

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

March 2, 2010

Present: Michael Autuori
Peter Chipouras
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz
James McChesney
Phil Mische
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Patrick Walsh, Vice Chairman

Absent: Joseph Fossi

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

At 7:34 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2010-020-PR:** Plenary Ruling application as required by Section 7.6 of the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Regulations for the Town of Ridgefield for regulated activities within the wetlands and upland review areas for piping and reconstruction of watercourses in conjunction with the development of a single family residence on property located on **Second and Third Lanes** in the RA zone. Owner: Wayne E. Wood and The Estate of Charles F. Dean, Jr. Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy, VII, P.E. *65 days to commence public hearing ends 5/6/2010. For receipt, schedule walk and public hearing.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a site walk for 3/21/10 and a public hearing for 4/6/10.

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site walk and public hearing as suggested.

Mr. Katz asked the Agent if this application was essentially the same as the application that had been reviewed by the Board previously, and whether it was worth the time and expense of the Board and staff to review it again. The Agent reminded Mr. Katz and the Board that the previous application was withdrawn before final Board action, and that items that were left unfinished in the review at the end of the hearing process had now been completed. The applicant was left with the belief that at least several of the Board members would be willing to review a new application provided that the drawings and information were revised according to the latest

comments from the Board's consultant. She noted that all fees had been paid in full, as well as all current consultant fees.

The motion for receipt of the application, site walk on March 21st and public hearing on April 6th passed by a vote of 8-0.

2. **#2010-021-SR:** Summary Ruling application as required by Section 7.5 of the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Regulations for the Town of Ridgefield to permit activity in the upland review area in conjunction with construction of a swimming pool, terrace and pavilion on property located at **39 Boulder Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owners/Applicants: Christopher & Catherine Desmarais. Auth. Agent: Studer Design Associates, Inc. *65-day action period ends 5/6/2010. For receipt and schedule walk.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a site walk for 3/21/10 and a review of the application on 3/23/10.

Mr. Walsh motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site walk and discussion date as suggested. The motion passed, 8-0.

Mr. Katz noted an error on the application where the proposed area of construction was identified as a wetlands area, when in fact it is a regulated upland review area. The Agent acknowledged the error on the application.

BOARD WALKS

As noted above, the Board scheduled the following for site walks on **March 21, 2010:**

- **#2010-020-PR:** Plenary Ruling **Second and Third Lanes**, Wayne E. Wood and The Estate of Charles F. Dean, Jr.
- **#2010-021-SR:** Summary Ruling **39 Boulder Hill Road**, Desmarais

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2008-096-SP-SR:** request to release bond in the amount of \$2,250.00, **167 Silver Spring Road**, McAuley. *Agent recommends 100% release with understanding new owner post new bond.*

Chairman Mucchetti referenced a memo from Wetlands Inspector/Agent Aimee Pardee, and the recommendation that the bond be released in full, with new bond amounts to be set for the new owner when additional work is done on the property. The Agent reported that the site is stabilized at this time.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to release the bond in full. The motion passed, 7-0-1, with Mr. Walsh recused.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the minutes of February 9, 2010. The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

March 2, 2010

Present: Michael Autuori
Peter Chipouras
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz
James McChesney
Phil Mische
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Patrick Walsh, Vice Chairman

Absent: Joseph Fossi

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning
Linda Caponetti, Recording Secretary

At 7:40 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order. The items were addressed in a revised order, because the Commission was waiting for applicants who were first attending the Architectural Advisory Committee and Village District Consultant meeting in the next room.

PENDING ITEMS

[**Note**/The following item was withdrawn prior to a public hearing scheduled for 7:30 p.m., and there was no discussion during the regular meeting: **#2010-002-SP**: Special Permit application under Section 9.2 as required by Section 3.3.D.2 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to conduct a major home occupation in the single-family residence located at 180 Barlow Mountain Road in the RAA zone. Owner/Apl.: Barbara Morris. *Received 1/5/2010. 35-day action period ends 4/6/2010. Application withdrawn. The Commission unanimously acknowledged the withdrawal.*]

1. **#2010-009-REV(SP)**: Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for a change of use from retail to restaurant requiring additional parking located at **107-109 Danbury Road** in the B-1 zone. Owner/Apl.: Cops Hill Common, LLC. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *65-day action period ends 4/15/2010. Received 2/9/10. Draft Resolution of Approval requested and tabled 2/17/2010. Review modification of application/for discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Planner if she was satisfied with the re-definition of the purpose of the application, as per letter dated February 19, 2010 from Attorney Robert Jewell. The Planner said she felt the new description of the request for the Special Permit revision was adequate.

Chairman Mucchetti referenced the draft resolution of approval prepared by the Planner.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the resolution as drafted. The Planner offered a few corrections/additions, adding the zone designation in the first paragraph, and referencing the Plan of Conservation and Development under "Reasons."

The motion to approve the application according to the amended resolution passed by a vote of 8-0.

2. **#2010-011-REV(SP/VDC):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e as required by Section 5.1 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to permit signage on awning in addition to wall sign, and Revision to previous VDC approval to modify awnings with signage for expanded restaurant, on property located at **24 Prospect Street (Piccolo Pizza)** in the CBD zone. Owner: Pretty LLC. Appl.: Matthew Criscuolo. *Received 2/17/2010. 35 days to receive VDC report ends 3/24/2010. 65-day action period ends 4/23/2010. For discussion after receipt of VDC report/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti explained that this item would be reviewed at the same time as item #5, in combined discussion, because the businesses are adjacent, in the same building. Mr. Katz questioned the reason for review of signage for the rear-facing parking lot side of the building. The Agent explained that the parking lot side is also visible from Bailey Ave. The Chairman noted that Item #5 will have the same review for the same reason.

Applicants Matthew Criscuolo (for this application) and Sharon McSpedon (for The Pilates Barre) appeared together to present their proposals for awnings and signage. They said the Village District Consultant had reviewed the applications together. The Chairman read minutes and comments received from the VDC, and said that the applications would be decided separately, following discussion.

It was determined that the single awning along the parking lot (Bailey Avenue) side of the building will identify both businesses, with each using their own logo colors. Mr. Criscuolo said the VDC allowed that the awning may consist of two separate awnings stitched together in the center.

Ms. McSpedon said that she and Mr. Criscuolo were in agreement with the VDC recommendations for the Prospect Street side of the building, but she suggested to the VDC that hanging signs on the corners of the building might be advisable. She said that she and Mr. Criscuolo agreed with the VDC on two perpendicular hanging signs over the sidewalk on the corners of the building, and one large awning with signage.

Mr. Criscuolo said that he and Ms. McSpedon then had some discussion with each other after the VDC meeting. They were both uncomfortable with the single awning

sign combining both colors, and would prefer separating them. He requested that the Commission allow them to separate the awnings by 3 or 4 ft. The square footage of signage would remain the same, but each business would be able to distinguish itself. The awnings would be mounted symmetrically on the building, with one over each window.

The Planner asked the applicants if they still intended on requesting the two hanging signs. They did. Mr. Chipouras was opposed to the hanging signs. Mr. Criscuolo explained why he felt they were important to his business.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve Mr. Criscuolo's application (Piccolo Pizza) with the following conditions:

- On the parking lot side, there will be (1) a black awning with matte finish and white lettering over the new, expanded space, (2) the existing sign on the fascia will be removed, (3) the window in the currently occupied space will be "cleaned up" to remove excess signage, with the window lettering to remain.
- On the Prospect Street side of the building, there will be a black awning with matte finish and white lettering over the window on half of the building (the west side), and a hanging sign of approximately 1.5 X 2 feet at the edge of the building (similar to hanging signs on businesses on Bailey Avenue).

The motion to approve the application with these conditions passed, 8-0.

3. **#2010-012-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e as required by Section 3.3.D.2 of the zoning regulations (major home occupation) to modify the condition requiring that produce for-sale be grown on the premises, on property located at **34 Craigmoor Road and North Salem Road**, "Garden of Ideas." Owners/Applicants: Ilsa Svendsen and Joseph Keller. *Received 2/17/2010. Application withdrawn 2/18/2010. Acknowledge withdrawal.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of the withdrawal of the application. Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to acknowledge the withdrawal. The motion passed, 8-0.

Mr. McChesney asked the Planner to explain the reasons for the withdrawal.

Planner Brosius pointed out that the zoning regulations prohibit sale of produce not grown "on the premises," and the applicants would need a variance or a change in the zoning regulations in order to apply for use of off-site land for growing of produce to be sold on their property. The Planner said that some towns allow this by Special Permit, but Ridgefield does not. The applicants are now fully aware of the procedures to follow, should they decide to move forward, she said.

This question and explanation set off a discussion of possible alternatives to changing the regulations. There was general support among Commission members for the concept of promoting local growing and sale of produce. Dr. Autuori asked how this

could be enabled. Farm stands are “as of right,” the Planner noted. Specific situations were discussed, such as contiguous properties with one farm stand between them.

The Planner said that, if the Commission decides it wants to amend the regulations to allow this by Special Permit, she would draft something for review. Under a Special Permit, the Commission has some control of it, she said. The Planner warned against allowing the potential for someone to sell large quantities of produce grown elsewhere in town.

Mr. Walsh was strongly opposed to amending the regulations, saying he is “not in favor of having multiple pieces of property” being used to “cultivate and sell on another residential piece of property.” This creates a retail use in a residential neighborhood, he said, which is “exactly why this property received so much scrutiny” in the first application, he added.

Mr. Katz disagreed. Referring to the prior application, he said that granting permission for the sale of art goes far beyond the sale of locally grown produce. He did feel that the wording of the Special Permit should pay careful attention to avoiding the potential for “a supermarket” in a neighborhood. However, he felt the Commission should support and encourage the local growth of produce whenever possible.

Mr. Walsh maintained that the Farmer’s Market provides the opportunity for this.

Mr. Mische asked about produce grown on contiguous property, wondering if that would be worth exploring. He pointed out that there is the potential for two as-of-right farms stands if adjoining properties are used for growing produce, and the applicant’s request in this case would decrease that potential intensity, if they were allowed to sell produce from one location.

The Planner said that Connecticut has long promoted itself as an agricultural state, but with the understanding that there is need for regulation to limit the size and intensity of the use. She said she was a proponent of encouraging the concept, but with the control provided by the Special Permit process. She suggested starting with investigating the possibility of only contiguous properties.

It was agreed that the Planner should draft some language that would permit a property owner to use contiguous property for growing produce for sale, following Commission review of an application for Special Permit where conditions could be imposed to limit the size and intensity of the use. Mr. Katz interjected, “the geography has to be specific, it has to be Special Permit, and it has to be owned or leased within the geography of Ridgefield.”

The Planner stated that the particular property in question would need very strict controls because of strong neighborhood involvement and/or opposition at the public hearing for their prior application.

An informal vote was taken on whether to proceed with drafting a regulation. Mr. McChesney was undecided; Commissioners Katz, Autuori and Chipouras were in favor; Commissioners Walsh, Mucchetti and Mische were against. (Mr. Mische was against unless the proposal was for contiguous properties only.) The proposal did not go forward, but then discussion continued.

Mr. Mische encouraged further consideration of at least the contiguous properties scenario.

The Chairman stated that the current economy is resulting in a growing interest in home occupations, which is putting pressure on zoning agencies to take a second look at some of their regulations.

Mr. Katz said that there has been a resurgence of interest in farming and buying local produce, and that “there is a move afoot to cut down on travel and on how far food is shipped...” He strongly supported creating the opportunity within the regulations for supporting the growth and sale of local produce.

Mr. Walsh disagreed, once again citing the Farmers’ Market, which is located in a retail area and, he feels, provides an adequate outlet for the sale of produce. There are actually two farmers’ markets in town, the Chairman noted.

Mr. Mische felt that the Farmers’ Market caters to large growers, while a farm stand enables individuals who so desire to grow a few bushels of a crop and sell them. At his urging, there was a show of hands indicating the Commission’s desire to have the Planner draft language to amend the regulations governing the sale of produce in a residential zone. The majority were in favor.

NEW ITEMS

4. **#2010-015-REF:** Referral under Section 8-24 of the Connecticut General Statutes for a gas main extension project along **Market Street and East Ridge**. 35-day action period ends 4/6/2010. *For comment.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Planner to describe the proposal for gas main extension.

The Planner displayed maps prepared by the Town Engineer, and explained the proposed Town connection of a new gas pipeline to the Main Street line provided by Yankee Gas. The Town pipeline would go down Market Street for access by Veteran’s Park School, and south on East Ridge Road to the Middle School.

Mr. Walsh questioned why an 8-24 referral was needed. It was clarified that the 8-24 referral was required because it is the Town (not the gas provider) that is extending the public utility. Mr. Walsh asked if private residences would be able to tap into the

line. The Planner said the purpose of the line was primarily for the schools, but she was unsure as to the availability of the gas line for private use. Mr. Walsh asked, "If it remained a public utility used for a public purpose," why would an 8-24 referral be needed? The Planner reiterated that a referral is needed when a town extends utilities.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to provide a "favorable report" to the Board of Selectmen with regard to the proposed utility line installation. The motion passed, 8-0.

5. **#2010-016-VDC:** Village District Application under Section 8.3 of the zoning regulations for awnings with signage to be located on existing building located at **28 Prospect Street (The Pilates Barre)** in the CBD zone. Owner: Matthew Criscuolo. Appl./Auth. Agent: Sharon McSpedon. *35 days to receive Village District report ends 4/6/2010. For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti explained that this item would be reviewed at the same time as item #2, in combined discussion, because the businesses are in the same building. Applicants Matthew Criscuolo (for Piccolo's Pizza) and Sharon McSpedon (for this application) appeared together to present their proposals for awnings and signage. The Chairman read minutes and comments received from the Village District Consultant.

[See discussion under #2, above.]

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to approve Ms. McSpedon's application (The Pilates Barre) with the following conditions:

- On the parking lot side, there will be (1) a burgundy-colored awning with matte finish and white lettering, over the new business space.
- On the Prospect Street side of the building, there will be a burgundy awning with matte finish and white lettering over the window on half of the building (the east side), and a hanging sign of approximately 1.5 X 2 feet or 2 X 3 feet at the edge of the building (similar to hanging signs on businesses on Bailey Avenue).

The motion to approve the application with these conditions passed, 8-0.

6. **#2010-018-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e of the zoning regulations to construct new brick-sided dugouts on baseball fields behind the Venus Municipal Building located at **90 East Ridge Road** in the RA zone. Owner: Town of Ridgefield. Appl./Auth. Agent: RHS Homerun Booster Club and Ridgefield Babe Ruth. *65-day action period ends 5/6/2010. For receipt/discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized Stefano Zandri, contractor and organizer for the project, and Bob Alicea, President of the Ridgefield Babe Ruth League.

The Chairman read the minutes and comments received from the Architectural Advisory Committee, which approved the design as presented.

Mr. Zandri explained the application and his role in the project. He was able to get donations from local businesses to cover materials. Approval of the dugout design (drawings prepared by architect Peter Coffin) and the installation was all that was being requested at the time. They hoped to start construction as soon as weather permits, in order to be ready for the spring/summer baseball season.

Following discussion,

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the application as submitted, according to the drawings provided by the applicant, and with the following conditions based on the AAC review:

- The rubber membrane roof color should not be black, but should be complimentary to the roof of the Venus Building.
- The dugouts should be built according to the drawings provided.
- The floors should be pitched toward the field.

The motion to approve the application with these conditions passed by a vote of 8-0.

7. **#2010-019-Misc:** proposed installation of garden hoop house on property located at **Scotts Ridge Middle School, 750 North Salem Road** in the RAA zone. Owner: Town of Ridgefield. Appl.: Rick Taylor, Science Dept. *For discussion. Authorize PD administrative review/ approval.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the proposed temporary “hoop house” would be located near the detention basin at the back of the school, down the hill below the soccer field, and would not be visible from the street. The Planner is asking for administrative authority to review the application.

The Planner explained that a middle school science teacher had worked with students last year to plant a garden on the site, and this is a “greenhouse” for the same project.

Mr. Chipouras motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to authorize the Planner to deal with the matter administratively. The motion passed, 8-0.

8. **#2010-022-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e of the zoning regulations to install permanent 9/11 Memorial to be located at **195 Danbury Road**, (Parks and Recreation) in the RAA zone. Owner/App.: Town of Ridgefield. Auth. Agent: Stephen Zemo. *65-day action period ends 5/6/2010. For receipt/discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized Stephen Zemo, Agent for the applicant. [**Note:** Mr. Zemo briefly explained the proposal to the Commission and then attended the Architectural Advisory Committee meeting in the next room, for review. Mr. Zemo returned later in the meeting to continue the discussion with the Commission.]

Mr. Zemo displayed drawings prepared by Delalla Associates and gave a brief history of the project. Post 9/11, the Port Authority of New York was looking for municipalities to pick up pieces of I-beam from the Twin Towers. This was brought to the Town's attention by Mr. Zemo, and a committee was appointed by the Board of Selectmen to do a feasibility study. Ten potential sites were identified. The two lead contenders were Ballard Park and the Parks and Recreation facility on Danbury Road. After months of meetings, it was decided that the memorial sculpture and gardens will be located on the Parks and Recreation property. Mr. Zemo gave a detailed description of the project, explaining that the final plans would need to go back to the Port Authority for approval. He said the chances for Ridgefield getting the I-beam are quite good. The goal is to have the dedication on 9/11/10.

Mr. Chipouras asked who would be charged with maintaining the memorial. Mr. Zemo said that Parks and Recreation requested that the materials be maintenance free, and they would maintain the lawns. But they also suggested that \$10-\$20,000 be earmarked for the maintenance of the site.

It was hoped that committee member(s) might have some ability to select the specific piece of I-beam to be used for the memorial.

After the AAC review, Mr. Zemo came back to report their comments. The AAC asked the applicant to provide additional landscaping. It was confirmed that the changes involved plant material only and did not change anything else about the application.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the concept plan and location for the memorial sculpture, understanding that details of the landscaping would be developed further, based on input from the Architectural Advisory Committee. The Planner noted that the monument (but not the sidewalks and benches) would need to meet the setback requirements for the zone, and the drawings appeared to be correct.

The motion to approve the application passed, 8-0.

9. **#2010-023-REV(S):** Revision to approved subdivision plan, condition #7 requiring shared driveways between lots 1 and 2 on property located at **Peaceable Street** (Ward Acres Farm Subdivision) in the RAA zone. Owners: Diane McNamara, Donald Sturges and James Sturges. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *65-day action period ends 5/6/2010. For receipt/discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized Rex Gustafson, agent for the applicant, who explained the request.

Mr. Gustafson stated that the additional driveway cut proposed on Peaceable Street is a modification of the Subdivision approval requiring that Lots 1 and 2 have combined driveways. The additional driveway will provide privacy for both lots, he

said. Donald Sturges (one of the owners of Lot 1 and head of the homeowner's association) contacted all the owners and got their approval. He provided an affidavit stating such.

Mr. Gustafson said that Planner Brosius alerted him to the fact that a conservation easement will be crossed in the creation of the driveway, and State statute requires that the holder of the easement be notified when work is proposed within the easement. She provided him with the necessary forms, which he completed. He stated that the driveway will not take away from the open space donation in the subdivision (about 23% of the property). The conservation easement was imposed in addition to the open space, he said. Mr. Gustafson stated that the property line adjacent to the "foliage peninsula" would be moved.

Mr. Katz pointed out that the new property line goes directly through the foliage peninsula, (shown on the map). Mr. Gustafson agreed. Mr. Katz asked, "Who will own and maintain the trees?" Both property owners, Mr. Gustafson replied.

Discussion continued. Some confusion existed as to the plan for the foliage peninsula. Mr. Gustafson explained that it would not be disturbed if the second driveway were allowed, but it would be "broken" to access the second lot from the first, if only one driveway is permitted.

The Chairman suggested adding the properties to the walk schedule for 3/21/10. Some Commissioners saw no need for a walk. The Chairman noted that several Commissioners felt the walk would be helpful and the applicant was in agreement. Also, she noted, there was no specific timeline to meet.

Although the applicant had photographs of the site, there were several Commissioners who wished to do a site walk.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to schedule a site walk for 3/21/10. The applicant will mark the proposed driveway location (new road cut) on Peaceable Street, and also the location of a driveway to Lot 1 which would require a break in the "landscaped peninsula" (row of trees) in the event that the Revision to the Subdivision Approval is not granted.

Chairman Mucchetti asked to add an item to the agenda, to report on the Route 7 Corridor Study public meeting held the previous evening in Wilton. The Commission agreed unanimously to add the new item.

10. Route 7 Corridor Study Meeting, held 3/1/10 in Wilton.

Chairman Mucchetti noted that there was a good turnout for the meeting including the Planner and herself, the First Selectman, two EDC members, and some Norwalk Trail representatives from Ridgefield. "Ridgefield is getting a lot of attention in this

study,” she said. In the traffic study, it was found that a significant amount of traffic on Rte.7 actually turns off at Rte.35 and the Branchville Rd. intersections, heading into Ridgefield. Also, Branchville is the primary focus of attention for a transportation oriented district (TOD). She said the meeting was well attended and encouraged Commissioners to attend future meetings.

The Planner said that the traffic report is on the web at www.route7study.org. She gave a brief summary of the meetings topics. There are three focus areas, she said, with Branchville being one. The Planner said she would notify the Commission when the focus group will be meeting.

The Chairman said that the study is also looking at what is in the corridor and what people would like to see there. Work force housing was discussed at length, she said. She and the Planner gave some statistics related to housing and the discussions and plans relating to it.

Dr. Autuori is concerned that this study as well as the Draft Plan of Conservation and Development do not confuse the new Norwalk River Valley Trail with the Sugar Hollow Greenway. One does not replace the other. There will be additional discussion on the Sugar Hollow Greenway during the workshop with the Commission consultant for the POCD.

COMMISSION WALKS

As noted above, the Commission scheduled the following for site walk on **March 21, 2010:**

- **#2010-023-REV(S):** Revision to approved subdivision, **Peaceable Street,** McNamara/Sturges

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Wall Street Journal article about the growing trend for home occupations.
- Letter re proposed roofing shingles at the Ridgefield Housing Authority site, for the stone building (former Board of Education offices)

Chairman Mucchetti informed the Commission of the proposed meeting schedule for the month of March:

- **March 4th – Thursday** – Public Information Meeting on the update to the POCD, meeting to be held in the Board of Education large meeting room at the Annex
- **March 9th** – Regular meeting
- **March 16th** - Regular meeting will be canceled.
- **March 23rd** – Regular meeting
- **March 30th** - Workshop with consultant Planimetrics, on the update to the POCD.

MINUTES

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the minutes of February 9, 2010. The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary