concerns.

Also in October, part of the sub-committee met with Senator Ed Meyers, and the Selectmen to further discuss the project.

On October 17th we met with your board at which time the public hearing portion of the review of our application was held open until we could convene a Town-wide meeting with the public on the project.

November 27th The Jacobs Beach Improvement Project Sub-Committee held a Public meeting on the Jacobs Beach Improvement Project at the Community Center from 7:00 – 8:30 pm. In our attempt to be responsive to the concerns of area residents, we have made changes to our master plan with the removal of three large trees. The removal of two of the three trees has provided a 145 foot unobstructed view of the water.

In closing, given the Department and the leadership responsibilities of the Commission members, as well as the results of various studies and planning documents, the time has come to make significant improvements to our most central coastal resource, Jacobs Beach which houses two picnic pavilions, a half basketball court, a much-used playground, and thirteen kayak and small boat racks, in addition to the beach and bath house. We feel that this project in completion will in fact, according to the Municipal Coastal Program report, provide public access to the waterfront as one of the cornerstones of coastal management, and maximize the promotion and usage of this existing coastal site.

At this time I would like to have Will Thompson and John Cunningham make their presentation.

Will Thompson, AIA – he gave a summary of the application. Since the last meeting, they met with the neighbors and other residents of the town and are now proposing to remove three of the previously proposed trees in order to provide a 145’ uninterrupted view. He explained that the shade structure is located where it is in order to stabilize this corner of the beach and because it is at the hub of a disturbed area. This location was deliberately chosen from an engineering perspective.

John Cunningham TEC Landscape Design – listed the changes in species of plantings that remain as per the plant list on the plans.

Vice Chairman Cost – asked for questions from the audience.

Tom Skoczylas – why wasn’t more of the public input considered when making changes to the design?
Will Thompson, AIA – we tried to take a balanced approach, addressing the concerns of the neighbors as well as the concerns of the rest of the town residents.

Kathryn Greene – Will the red maple be replaced with any other foliage?
Will Thompson, AIA – no. We are trying not to block the view corridor for the immediate neighbors.
Kathryn Greene – it would be nice to see something around that building to soften it, even something low.
Will Thompson, AIA – this is proposed to be built in two phases. The first would be done this winter/spring including the major regrading, parking lot, plantings and roughly 1/2-2/3 of the boardwalk. We will be seeking additional funding for a year later for the second phase to include the balance of the boardwalk, the shade structure and a few other elements. He pointed out the location of the stockpiling.

Harland Christofferson - The boardwalk will have a freeboard cross-sectional area to coastal velocity zone water. When making contact with this cross-sectional area, water with velocity will be vectored laterally and down. The downward vector will burrow away sand beneath the boardwalk. As a void is created beneath the boardwalk, water with velocity will vector laterally beneath and upwards beginning to dislodge decking material. How will this scouring action be prevented?
Will Thompson, AIA – it is possible there will be scouring. It is designed to accommodate that. The first 1-1 ½’ are designed as if they don’t exist in bearing capacity. He has tested it to 2 ½’ and it still works. There are many scour models. In this situation you mostly get overtopping. The boardwalk is designed for that load. The boards may be damaged but the frame is designed to withstand the storm elements.

Harland Christofferson – asked how the irrigation system will hold up to sand inundation.
John Cunningham – pointed out the location of the irrigation system. Sand from a storm would need to be removed from the lawn but it wouldn’t affect the pipes because they are completely enclosed. If the grade of the lawn area was changed, then the pipes would need to be taken care of.
Will Thompson, AIA – the boardwalk acts as an anchor for the landscaping.

Harland Christofferson – asked how the parking lot drainage will hold up to sand inundation.
Will Thompson, AIA – explained the makeup of the drainage system and that sand will not have a negative impact.

Bob Prichard – Questioned the number of parking spaces and complained about the traffic speed.
Will Thompson, AIA – can’t control the speed but the number of parking spaces is almost the same as it currently is when including the overflow parking.
Rick Maynard, Parks & Recreation Director – we asked the Police Department to post the portable radar and the general opinion was that it helped to slow the traffic down when people could see how fast they were going.

Lisa Gugliotti - surveys showed that people wanted more playscapes and better sand. Why weren’t more playscapes included in this plan?
Will Thompson, AIA – budget priority is the grooming machine for the sand which will make a big change in the texture of the beach. Playgrounds were not included in the RFP. There was a lot of resistance to the playground that is there and took years to get approved. We just worked with what the Park and Recreation Commission gave us. Maybe the playground will be addressed at a future time. Access has been a priority and relief from the direct sun.

Joe Nugent – when the bids go out for the shade structures, P&R has determined that they will take alternate proposals to the permanent structure.
Comr. Grigsby – what is the maximum wind velocity for this shade structure? How will it be mounted in the sand?
Will Thompson, AIA – 110 mph. He explained the method of installation.

Tom Skoczylas – questioned the actual location of the shade structure. Zoning says it shouldn’t be any closer than 50’ 273-91.H.
Comr. Grigsby – you are considering this a structure. He asked why it is so close to the beach.
Will Thompson, AIA – the statutes use mean high tide. There is some ambiguity in the town’s regulations about sand which moves as opposed to rocky shore front. He used the state statute to determine the setback because it is a clear line, Elevation 4 in the Town of Guilford and there is plenty of distance from that line. This
is a stabilizing structure which will increase the stability of the dune. It is also a permeable deck surface. The location of the shade structure has been regraded numerous times. It is not a natural beach. Sometimes it is grass; sometimes it is sand. A whole swale was built there in 2003. It is not a fixed element.

TP Kral – the setback would be 25’ because the property is already developed. It is not 25’ from the beach. But… as Will said, in the State Statutes under definitions, #6, public beach is defined as “that portion of the shoreline held in public fee ownership by the State or that portion of the shoreline below the mean high tide elevation that is held in public trust by the State.” It also says that beaches and dunes means beach systems, which goes on, not really providing any guidance. In the fact sheet that EP Magee provided, it uses the same definition. In general, beaches are dynamic areas abutting coastal waters that are characterized by sand, gravel or cobbles. It appears we have set a setback from a moving object. We have created a problematic regulation.

Will Thompson, AIA – added that the State has put in place for clarification, the new jurisdiction line.

Comr. Grigsby – we are really only talking about the shade structure. The deck/boardwalk is at ground level and is therefore exempt.

Tom Skoczylas – how many of the remaining shrubs will fill reach 8’?

John Cunningham – the only areas they are being used is by the shower in order to provide some screening and by the boat racks.

Vice Chairman Cost – do the drawings show silt fence or hay bales for the stock piling during the construction?

Will Thompson, AIA – that will be included in the specifications. He clarified what would be written.

Vice Chairman Cost – if we have another storm such as the two we have had in the last two years, how do these trees survive?

John Cunningham – from his research, all Honey Locusts in those areas, all Tree Lilacs and Swamp Maple, and Hedge Maple survived. They are the most salt tolerant varieties. The only way that these varieties would not survive would be in the area was compromised.

Vice Chairman Cost – asked for comments from the public.

In Support

Shirley Girioni – spoke in support. The Design Review Committee was unanimously in favor. The shade will expand the population of people who can enjoy the beach.

Kathryn Greene – spoke in support.

Rick Maynard, Parks & Recreation Director – spoke in support. There is a net increase of 15 trees. The sand area that is not being used will be used for the boardwalk.

In Opposition

Tom Skoczylas –

Regarding the Jacob’s beach project, you had required the applicant Mr. Thompson and the Parks and Recreation Department to schedule a meeting to hear public input. I am writing to you to share with you my suggestions I had submitted for consideration into design adjustments, simply for your awareness. Please refer to the attached drawing showing my suggestions.

Summary of suggested input:
- Eliminate Grass and trees between beach and parking lot
- Move boardwalk (and sand dunes) back adjacent to the parking lot (next to the guard rails)
- Eliminate boardwalk in front of the bath house (to the water side)
- Add width to boardwalk to the right side of the bath house to provide seating area for changing and tying shoes, etc near the entries to the bath house
- Sun shade Structure
- o downsize to about half
- o shift back off of the beach close to the walkway to the playground
- o Change structure to be similar to existing pavilions or gazebo.
  Trees: reduce # to near zero (see drawing)
  Eliminate Juniper and Hicksi Yew, these plant types do not belong in a seaside setting, these are for an inland setting.
I have shared my modifications with the State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection’s Office of Long Island Sound Programs. I met with Mr. John Gaucher, Environmental Analyst 3 of the Office of Long Island Sound Programs. The same State Official whom has reviewed Mr. Thompson’s project plan.
Mr. Gaucher’s comments to my recommendations are attached.
Keep in mind that Mr. Gaucher nor the State DEEP is required to “approve” any Municipal Coastal Management Site Plan. There is only a requirement that it be reviewed. The State has no authority to approve a municipal decision; they can only appeal a municipal decision. This means that Mr. Thompson can easily modify his project plan and it can easily be reviewed again by the State DEEP just as I have done.

He read a letter from John Gaucher which was a response to changes he proposed.

Based on your descriptions and the discussions at our meeting, the modifications you are recommending do not appear to be inconsistent with the applicable Connecticut Coastal Management Act policies. Please let me know if you have any further questions.

John Gaucher
Environmental Analyst 3
Office of Long Island Sound Programs

This is my statement of request for denial of the application by William Thompson for Town of Guilford, Jacobs Beach: property located at Seaside Ave., Map 24, Lot 6, Zone R-3. Coastal Area Management Site Plan Revision. §273-91.
If ultimately a motion and a vote is to approve it, I request that it be approved with conditions in line with my comments below and also my design suggestions sent to your attention under separate letter (email) regarding my suggested design modifications which I have all ready reviewed with Mr. John goucher of the State of Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection’s Office of Long Island Sound Programs.

For organization reasons, the content below is organized in the following fashion: 

Highlighted in blue indicated text taken from the Town of Guilford Zoning Code Chapter 273
Highlighted in yellow is text taken from C.G.S. §22a-93 of Chapter 444 of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act

The content below in red font are my comments.

Notes Guilford Zoning Chapter 273 Town of Guilford 273-91 E (1) (a)

Consider the characteristics of the site, including the location and condition of any of the coastal resources defined in C.G.S. §22a-93;
Sec. 22a-93. Definitions. For the purposes of this chapter:
(15) "Adverse impacts on coastal resources" include but are not limited to: (A) Degrading water quality through the significant introduction into either coastal waters or groundwater supplies of suspended solids, nutrients, toxics, heavy metals or pathogens, or through the significant alteration of temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen or salinity; (B) degrading existing circulation patterns of coastal waters through the significant alteration of patterns of tidal exchange or flushing rates, freshwater input, or existing basin characteristics and channel contours; (C) degrading natural erosion patterns through the significant alteration of littoral transport of sediments in terms of deposition or source reduction; (D) degrading natural or existing drainage patterns through the significant alteration of groundwater flow and recharge and volume of runoff; (E) increasing the hazard of coastal flooding through significant alteration of shoreline configurations or bathymetry, particularly within high velocity flood zones; (F) degrading visual quality through significant alteration of the natural features of vistas and view points; (G) degrading or destroying essential wildlife, finfish or shellfish habitat through significant alteration of the composition, migration patterns, distribution, breeding or other population characteristics of the natural species or significant alteration of the natural components of the habitat; and (H) degrading tidal wetlands, beaches and dunes, rocky shorefronts, and bluffs and escarpments through significant alteration of their natural characteristics or function;

Regarding (F): The current plan is in conflict with this Definition: Planting 33 trees possibly reaching heights to 50 ft and 40 ft wide, and numerous shrubs (170) expected to reach up to 8 feet high. Permanent sunshade structure 20 ft high, L x W = 26 ft x 106 ft. Cross sectional line of sight area of the roofing fabric is 9 ft x 106 ft.
Regarding (H): Reduction of existing beach area from 1.6 to 1.3 acres (24%) (ref William Thompson 27NOV12) and covering with permanent wood decking, soil, grass, trees, and various vegetation is in conflict with this definition.

Zoning Code Chapter 273 Town of Guilford 273-91 E (1) (c)
Follow all applicable goals and policies stated in C.G.S. §22a-92 and identify conflicts between the proposed activity and any goal or policy.

Sec. 22a-92. Legislative goals and policies. (a) The following general goals and policies are established by this chapter:

(6) To encourage public access to the waters of Long Island Sound by expansion, development and effective utilization of state-owned recreational facilities within the coastal area that are consistent with sound resource conservation procedures and constitutionally protected rights of private property owners;

I believe the current plan in conflict with this policy - Repurposing 24+% of the beach to lawn, plants, and trees changes the characteristics of a coastal resource to be more like an inland type park.

(10) (c) (1) (F) (iii ) to enhance or not unreasonably impair the visual quality of the shoreline;

The current plan is in conflict with this policy: Planting 33 trees possibly reaching heights to 50 ft and 40 ft wide, and numerous shrubs (170) expected to reach up to 8 feet high. Permanent sunshade structure 20 ft high, L x W = 26 ft x 106 ft. Cross sectional line of sight area of the roofing fabric is 9 ft x 106 ft

Trees and shrubs are characteristics of an inland park, not of a shoreline beach

3DEC12

Zoning Code Chapter 273 Town of Guilford 273-91 E (3) In approving any activity proposed in a coastal site plan, the Commission shall make a written finding that the proposed activity with any conditions or modifications imposed by the Commission:

(a) Is consistent with all applicable goals and policies in C.G.S. §22a-92;

and

(b) Incorporates as conditions or modifications all reasonable measures which would mitigate the adverse impacts of the proposed activity on both coastal resources and future water-dependent development activities.

Regarding (a)

From C.G.S. 22a-92

#1: “Incorporate site planning and design features which limit or avoid negative visual and aesthetic impacts or which create positive visual and aesthetic impacts on the site and on the surrounding area. For example”:

- blend the architecture, size, materials, color, and texture of new structures with the existing qualities and characteristics of the man-made and natural environment;

- I believe the sunshade structure is clearly in conflict with this requirement.

- maintain, improve, or enhance visual access to the coast.

– Trees and Sunshade structure is in conflict with this requirement.

#2 “Maintain or enhance public access to and along the shorefront when compatible with the proposed use, and design facilities so as to take advantage of their waterfront location in order to provide an area for public enjoyment.”

– I believe the reduction of beach size and repurposing it with characteristics of an inland park is in conflict with the requirement.

3DEC12


A permanent sun shade structure is in conflict with the required set back. Not only is it not in compliance, it is actually planned to be installed on the beach which (I believe) is clearly in violation of this requirement.

3DEC12

Approved: December 16, 2009, Effective Date; December 25, 2009 Proposed Section 273-91 Coastal Site Plan Review and the Coastal Area Overlay District

J. View Standards. In reviewing applications under this section, the Commission shall take into consideration the impact of the proposed activity or use on views of the coastal resources. In addition, waterfront property shall be developed so that the design and relationship of the development to waterfront as viewed from the water or land, is consistent with a waterfront setting.

Diminishing the size of the existing beach by more than 20% and adding 33 trees is not consistent with a waterfront setting; it is becoming more like an inland park setting.

(3) There shall be no buildings or other permanent obstruction placed in view lanes.

No obstruction by fences, shrubbery or trees or other landscape features higher than four feet shall be placed in view lanes between the coastal resources and the nearest public street or right of way used by the public.

All major shade trees must have their lowest branches at least six feet above the ground at the time of
installation and be maintained in that manner. Any fences placed within view lanes shall be see-through. Protective (see-through) fences or railings which are part of a public pedestrian walkway which are in or pass through a view lane may be built to a height not to exceed four feet. Existing trees and shrubbery within view lanes may be maintained in their present position, but in the spirit of the Plan of Conservation and Development and the requirements of this section, it is recommended that property owners trim existing trees and shrubbery to the maximum extent possible. The replacement of existing trees and shrubbery shall be in conformance with the requirements of this section.

Regarding “view lanes” the beach is the focal point of many of the view lanes along Seaside Avenue and the pedestrian walkway. By adding 30+ trees and 300+ bushes and shrubs to this focal point will all but eliminate the view to the coastal resource and beyond. View of the water’s horizon, Faulkner’s Island, and on clear days – Long Island will be practically eliminated.

John Braccio – spoke in opposition to the trees and shade structure but in support of the project as a whole.

Lynn Skoczylas – I understand that this does not pertain to the Planning and Zoning code of the Town of Guilford. However, since it was discussed at the Oct 17th P&Z meeting, I think it is important to bring this to your attention. As the Parks and Recreation Commission stated several times, including at the Oct 17 P&Z Meeting, there was a survey done by the Parks and Rec department. I have reviewed this survey (Community survey by Parks and Recreation Department 2010) as well as the PCDC Online Survey 2/28/11, Given to us by George Kral. The PCDC did not make any reference to Jacob’s Beach that I could find. The summarized results of the Parks and Rec survey are in the chart below. This graph is a synopsis of the majority of the 76 comments that people made pertaining to just Jacob’s Beach in the survey. I have attached the actual survey for your reference. Excluding those that have recently expressed comments opposing this application it appears that this design is not representative of what people in the town are asking.
Mr. & Mrs. Glickman – expressed concern over the Town’s ability to maintain the upgrades and the funding.

Letters in support

As a thirty-five year resident of Guilford I support the project to improve Jacobs Beach Park. The improvements will make the park more accessible to all citizens of Guilford, which is essential for community recreational areas. Given that the environmental integrity of the Beach will not be compromised by the project and the Park will receive long over due improvements offset by a grant I hope that the Planning and Zoning Committee will support the project.

Toni Page

I am writing to say that I am in support of an improved Jacobs Beach Park. I believe that the boardwalk, native trees and improved beach house will give Guilford more appeal, to potential incoming residents as well as current residents. I do have one caveat: given the nature of global warming and the weather disasters we have been having, would it not be prudent to put up some kind of sea wall, to protect the sand from eroding away and the trees from being blown over?

Best,

Blythe

I want to add my very strong support for the wonderful plan to renovate and beautify Jacobs Beach. I have examined the rendering of the plan by Thompson and Cunningham and am very impressed with what they have done. The improvements to the beach, the parking lot, the artful provision of shade structures over a ground level boardwalks linking the beach with the playground is a thoughtful and compelling design. So, too, is the addition of trees and native plantings to provide both shade and a more inviting, park-like environment that will transform what currently has all of the appeal of a moonscape. Provision of a beach-cleaning machine to filter out shells will create a more inviting beach for tender-footed citizens, young and old. And, lest we forget, the boardwalks will be inviting to handicapped citizens, as well as seniors dependent on canes and walkers. What's not to like?

It goes without saying, of course, that there will always be opposition to change by some folks, especially those who are most immediately affected by it. Currently, Jacobs Beach is not as heavily used as it is likely to be with the improvements proposed in the plan. But this is a "town" beach/park that is for the enjoyment of the all Guilford residents, and that, in my opinion, trumps the slight inconvenience that abutting residents believe they will experience. In sum, the Jacobs Beach proposal will be one of those common assets that helps to make Guilford the kind of community we want to be a part of. As I say, what's not to like?

Sincerely,

Larry Dowler

As Guilford residents, we wholeheartedly support the recommended improvements of the Beach and Park so thoroughly developed by your Parks and Recreation Commission members, and send this letter of support since we are unable to attend either of the Nov. 27 or the Dec 5 public meetings. An improved beach park, both aesthetically and functionally, will be a major asset in our town, and make the beach experience much more enjoyable for users of all ages.
- A beach that provides shade is a necessary health consideration, given that folks should not overexpose themselves to the sun, especially children and older people.
- An area with boardwalks, benches, and shade trees will be a welcome oasis in the midst of the vast sand beach, far more functional. And it will be aesthetically enhancing.
- Landscaping the parking areas will make the entire Park will be far more attractive and manageable. We urge the Commission to proceed with your excellent plans for the betterment of Guilford's natural resources.
Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the Town.
Sincerely,
Pam and Bruce Simonds

We are in favor of the proposed restoration of Jacobs Beach. Guilford has the reputation of an attractive and well maintained Town to live in and visit. Witness the attractive Town Green; the historic buildings and the scenic Route 77.
Jacobs Beach is in dire need of upgrading, not only to provide an attractive venue in keeping with the Town's other sites but for practical purposes well spelled out in the proposal.
Sally and Bob O'Such

RE: Jacobs Beach Plan

Dear Mr. Bower:

I have followed with interest the development of plans to restore and improve Jacobs Beach. I have also noted the neighborhood controversy regarding some of the proposed actions.
It is important to note that most of the proposed actions are consistent with several Plans already approved by the Town, including the recently completed revised Harbor Management Plan. The other adopted Plans are the Pre Disaster Mitigation Plan and the Revised Coastal Area Management Plan.
Any plan may run the risk of being opposed by certain individuals for various personal reasons. However, Jacobs Beach is one of the principal points of shoreline access for the Town's residents. As such the greater good of the many should take precedence over a few dissenting voices.
As demonstrated in the above Plans, let the record show that the Harbor Management Commission supports the proposed improvements.

Sincerely,

Harbor Management Commission

John Henningson, P.E., Chairman

Unfortunately, we will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow night about the improvements to Jacob’s Beach. I was told that I could forward our comments to you about the improvements.

My husband Brian and I are very much in support of these improvements. We’ve lived in Guilford for 6 years, and the beach area, while nice, has always seemed lacking as compared to other towns (especially Madison). Our children are school-aged now (5 & 7), and we’ve spent countless days at both the play area and on the beach, and I expect we’ll be spending countless more days there. The boardwalk area, and the walkway along the beach to the bathroom area would be much appreciated – when my children were younger, I remember having to walk with a stroller over the sandy beach, and it was tough. Redesigning the parking lot would not only make it nicer esthetically, but also safer. And the shaded area would be much appreciated – even when we are sitting on the beach, it’s nice to be able to get out of the sun without leaving the beach.
Overall, we feel the proposed improvements are very much needed, will add value to the entire Jacobs Beach area that the entire community can enjoy, and we support them.

If you need to contact either of us, please feel free to call or email.

Barb & Brian Hargraves

Does anyone understand that shade is a health issue?
Skin Cancer is a major health problem in our area for all ages.
Read the literature. Providing shade is a public safety issue for all those who wish to use Jacob’s Beach Park. From young to old, the citizens of Guilford and the paying guests should be able to enjoy the beach without being fried in the sun. Ask any physician and they will tell you to enjoy the beach but seek the shade after just 1/2 hour maximum. Climate warming has changed our safe exposure time.
I wrote this to the Courier in response to a letter to the editor:
To the Editor:
This is a reply to the "Down the Wrong Path" written by Lisa Gugliotti, published in Nov. 15th publication. Skin cancer should be a major reason to consider access to shade for those of all ages who wish to use the town beach. Young children, campers, middle aged and seniors all want to be able to enjoy the beach without frying or constantly slathering sun screen.
There should be a choice to use the beach park area by being in or out of the sun. Even on hazy days, the sun can do a lot of damage to one’s skin.
Laura Raymond

Letters in Opposition

I would like to throw my thoughts into the Improvements for Jacob's beach...I agree with both Joyce Rogers and Lisa Gugliotti whom both wrote quite intelligently concerning the situation.
Living on the shore myself I have learned over 12 years that mother nature will have her way and the best way to coexist is to let nature show us the way.
The beach always seems to be quite well utilized and to reduce it's size would be a shame and only make conditions more crowded.
I do agree if we have some funding available the sand thresher and the bathroom should be of first priority. If people want to picnic with trees and water I suggest they go to Chaffinch Island Park.
Linda Byrd

I believe insufficient consideration has been paid to sections of the Connecticut General Statues, Chapter 444 (CGS) and the Town of Guilford Zoning Code, Chapter 273 (GZC) regarding the Jacob's Beach Improvement Plan (the plan). Furthermore, I have heard no cogent discussion regarding the long term impacts of changes contained within the plan. It is my opinion that adherence to the CGS and GZC and consideration of the impacts these changes may have over time to a living-beach such as Jacob's will lend decades of enjoyment for town residents.

For ease of explanation, I offer two classifications of enhancements: static and dynamic. Static enhancements being structures and dynamic being any vegetation and artificial sand dunes. My specific concerns are the boardwalk (static) and the vegetation and sand dunes (dynamic) at the beach/parking lot boundary.

1. I believe there is non-compliance with the following CGS sections pertaining to beaches:
   1. Degrading visual quality through significant alteration of the natural features of vistas and view points [CGS section 22a-93(15)(F)].
      1. Additional trees and artificial sand dunes proposed in the plan at beach/parking lot boundary will impact the current vistas of the beach, Guilford Harbor, and Grass Island from the vantage of the parking lot. Since these are dynamic features, they will change over time and their impact over time should be considered.
   2. Degrading tidal wetlands, beaches and dunes, rocky shorefronts, and bluffs and escarpments through significant alteration of their natural characteristics or function [CGS section 22a-93(15)(H)].
      1. The location of sand dunes and areas w/ vegetation along the beach/parking lot boundary will alter due to wind and tidal action. Sand dunes and areas w/ vegetation will grow due to windblown sand deposits. Artificial sand dunes tend to erode due to wind action.1.
      2. Addition of proposed trees, vegetation, and boardwalk at the beach/parking lot boundary will reduce current sandy beach area by 20-25%.
   3. A municipal board or commission reviewing a coastal site plan must determine whether or not the potential adverse impacts of the proposed activity on both coastal resources and future water-dependent uses are acceptable [CGS section 22a-106].
      1. Jacob's Beach is a coastal flood velocity zone. No data is presented with the plan forecasting how the dynamic vegetation, dynamic sand dunes, and static boardwalk shall withstand water impact in a coastal velocity zone.2.
      2. No data is presented with the plan forecasting how the proposed dynamic changes to the beach/parking lot boundary will change over time due to wind and tidal action.
3. No data is presented with the plan forecasting how the proposed dynamic changes to the beach/parking lot boundary will impact the ability of Jacob's Beach to heal itself as a living-beach.

2. I believe there is non-compliance with the following GZC Section:
   1. Follow all applicable goals and policies stated in CGS Section 22a-92 and identify conflicts between the proposed activity and any goal or policy [GZC section 273-91 E(1)(c)].
   1. To consider in the planning process the potential impact of coastal flooding and erosion patterns on coastal development so as to minimize damage to and destruction of life and property and reduce the necessity of public expenditure to protect future development from such hazards [CGS section 22a-92 a(5)]
   1. No data is provided to support how the static and dynamic features at beach/parking lot boundary will be protected from such recurring damage that is expected in a coastal velocity zone.
   2. To conduct, sponsor and assist research in coastal matters to improve the data base upon which coastal land and water use decisions are made [CGS section 22a-92 a(7)].
   1. No data is provided to indicate that any research has been performed as to the impacts of static and dynamic improvements will have on Jacob's Beach, or the impacts a coastal velocity zone will have on these improvements.

Respectfully,
Harland Christofferson

---

1 Artificial sand dunes lack the electrostatic attractive bonds (Van der Waal forces) between uniform sized sand grains and seawater minerals to stabilize these deposits which are built up over time and present in naturally occurring sand dunes. Artificial dunes tend to erode with greater ease due to wind action.

2 Velocity zone impact has been observed on Jacob's Beach during tropical storm Irene and hurricane Sandy.

3 Sand dunes and trees impact wind flow patterns over beach by acting as obstructions. The airflow is forced off the beach to near these obstructions and prevents drying of wet sand on the windward side. The wet sand is not easily redistributed around the beach by the wind. This may lead to further erosion by wind and tidal forces and not allow windblown sand to be evenly distributed across the sandy beach area.

4 The boardwalk will have freeboard cross-sectional area to coastal velocity zone water. When making contact with this cross-sectional area, water with velocity will be vectored laterally and down. The downward vector will burrow away sand beneath the boardwalk. As a void is created beneath the boardwalk, water with velocity will vector laterally beneath and upwards beginning to dislodge decking material.

5 The low-lying sections of the Silver Sands Beach / Walnut Beach boardwalk in Milford sustained damage in tropical storm Irene and is now decimated from hurricane Sandy.

6 The Parks and Recreation Department states approval of various local, state, and federal agencies. CT DEEP has no jurisdictional authority landward of the high water mark on municipal beaches. Pursuant to the Guilford Historic District Certificate of Appropriateness, no public record nor meeting minutes have been found to be published recording a public meeting whereby the Guilford Historic District approved the plan’s Certificate of Appropriateness.

7 No reviewing member has shown credentials supporting education or certification in a coastal zone management or beach resource management specialization by an accredited agency or institution.

---

Comr. Bailey – how tall is the ground cover?
John Cunningham – all of the ground cover will be 16 – 18" or below. Also, the invasives that have grown will be moved.

The public hearing was closed at 9:13 PM
REGULAR MEETING

APPROVAL OF REVISED AGENDA - Agenda revised 12/5/12

Upon a motion by Mr. Goletz, seconded by Ms. Bailey, the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to accept the agenda revised to 12/5/12.

A. Deliberation of Public Hearing Items

Town of Guilford Jacobs Beach

MOTION: P. Goletz
2ND: M. Sessine

Voted: That the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission approve a Coastal Site Plan application for the Town of Guilford, Jacob’s Beach, located at Seaside Avenue, Map 24, Lot 6 as shown on “Jacobs Beach Park Improvements”, 11 sheets, dated 11.27.12, prepared by William Thompson, AIA and TEC Landscape Design.

This application is approved with the following conditions;
1. That the construction staging area be confined to the parking lot and contained by silt fencing or hay bales.
2. The Concrete Paver Detail should be revised to a Permeable Paver Detail.
3. In order to make sure that the coastal resources are protected the Town of Guilford Zoning Enforcement Officer should be notified to inspect the sedimentation and erosion control measures and orange construction fencing prior to any site work. Soil stock piles shall be contained by silt fencing and or hay bales. Soil erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be maintained until all site work has been completed.
4. The shade structure is to be eliminated from the site plan.

This application is approved based upon a finding that it conforms with the Zoning Code of the Town of Guilford and is consistent with the Coastal Management policies of the State of Connecticut.

Discussion
Comr. Goletz – there is currently no place for people who want to go to the beach with a book and relax in the shade and enjoy the water. We need shade trees to accommodate them. Park and Rec. has made concessions by removing the trees from the center of the parking lot in order to decrease view obstruction. This plan accommodates all residents of Guilford, not just a few neighboring houses.
Comr. Grigsby – the thing that concerns him the most is the setback issue. He is confident that the setback is not determined from the mean high water line. The question of what to do when your fixed line moves is a problem but common sense tells you where the beach is. This project will be done in phases and the shade structure was in the second phase. If we want to approve this, we can carve out the shade structure and then be able to say that this is in conformance with our CAM regulations.
Comr. Sessine – what avenue would they need to take to get the shade structure approved?
TP Kral – they could define the boundary of the beach. They could move the structure. They could apply for a variance and have a sound hardship. Without that, you can’t approve it because it doesn’t conform to the setback. The setback was written from the perspective of residential or commercial properties. We never thought about the fact that dunes and beaches move. The regulations could be changed.
Comr. Sessine – this is a structure but this structure does not conflict with the intent of our setback.
Vice Chairman Cost – his concern is the trees and their impact on the views. It is in favor of improving the beach but reading through the letters, he has to agree that he feels that this plan doesn’t fit the regulations. This is a question of what we are doing to the coast line.
Comr. Grigsby – this is not like a seawall that is going to block the views. He appreciates that they removed the two trees in the middle.
Comr. Sessine – the views referred to in the regulations are the views from public spaces, not the views from private property.
EP Magee – that is correct and is enforced by the comments from John Gaucher.
Comr. Bailey – appreciates that the two center trees were removed. She doesn’t feel that the other trees will block views from public property. The trees do give scale to the beach. The part of the beach that abuts the parking lot is under utilized. People cross that no-man’s-land to get down near the water. Adding a boardwalk for safe crossing is a nice improvement. That the project is being done in stages is a plus. The location of the shade structure needs to be addressed but it is definitely needed.

Comr. D’Andrea – agreed that the two trees needed to be removed, isn’t opposed to the location of the shade structure and will support the motion as proposed.

Comr. Sessine – asked Comr. Goletz to revise the motion to exclude the shade structure.

Comr. Goletz – proposed a revision to include the condition excluding the shade structure.

Comr. D’Andrea – does this exclude the boardwalk under the shade structure?

TP Kral – no, just the shade structure because the boardwalk is not a structure.

Vice Chairman Cost – asked Comr. Grigsby if he felt the Town would be protected if this proposal was approved.

Comr. Grigsby – the point of Coastal Area Management, in part, is to protect the coastal resources but also to insure that the coastal resources are used as coastal resources. One way to look at it is, you are adding trees; you are blocking the view; you are making the beach smaller. Another way to look at it is, you are improving the facilities there which will make it more likely that people of different abilities, of different ages and different mobility levels will be able to enjoy those coastal resources.

TP Kral – the coastal management program has multiple objectives. To preserve and protect undeveloped areas is a big part of it. Preserving and protecting visual resources is a big part of it. Encouraging access and use is also a major goal. Sometimes there is a conflict. Part of the Commission’s job is to make a judgment as to whether or not the overall impact of this project meets a substantial goal of the Coastal Management Act.

APPROVED:
OPPOSED:   None
ABSTAINED:  Motion carried 6-0-0

B. Special Permit


Upon a motion by Mr. Goletz, seconded by Mr. Sessine, the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to receive the application for William Palmer and schedule it for public hearing on 12/19/12.

2. Guilford High School: property located at 605 New England Road, Map 84/85, Lot 1/9, Zone R-5. Special permit to allow a Town building to exceed 35’ in height. §273-31. Receive and set public hearing for 1/16/13.

Upon a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. D’Andrea, the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to receive the application for Guilford High School and schedule it for public hearing on 1/16/13.


Upon a motion by Mr. D’Andrea, seconded by Ms. Bailey, the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to receive the application for Richard Mazzella and schedule it for public hearing on 1/16/13.

C. Zoning Code Amendments

1. Amendment to Zoning Code Regarding “Coastal Jurisdiction Line” Amend the Zoning Code by substituting “Coastal Jurisdiction Line as defined by CGS 22a-361” for “Mean High Tide” in the
Upon a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. D’Andrea, the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to receive the proposed amendment to the zoning code and schedule it for public hearing on 12/19/12.

D. Mandatory Referrals

1. Town of Guilford: Purchase of Lot 3 off of Fire Tower Road located on Subdivision Map 2809. Receive and take action.

EP Magee – this is a 5 ½ acre parcel located on the top of Bluff Head. This is the only undeveloped lot in the three-lot subdivision. Land Acquisition is interested in this parcel because of the scenic views available to hikers and the proximity of the parcel to other Land Conservation Trust and other Town of Guilford property. The Board of Selectmen has approved this to go to Town Meeting.

MOTION: M. Sessine
2ND: F. D’Andrea
REPORTS FAVORABLY: The Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission reports favorably to the Board of Selectmen for purchase of Lot 3 off of Fire Tower Road as shown on map entitled “Record subdivision map and site development plan, property of John H. Johnson & Eleanor Johnson, Guilford, Conn, Date: May 17, 1982, rev. through 10-20-82, Anderson Associates” which map is recorded as map No. 2809.

APPROVED:
OPPOSED: None
ABSTAINED: Motion carried 6-0-0

E. Correspondence - none

F. Other

1. Town of Guilford: property located at Map 125, Lot 6, request for modification to Condition 4 of the July 28, 1982 subdivision approval for John H. & Eleanor Johnson, Lot 3, Fire Tower Road.

EP Magee – each of the three parcels is responsible for a share of the road maintenance. The Town doesn’t want to get caught up in a third split in the maintenance of the common driveway since there will not be regular traffic wear and tear on its part. We met with the other two property owners and drafted an agreement that gives them better understanding of the road maintenance. We are proposing to replace the note on the plan with a road maintenance and easement agreement.

Vice Chairman Cost – if the Town buys this, are there any restrictions as to what they can put on the property. EP Magee – it will only be for open space, Class A passive recreation. There can be no towers.

MOTION: M. Sessine
2ND: P. Goletz
Voted: That the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission approve a revision to its July 28, 1982 approval letter of a subdivision application for John Johnson and Eleanor Johnson, by deleting condition #4 and replacing it with the November 17, 2012 Road Maintenance Agreement.

APPROVED:
OPPOSED: None
ABSTAINED: Motion carried 6-0-0
G. Committees

Planning Committee – December 18, 2012 Selectman’s meeting room 5:15PM

Zoning Committee – December 10, 2012 Town Hall South 5:00PM

H. Approval of Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NH Register</td>
<td>$286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB Mason</td>
<td>165.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore Pub.</td>
<td>208.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$659.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon a motion by Mr. Sessine, seconded by Mr. Grigsby, the Guilford Planning and Zoning Commission voted unanimously to approve payment of the bills as submitted.

I. Approval of Minutes

11/7/12 - Tabled

There being no further business, and upon a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. D'Andrea, it was unanimously voted to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Donnette Stahnke
Administrative Assistant Planning and Zoning Commission