

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

May 19, 2009

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

Absent: Peter Chipouras

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

At 7:30 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

There were no pending items.

NEW ITEMS

There were no new items.

BOARD WALKS

There were no walks to be scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Soils Report from Mary Jaehnig for the Hickory Lane subdivision (public hearing scheduled for 6/19/09)

MINUTES

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the minutes of May 5, 2009. The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

May 19, 2009

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

Absent: Peter Chipouras

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

At 7:32 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

[Note: Item #2 was addressed first, to accommodate the applicant.]

1. **#2009-027-A:** Proposed **amendment** to the zoning regulations, **exterior lighting regulations, Section 7.8.B** c/o Michael Autuori.

Chairman Mucchetti reviewed the proposed amendment, noting that three versions were at the table for review; Dr. Autuori's original version, the staff's version, and a combination of both.

Mr. McChesney asked how the new regulation would affect people applying for a home occupation requiring a zoning permit. Would all exterior lighting need to be changed?

The Planner said, if there is lighting that relates to the home occupation application, that lighting must comply with the regulations.

Specific situations were discussed. The Planner used a prior jewelry business application which was approved to describe examples of lighting that would need to comply.

There was lengthy discussion about the revised draft of the amendment, including how it should apply to residential uses and residential zones. Also discussed were the

potential difficulties with enforcement, and the specific lighting covered under an ordinance if it were to be created by the Board of Selectmen.

The Planner, in response to questioning from Mr. Mische, said that the first part of the applicability section would allow the Commission, or ZEO Richard Baldelli, or the Planner (under a site plan approval) to require that any lighting needed for the home occupation itself needs to comply with the regulations.

Mr. Katz felt that the wording was confusing, and said it appears that a multi-family use, such as the Casagmo condominiums, would not have to comply. The wording should exempt single family uses, he said, not non-conforming, residential, multi-family uses.

Mr. Walsh asked if such multi-family uses wouldn't fall under a Special Permit. They would. This was precisely why Mr. Walsh felt the regulation was not necessary, he said.

Mr. Katz preferred rewording of the regulation to clarify the inclusion of the words “non single family residential use.”

The Chairman said that this wording had been removed the prior week.

The Planner said there appeared to be enough confusion to suggest an attempt at rewriting a clearer regulation.

Mr. Katz said, “We ought to wordsmith it to the best of our ability, agree on the wording, and take the consequences...”.

Mr. Fossi supported a re-draft of the regulation.

The Chairman felt clarification was needed before the Planner could proceed with a re-draft.

Dr. Autuori said that the regulation should encompass large multi-family residential developments, such as Casagmo and Fox Hill. He asked if the regulation should include mixed use applications, such as first floor businesses, with apartments on the second floor. He felt those uses should be included as well.

Mr. Katz asked the Planner to include the term “single family” housing, as it properly delineates the intent of the regulation.

The Chairman asked the Commission to review the original language provided by Dr. Autuori, and to be clear about what they are requesting.

The Planner asked Dr. Autuori if he wished to include two- and three-family units in the regulation. “What about accessory apartments?” she asked.

Some on the Commission preferred to exclude two-family units from the regulation.

Discussion continued around the issue of rewording to clarify uses for inclusion and exemption, as intended by the Commission.

Mr. Katz said three-family units are considered multi-family. The Planner noted, “By fire code, as well.”

Mr. McChesney suggested putting zoning permits back into the language (top sheet, as per staff comment).

Discussion continued as to the intention of the regulation. Clarification was achieved.

The Chairman asked if the table contained enough votes to move to a public hearing.

Mr. McChesney suggested adding the changes and going to a public hearing.

The Planner said another draft would be necessary first. She asked the Commission to consider how much extra work the implementation of the regulation (with the changes) would create for the office. She asked that they consider this carefully and make sure that the regulation is something they feel strongly about going forward with. She felt that the magnitude of the workload it will create was not fully understood by the Commission. She gave specific examples and scenarios.

The discussion continued back and forth around pursuing this item or not, with a strong appeal from Dr. Autuori to pursue the proposed regulation, at least to the public hearing phase.

Mr. McChesney felt a public hearing on the issue was warranted.

Mr. Fossi felt the regulation would be extremely difficult to enforce.

The Chairman called it, “regulatory creep at its most advanced.”

Mr. Katz suggested a future two part approach to the problem of exterior lighting regulation, with one part dealing with commercial/multi-family uses, and the other, with residential uses; (with the selectmen being responsible for the residential part.) He also suggested “beefing up” the current regulations so that a revision to a Special Permit could include lights that were not in the original Special Permit.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to request another draft of the regulation, incorporating the concerns expressed by some of the Commissioners. The vote was 4-4 with Dr. Autuori, Mr. Mische, Mr. Walsh and Dr. Gelfman in favor, and

Chairman Mucchetti, Mr. Katz, Mr. McChesney and Mr. Fossi against. The motion failed to pass.

2. **#2009-033-VDC-REV(SP):** Village District Application under Section 8.3 and Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to permit outdoor deck display on property located at **29 Prospect Street**, Ridgefield Supply Company, in the CBD zone. Owner: Louis Price. Appl./Auth. Agent: Bennett Fletcher. *65-day action period for revision ends 7/16/2009. 35-days to receive VDC report ends 6/16/2009. Received 5/12/2009. For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti introduced Ben Fletcher, authorized agent for the owner. A revised plan was reviewed, and discussion continued relative to the location of the proposed work, and the report that was received from the Village District Consultant (VDC).

The Planner stated the minutes from the VDC were hand written, and then the official typewritten copy was received. The VDC suggested relocating the deck to the west side of the entrance to the building, and recommended that a new plan be submitted.

Mr. Fletcher met with Mr. Jeff Mose, who is also a member of the VDC, and revisions were made to the plans. He provided the revised plans to the Commission.

The layout and the design were revised, but Mr. Fletcher said that Mr. Mose understood the reasoning behind the applicant's desire to keep the deck on the easterly side of the entrance way. Mr. Mose suggested adding shrubbery as a buffer zone between the deck display and the parking lot, Mr. Fletcher said.

Chairman Mucchetti asked Mr. Fletcher, "In what capacity" did Mr. Mose visit the site and assist in the revision? Mr. Fletcher said he was there as an individual, not as a representative of the VDC. The Chairman confirmed that Mr. Fletcher was asking the Commission to consider the display in its original location on the easterly side of the entryway (on the street side of Ridgefield Supply.) "That is correct," Mr. Fletcher said, adding that the display had been reduced in size and landscaping had been added.

Mr. McChesney asked if the application could be approved as revised.

The Planner said that the regulations require the Commission to wait for a report from the VDC before taking action, but the regulations also state that, if the applicant decides against resubmitting revised plans to the VDC, then the failure of the VDC to come to a final conclusion on the application would not be considered "failure to act". The Commission would be able to make a decision on what was submitted, so far, at that point.

Mr. McChesney said that he would like to make the final decision to approve, because he liked what the applicant had presented and the reasons for their choices. He motioned to approve the revised application. Mr. Katz seconded the motion.

Mr. Walsh said he agreed theoretically with both Mr. McChesney and Mr. Katz, but, noted “there is a procedure in place which has not been followed.” He said the applicant went before the VDC and recommendations were made. The applicant went back to the site with a member of the VDC (who was not acting in an official capacity) and made revisions. The applicant did not reject the VDC's recommendations. He altered the plan, Mr. Walsh said, incorporating some changes, but not all. Mr. Walsh liked the plan, but said that there is a process in place which can not be bypassed.

Mr. Katz said, “I thought we learned from the Planner that a final decision from the VDC is not what's required.”

Planner Brosius said the regulation says that the Commission shall take action on the application upon receipt of the report from the Village District Consultant. Also, prior to that: “A request from the VDC for resubmission of the application based on the VDC recommendation shall not be considered failure to act.” The regulations do not prohibit the Commission from considering the VDC report or the applicant's response. (In essence, the applicant would be saying that he preferred his original location, she said.)

However, **Mr. Walsh** noted that the applicant had gone back and changed the application from what had been originally reviewed by the VDC. He was very pleased with the new plan, but, advised that, to proceed with an approval at that point, would be giving the regulatory process “short shrift.”

The Chairman felt Mr. Walsh's point was valid because there were revisions made in the field and a member of the VDC (though not in a professional capacity) was involved.

Mr. McChesney said he did not want to go against the VDC. “And we don't want to set a precedent,” the Chairman added.

Mr. Katz asked the Planner to go over the changes made to the application, which she did. He said the revised application could be described as “less intense” than the original one.

The Chairman said that shouldn't matter. There had been a modification made, which the VDC had not reviewed.

The Planner felt the regulations would allow the Commission to act at that point. Her concern was that the VDC may not meet again until June 9.

Discussion continued in an effort to avoid undue delay, and yet follow the intent of the regulations.

Dr. Autuori felt it would be “ridiculous” to wait for another meeting when the Commission had already heard and seen the VDC report. He saw this application as a situation where the Commission would have the ability to approve with modifications or conditions.

Chairman Mucchetti countered that the VDC had not seen the modification. She went on to say that the Commission had not used the VDC often, and there seem to be some quirks within the process which hadn't been identified or anticipated. She asked the Planner if the applicant withdrew the modification and went with the original application (which the VDC had reviewed), if action would be allowed. The Planner felt that either plan could be approved under the regulation. The Commission has the final say, the Planner noted.

Dr. Gelfman added, “We're here to make judgments.”

The consensus was that the modified version was the preferred plan.

Mr. Mische asked about the Special Permit part of the application. The Planner said that there are actually two applications, the modification and the Special Permit, each requiring a motion and a second.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the revised plans under the application submitted pursuant to the Village District regulations, with acknowledgment that a report, although inconclusive, had been received from the Village District consultant. The motion passed, 6-2, with Mr. Walsh and Chairman Mucchetti voting against.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the Revision to the Special Permit (as modified) in accordance with the plans approved under the Village District application review. The motion passed, 6-2, with Mr. Walsh and Chairman Mucchetti voting against.

3. **#2009-035-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit Application under Section 9.2.A.7.e to convert approx. 4,000 s.f. of space from a day care to 6 residential apartments including one restricted affordable unit under Section 8-30g of the Connecticut General Statutes located at **100 Danbury Road, Unit C** in the B-3 zone. Owner/App.: Ridgefield Apartments, Inc. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *65-day action period ends 7/16/2009. Received 5/12/2009. For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti introduced attorney Robert Jewell and the owner of Ridgefield Apartments, Stephen Zemo, present for the application review.

Mr. Jewell said that he had corrected some errors pointed out by the Planner with regard to the affordability plan, the date, and the proposed deed restriction for the original affordable units. He described the designated affordable units. There are no health or safety issues, he said.

Mr. McChesney asked if additional exterior doors were being added. The answer was negative.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the application, as presented. The Planner noted that a condition in the approval should reference the time at which documents for the affordable unit restrictions should be filed [prior to the issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy]. The motion to approve the application passed, 8-0.

4. **#2008-032-RCS: Ridgefield Center Study. Edits, For discussion.**

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the Ridgefield Center Study had been reviewed at a public meeting and asked Commissioners if there were any final comments, prior to finalizing the document. The Planner gave a brief report of her presentation at the Police Commission meeting the prior week, where she explained the nature of the document and how it will be used by the Commission.

It was noted that Mr. Katz had already given his comments to the Planner. Several Commissioners expressed concern about the quality of the maps in the report. The Planner was concerned that, since most people will view the document online, the maps need to be readable and able to be enlarged for printing and for better viewing online.

Mr. McChesney asked for confirmation that the Study would be referenced in the Plan of Conservation and Development, but that it would not be included in its entirety as part of the Plan. The Planner and the Chairman confirmed that it would be referenced only.

The Planner will visit with the consultants to facilitate the final changes to the Study.

NEW ITEMS

5. Proposed Amendment to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations, Section 3.5.F. and 3.5.G.c/o Jeffrey D. Mose AIA. For discussion.

Chairman Mucchetti introduced architect Jeff Mose, who was present to explain proposed changes to the calculation formulas in the zoning regulations for lot coverage and floor area in the residential zones. Attorney Robert Jewell also came forward to assist in the presentation.

Planner Brosius said this is under review as a pre-submission concept, because it may be viewed as a Commission initiated amendment.

Mr. Jewell presented the reasoning behind the request for the amendment to the floor area ratio and coverage regulations, relating specifically to lots larger than three acres. He gave specific examples illustrating the discriminatory treatment of the larger lots, and requested that the numbers be adjusted when applying to lots larger than three acres.. Mr. Jewell gave a history of the regulations. After the May 2007 revised regulations, the FAR (floor area ratio) was amended to include outbuildings, he said. The ZBA (Zoning Board of Appeals) did recognize that the graduated scale currently in place is unfair and overly restrictive to the larger lots. However, they again indicated that they will stop granting variances to these larger lots, Mr. Jewell said.

Architects **Douglas MacMillan and Peter Coffin** came forward later in the presentation, to offer comments in support of amending the regulations, based on their own experiences.

Mr. Mose said that attachments the information he provided and the table prepared by the Planner show the progression from the old regulations through the newest with lots showing the incremental differences from one acre to six and a half acres. He explained their proposed numbers beginning with 7500 s.f. lots at 10%, a bump at the one acre lot to 5 ½ %, and the two-acre lot at 5835 with a 5% bump, and everything above that, and that number calculates out to be 8,000 s.f. There is a consistent line (sliding scale) as the lots get larger.

Mr. Mose said, “What we're trying to do here, I think, is come up with a little more realistic set of criteria that we can apply to the larger lot sizes, without really affecting the adjacent neighbors.” He also mentioned that tax revenue incentive for allowing the upgrades.

The examples given were called Case Study #1, demonstrating the ramifications of the new regulations at the two acre mark, and Case Study #2 relating to the same at the five acre lot size. Mr. Mose noted the substantial penalty created by the 2007 regulations.

Mr. MacMillan and Mr. Coffin gave specific examples of properties where the lot coverage and floor area allowances were substantially reduced upon the Commission’s enactment of the revised zoning regulations, which were effective on 5/1/07.

There was a feeling among the architects that, if a homeowner has the means to enlarge their home and the space to do it, they should have that right. There is no reason to penalize persons in that category by making it impossible for them to improve their property, he felt. Mr. MacMillan cited homeowners who feel that the new regulations “very much devalued their property.” Their ability to do anything to their property is lost, he said. The Commission did not count detached structures in the old regulations, he added, which now count in the total. Barns in particular create problems, because of their size, when counted for floor area. He talked about the FAR changes, as well, and the excessive need for variances.

Mr. Katz gave the example of someone having maxed out the FAR and coverage for property in a zone that would allow them to divide the lot. “When they go to subdivide, what is the control on that?” he asked the Planner. The control is the lot coverage and the floor area, she said, which must be stated for any of the lots. If the applicant creates a vacant lot, the property that's left with the house must also conform to the zoning regulations. There must be enough land area to support the lot existing lot coverage and floor area of the house. In essence, the applicant has to prove that the lots they are creating conform to the regulations.

Mr. Jewell interjected, “...or get a variance...and, in that case, it's a self-created hardship,” so the variance would not be granted, he and the Planner both agreed.

Various scenarios were discussed.

Dr. Autuori was concerned about the impact of the proposed amendment on the level of impervious coverage created. Mr. Jewell said the effect could be toward less impervious coverage. “If you cut something in half,” he said, “you can build a lot more on those two lots” than you could have on the lot as a whole.

Mr. Coffin discussed a 34 acre lot on Peaceable Hill which had been subdivided. He said that his client was really looking to occupy the property and was applying to subdivide only for future considerations. Under the old regulations, this was a 2-acre zone and the applicant could have subdivided into six lots. They chose to only divide into three bigger “more gracious lots,” one of which the owner planned to build on. The new regulations of 5/1/07 so affected the lot coverage allowable, that the design of the house had to be modified. In essence, they were severely penalized by choosing to keep the lots large, and lost about 2700 s.f. of permissible floor area and lot coverage.

Mr. Coffin explained, however, that in some cases, where there is a vacant lot in a subdivision, the owners can get around the decreased lot coverage and floor area under the “Poirier rule” which allows a vacant lot in a subdivision to apply the regulations that were in effect at the time the land was divided. Mr. Jewell said that was the last vestige of 8-26a in the Connecticut statutes.

The Chairman asked Mr. Mose if what had been presented was what he wanted the Commission to consider. He said that it was.

Mr. Mose said that it had taken a great deal of consideration and time to come up with the numbers, as structured, with consideration as to how they would affect the results. “Some of the baseline numbers look bigger than we're all used to,” he said, “but, I think that they're fairly well reasoned...” and, when applied to the larger lots, they really do not create “a lot of additional bulk or coverage or mass.” That was not the intention, he said. It is just to make sure the larger lots “are getting a fair shake.”

Mr. Jewell said they all felt that going back to what was permitted for three acre lots in the three acre zone under the old regulations was the simplest solution, but, it created a huge gap between what was permitted for two and a half acre and three acre lots. He said that Mr. Mose was able to come up with a system “that got even less than the 4.5% but did not create such a size gap.”

Mr. Mose said that they preferred no to have to go back to the ZBA.

Mr. Jewell said that the ZBA had granted a few variances, but, then refused to consider any more. All such applications were now going to be forwarded to PZC, according to Mr. Jewell.

Mr. Katz asked if they wanted this taken to a public hearing. Mr. Jewell said they would like the Commission to review the numbers and possibly consider taking it on as a Commission initiated amendment.

Mr. Fossi questioned the specifics. There was some discussion as to where the greatest problem lay with the numbers: between two and a half and three acres, one and two acres, etc.?

Mr. Mose thought that perhaps the 140% rule should only apply to the lower lot sizes “as a way to balance [this] and build a little bit of a buffer into the upper sizes.”

Mr. Fossi agreed, saying that the 140% seems to make more sense with the smaller lots, and with the larger lots, “you don’t need it.” But, Mr. Fossi did not see any reason to change the coverage on the one to one and a half acre zones.

Mr. Mose felt they were “prisoners of the sliding scale” and, unless they agreed to a bump in that curve, it seemed necessary “to back into the other numbers.”

Dr. Autuori did not feel this amendment would discourage subdivision. He did not find a compelling reason “to basically enlarge coverage.”

Mr. Katz said he felt very uncomfortable with the current discussion. He said that it was being conducted like a public hearing.

The Planner said that what they were discussing was not an application.

Mr. Jewell said it was a concept, permitted for discussion, under the zoning regulations and the state statutes.

Mr. Katz said the Commission would, therefore, need to determine whether it was a concept they felt was worthy of going to a public hearing with.

Mr. Mose said there are not many “spec” houses being built currently. He said that everyone had done a great job of putting the brakes on putting big houses on little lots. This amendment would allow those with the means, resources, ego and [larger] property to expand that, as of right.

Specific examples of how coverages would be affected were discussed.

Mr. Jewell reminded the Commission, “All the numbers we're talking about are under the 4.5% that used to be allowed under our three acre zone.”

The Chairman said that the Planner had prepared a table of lot coverage and area ratio, which was distributed. She noted that Mr. Mose, Mr. MacMillan, and Mr. Coffin brought their information forward under the pre-submission component of the regulations, where an applicant can try to determine in advance whether or not there is sufficient interest in pursuing an item. She thought their request was for the Commission to pursue this as a Commission-initiated amendment to the zoning regulations. No decision was necessary that evening.

Mr. Jewell said that an incentive to encouraging genuine estates, as opposed to “McMansions,” could be the tax role benefit.

Mr. Coffin felt that “the new regulations have certainly helped the majority of properties in Ridgfield.” The smaller lots in big zones were really hampered prior to the new regulations, he said, and the number of variances he's had to apply for has decreased. He said there are no where near the number of large lots as there are the smaller ones.

Mr. MacMillan agreed, saying that it all seems to work out. He said there currently is no incentive for people who buy the big estates.

Mr. Coffin said, “There's really no relief.” The Zoning Board of Appeals will say you have no hardship if you want to design a bigger house.

Mr. Jewell said people wind up dividing and building twice what they had originally applied for. He said he mis-spoke when he cited three acre lots, when the intent was to provide relief to two acre lots or larger. “The changes on the lower levels are to prevent... such a disproportionate jump in the permitted sizes,” he said. If people can live with the jump (lots over three acres being allowed 4.5%), “then maybe that's the quickest and easiest solution.” But, the precipitous drop is what prompted Mr. Mose to come up with these numbers to “make it slide,” Mr. Jewell said.

The Chairman thanked the architects and asked the Planner if she felt this was something worth pursuing.

The Planner felt this should be added to the Commission's agenda in the next month.

In summary, the lengthy discussion about the proposed changes raised the fact that the larger lots (2 acres and greater) are the ones most affected negatively by the new zoning regulations. It was noted that the proposed changes by Mr. Mose also come with a recommendation that the Commission only permit the “140% rule” (Section 3.6.C) for lots of less than 2 acres. The proposed amendment would provide sufficient lot coverage and floor area for the larger lots, and, in fact, mirrors the numbers that could be achieved under the “140% rule”.

There was no action taken following the discussion. The Commission agreed to have its own discussion of the amendment at another meeting, probably in June.

6. **#2009-036-A: Proposed Amendment** to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations, **Section 8.1.C(1)-Non-conforming lots**, pursuant to Section 9.2.B. Appl.: Robert A. Fuller, Esq. *65-days to commence public hearing ends 7/23/2009. For receipt, schedule public hearing.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a public hearing for June 23, 2009.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded Mr. Mische, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule a public hearing as suggested by the Chairman. The motion passed, 8-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

The following site walks had been previously scheduled for **June 7, 2009**. There were no new walks scheduled.

- **#2009-030-SP: Special Permit 40 Grove Street**, 40 Grove Street LLC
- **#2009-032-S-SP: Subdivision and Special Permit 32 Hickory Lane and 164 Florida Road**, Wynmar Properties, LLC
- **#2009-034-SP: Special Permit 269 Nod Road**, High Ridge Custom Homes, Inc

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2006-031-SP: Request to reduce bond from \$840,000.00 to \$10,000.00**. Property located at **66 Grove Street**, (Treetops of Ridgefield Townhouses) Madaket Beach Developers LLC. *PD and IWA recommend reduction.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted the memorandum prepared by Wetlands Agent Aimee Pardee, and inspection made by both Agent Pardee and the Planner. [The Special Permit bond and the Wetlands Permit bond were combined in the \$840,000 total bond posted for the site work.]

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the bond reduction as recommended by the Agent and supported by the Planner. The motion passed, 8-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti noted the following correspondence:

- Letter from Commission Counsel Fran Collins, re the Commission's authority to review the proposed Old Playhouse demolition under the Village District regulations.

MINUTES

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the minutes of May 5, 2009. The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary