

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

June 22, 2010

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

Planning and Zoning Commission public hearings were held prior to the meeting.
At 8:47 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2010-058-SP-SR-FL:** Summary Ruling **599 Branchville Road**, Binn. *Request to re-schedule walk from 6/27/2010 to 7/11/2010 c/o Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy VII, P.E.*

Chairman Mucchetti referenced a letter from John McCoy, P.E. requesting a change in the site walk from June 27th to July 11th, for all of the applications pertaining to 599 Branchville Road, and 4 Stony Hill Terrace.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to re-schedule the site walk for this item to July 11, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

2. **#2010-059-SP-SR:** Summary Ruling **599 Branchville Road and 4 Stony Hill Terrace**, (Binn Animal Rescue and Sanctuary), Binn/ CT DOT (under contract by Binn) *Request to re-schedule walk from 6/27/2010 to 7/11/ 2010 c/o Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy VII, P.E.*

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to re-schedule the site walk for this item to July 11, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

NEW ITEMS

There were no new items.

BOARD WALKS

As noted above, the following items were re-scheduled for site walks on **July 11, 2010:**

- **#2010-058-SP-SR-FL:** Summary Ruling **599 Branchville Road**, Binn

- **#2010-059-SP-SR:** Summary Ruling **599 Branchville Road and 4 Stony Hill Terrace**, (Binn Animal Rescue and Sanctuary), Binn/ CT DOT (under contract by Binn)

The following item was previously scheduled for site walk on **June 27, 2010:**

- **#2010-057-SR:** Summary Ruling **312 Rippowam Road**, Provey

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2008-043-PD:** Request for release of \$1,200.00 bond, **140 Wilton Road West**, Louis and JoAnne Price. *IWA recommends 100% release.*

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the release of the bond as recommended by the IW Agent. The motion passed, 9-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the minutes of June 8, 2010. The motion passed, 6-0-3, with Board members Mische, Chipouras and Gelfman abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius
Inland Wetlands Agent
(from notes provided by Chairman Mucchetti, and audio tapes)

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

June 22, 2010

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

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 8:51 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2010-038-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.3.D.1 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for an accessory dwelling unit on property located at **50 Laurel Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owners/Appls.: John E. Proctor and Jennifer M. Ferrandino. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *Received 4/20/2010. Walked May 16, 2010. Public hearing commenced 6/1/2010 and continued to 6/22/2010. 65-day action period ends 8/26/2010. For action.*

[Note: Dr. Autuori recused himself from participation and action on this item.]

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing was closed, and asked for discussion on the item.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to request a draft resolution of approval for the accessory apartment, according to the plans presented. He stated the following reasons for approval:

- Although this is an after-the-fact permit application and the apartment has been occupied for the past seven years, that is irrelevant. This Commission has never taken the timing of the permit into account, when making a decision.
- The application does not offend any of the particulars of 9.2.A.5 (Special Permit Criteria), sections a through j.
- The 960 s.f. size of the apartment is only a minor intrusion into the 900 s.f. size allowed by right in the regulations.
- The apartment is appropriate to the neighborhood, and the structure is tastefully done.

The motion to draft the approval passed, 8-0-1, with Dr. Autuori abstained. Final action on the resolution will take place on 7/6/10.

2. **#2010-039-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.3.D.2 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to conduct a major home occupation in the lower level of an accessory building located at **50 Laurel Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owners/Applicants: John E. Proctor and Jennifer M. Ferrandino. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. *Received 4/20/2010. Walked May 16, 2010. Public hearing commenced 6/1/2010 and continued to 6/22/2010. 65-day action period ends 8/26/2010. For action.*

[Note: Dr. Autuori recused himself from participation and action on this item.]

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing was closed, and asked for discussion on the item.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to deny the application for major home occupation. Dr. Gelfman listed his reasons for the denial as primarily the following:

- The business use is totally inappropriate in the residential neighborhood.
- Even without the traffic concerns, the type of business is totally inappropriate in the neighborhood.
- There are special circumstances here: the road is narrow, and additional trucks are inappropriate on the road.
- Every aspect of the business is inappropriate.

Mr. Katz addressed the attorney's statement, that the Commission should give this application the same consideration coming in after-the-fact as it would have if the business did not currently exist. He agrees that everything would have been the same in the review. This application must be taken at face value. Mr. Proctor provides an exemplary service to the town, and he runs his business well. The violation was discovered by neighbor's complaint, but the Commission must examine each application on its own merit. He feels that this application offends almost all of the particulars of 9.2.A.5 (a-j), the criteria that the Commission is commanded by Statutes and town laws to consider. He explained further:

- (a) – "Suitable Location. The location, size, nature, hours of operation, and intensity of the proposed use or uses in relation to the size and location of the site shall be: i. appropriate for the proposed location and, ii. in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district in which it is located." He says that every one of those particulars is offended.
- (b) – "Appropriate Improvements. The location, nature, size, and the architectural design of buildings and appurtenances shall: i. be compatible with neighboring properties and their uses, ii. be in harmony with recognized principles of civic design and land use planning, and iii. not hinder or discourage the appropriate development or use of land and buildings nor impair the value thereof." The size of the business use is not compatible with residential uses in the neighboring

- properties. It is not compatible with neighboring uses for property owners whose home occupations were previously approved by the Commission, and whose business uses in comparison to this use are entirely benign. There were recent complaints from neighbors; this business is existing, and it is not legitimate.
- (c and d) – “Appropriate alteration of landscape” and “Appropriate landscaping.” The landscaping and physical alteration of the site are not relevant factors in this discussion. The landscaping is beautiful.
 - (d) – “Suitable Transportation Conditions. Streets, driveways, parking areas and other transportation improvements shall be appropriately sized and of adequate condition to accommodate the traffic to be generated by the particular proposed uses(s).” The roads (Laurel Lane and Florida Road) are not appropriate for this amount of truck traffic. School busses are allowed on the road by law. The attorney’s reference to the fact that many residents have several teenage drivers and cars is irrelevant – residential use does not require the Special Permit. It is interesting, but irrelevant.
 - (j) – “Consistent with Plan of Conservation and Development. The proposed use or activity facilitates achievement of one or more of the goals, objectives, policies, and recommendations of the Plan of Conservation and Development, as amended.” The POCD says that the emphasis for business development should be within existing business zones, and the primary goal is to promote business in areas currently zoned for business use. The Plan is only advisory, but to offend that document in this way [referring to the extant application] is something the Commission did not intend to do.

Mr. Katz says he could say more, but will defer to others. In overview, it is inaccurate to say that if the Commission says no to this application that it will put the applicant out of business. There are other businesses in the same or similar occupations in Ridgefield, operating successfully in business areas.

Mr. Walsh says he completely disagrees with Mr. Katz. He feels that Sec. 9.2.A.5 (a-j) of the regulations is completely satisfied. He looks at this application from a different perspective – What neighborhood are we defining? Is it Laurel Hill Lane, or Florida Road, or Florida Hill Road? He explains further:

- (a) – “Suitable Location.” The size and nature of the building fits with the residential character of the neighborhood.
- (b) – “Appropriate Improvements.” The architecture fits with the character of Laurel Hill Lane and Florida Road.
- (c and d) – “Appropriate Alteration of Landscape.” The Commission walked the site and saw the landscaping and the style of the building. It is appropriate to the neighborhood.
- (e) – “Suitable Transportation Conditions.” This gets back to the question, what is the neighborhood? Everyone on Laurel Lane supports the application. They all have to use the road, which is currently in rather poor condition, and they have no problem with the business. The Commission heard a lot from neighbors on Florida Road and Florida Hill Road, but everyone has a right to travel on that

- road. Is the Commission going to hamstring this business because of the “scenic road” designation when everyone has a right to use the road?
- (f and g) – “Adequate Public Services and Utilities.” These criteria do not come into play in this application [because the neighborhood is on private wells and septics].
 - (h) – “Long Term Viability. Adequate provisions have been made for the sustained maintenance of the proposed development (structures, streets, and other improvements).” This also does not apply, unless you are going to claim that the trucks may put a burden on the public and private roads.
 - (i) – “Consistent with Purposes. The proposed use or activity shall not impair the public health, safety or welfare or conflict with the purposes of the Regulations.” Clearly the proposed activity is consistent with the public health and welfare.
 - (j) – “Consistent with Plan of Conservation and Development.” The POCD includes a section on business uses, but not to the exclusion of home occupations. The Commission amended its regulations in 2007 to allow this type of business to occur.

In summary, Mr. Walsh says that this all comes down to whether or not the business is too much for the residential neighborhood, and whether or not it is a suitable business for the district.

Mr. Mische says this strikes right to the heart of why the Commission exists. And whether you buy into the concept of land use or not, the Commission has the power to decide where such activities should take place. The Town has commercial and residential zones, and there is the “gray area” of home occupations. The question all comes down to a matter of intensity. Is this activity appropriate in this residential community? This is a very intense use of residential land, and it has a warehouse of stock in trade. If this were a new application and not an after-the-fact permit, would the Commission think of it the same way, in consideration of the scenic road designation of Florida Road? That may be irrelevant, because anyone can use the road, but the fact is that this business use is too intense for this location.

Mr. Katz said that the phrase “appropriate and orderly development of the district” [Sec. 9.2.A.5.a – “Suitable Location” criteria] does apply to this situation. It is a residential district. The potential for residential sale of properties in the vicinity of the business use may indeed be discouraged because of the business. It may be prognostication on his part, but it is a distinct possibility. In regard to the “adequate condition to accommodate traffic” mentioned in criteria (e), where there is a requirement to provide adequate streets, driveways, etc. for the traffic generated by the business use, there is, in fact, no formal provision for the maintenance and repair of Laurel Hill Lane.

Mr. Katz says that the Commission has discussed the concept of “neighborhood” for his many years as a sitting member of the Commission, and never has he seen a situation where there were 7 (seven) persons in favor and 15 (fifteen) against where the Commission did not take that factor into consideration. The neighborhood encompasses Laurel Hill Lane, Florida Road, and Florida Hill Road, although Route

102 (Branchville Road) is of different character. There is a possibility of the business traffic to affect the “neighborhood.” On the DVD provided by a neighbor, clearly 20-25% of the traffic [during the time filmed] was produced by the applicant’s business. The Commission has no control over emergency hours when trucks will be called out during the evenings and weekends. This is the type of business that needn’t be conducted in a residential zone.

Mr. Katz says that, if this Special Permit is approved, there is really no reason to have the Special Permit process. The message will be that the Commission does not care about the intensity of the use and how it will affect the neighborhood. There has been ample testimony from 15 residential taxpayers against this proposal. While public views are not intended to be the final reason for a Commission’s decision on an application, they certainly provide some data for the Commission to consider.

Mr. Walsh says that the Commission does not count the number of “yes” and “no” votes in making a decision. The question is the intensity of the use on this property, and the intensity in the neighborhood. The seven most impacted neighbors all spoke in favor of the application. That doesn’t discount the opinion of the fifteen who were against, but the Commission cannot “throw the applicant under the bus” based on opinion counts alone.

Mr. Walsh disagrees with Mr. Katz’s statement that there is no point in having the Special Permit process if this application is approved. He believes that many of the criteria in 9.2.A.5(a-j) are satisfied. It all comes down to whether or not this business is too intense for its location.

Dr. Gelfman says this is the most inappropriate business for home use that he has ever seen, since he has been on the Commission [43+ years]. The intensity is too much for the location. He believes that people moved to this part of town because of the special nature of the road. He does not think that the Commission should change the whole character of the neighborhood by approving this intense use.

Mr. Walsh asks if Dr. Gelfman is interpreting “neighborhood” to include Florida Road and all the other homeowners there? Dr. Gelfman says, yes.

Mr. McChesney feels that if the applicant had come to the Commission before the business existed, it may have looked at the business as benign, but what’s happened since 2003 is that the business has grown. Now it is a warehouse and a parking lot for commercial vehicles. He thinks today that it’s too intense for the location. When he thinks of a “home occupation,” he has in mind an office, or the studio of an artist where craft work is done and then distributed by mail order. He mentions a jewelry business approved by the Commission as an example. Most operations in that case are conducted within the home, and are low-key. This business is not like that – it is a warehouse plus truck traffic plus truck parking. He supports the motion to deny the application.

Mr. Fossi does not support the motion to deny. He says the Commission should not count the “for” and “against” votes of the neighbors, and challenges Mr. Katz’s calculations. By Mr. Fossi’s count, there are only 14 (fourteen) signatures against, and there are 12 (twelve) in favor. He believes that everyone thinks his own neighborhood is “special,” but there is a large elementary school on Florida Road in this neighborhood. The scenic road designation does not give it preference. If it’s unsafe and narrow, that is typical to New England and especially to Ridgefield. Mr. Proctor, the school busses, PeaPod by Stop & Shop [grocery delivery], and all delivery trucks are allowed to use the road. Mr. Proctor has testified that there are three plumbers who come and go to the site, and one of those three does not come daily. There are perhaps 6-10 trips a day, on average.

Mr. Fossi also points out that several of the neighbors were not even aware of the business until about a year ago, and he asks how annoying and intense is it really?

Mr. Katz says that Mr. Fossi may be correct about the 6 trips per day, plus trips by the bookkeeper/office employee. But there was testimony that the plumbers may have to come back for materials and supplies during the day, so the Commission does not really have a handle on the exact number of trips involved. It is probably more than six. He disputes Mr. Fossi’s challenge of the numbers of neighbors who complained; the petition has 15 signatures, and it is part of the record.

Chairman Mucchetti asks if there is more discussion, and there being none, she called for a vote on the motion to deny.

The motion failed by a 4-4 vote, with Commissioners Katz, Gelfman, McChesney and Mische voting in favor of the denial, and Commissioners Chipouras, Fossi, Walsh and Mucchetti voting against. Dr. Autuori was recused.

Discussion then continued with a motion to approve the application.

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the application for major home occupation as presented, with conditions. Mr. Fossi suggested conditions as follows:

- The applicant should be required to request his suppliers to use small trucks for deliveries of materials and supplies.
- Truck traffic should enter the neighborhood from the south (off Route 102), and should exit the site, whenever possible, to the south.

Mr. Chipouras asked for a condition to regulate business hours, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.

Mr. Katz asked what would then happen if the trucks checked in at the end of the day after 5 p.m. Would that be prohibited?

Mr. Mische says that the emergency calls needed at night and on weekends are another issue, and this gets to the absolute core of the intensity of the use.

Chairman Mucchetti asked if the condition should be for business hours from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. daily, with the exception of emergency calls.

Mr. Chipouras asked, who would get emergency calls?

Chairman Mucchetti said that in her experience there is an answering service for such calls, and someone is assigned as “on call” for the night, to be the responder. Mr. Chipouras felt that the emergency service technician should be someone who has a truck outfitted for all sorts of emergencies, to avoid the need for trips to the warehouse. Mr. Mische said that is not always possible to predict; if there is a need for materials and supplies, the truck will have to visit the warehouse on Laurel Lane. It is therefore difficult to determine the real “hours of operation.”

Chairman Mucchetti emphasized that conditions can specify the hours of operation and the numbers of employees allowed, and the applicant must be held to those numbers. Any change would require further review and approval by the Commission.

Mr. Walsh asked why the southern end of Florida Road should be designated to take the majority of traffic from the business. Mr. Fossi explained that the applicant made that offer, as a gesture to the neighbors.

Mr. Walsh felt that the discussion should center on intensity of use. The number of trips to and from the property does not make a difference, whether the traffic is directed to the south or not. He also questions how that condition would be enforced.

Mr. Fossi said he was willing to withdraw that suggested condition. He agrees that it will be impossible to monitor the direction of the trucks. He does want to retain the condition for small delivery trucks for materials and supplies, and that these trucks enter the neighborhood from the south.

Chairman Mucchetti points out that just because the applicant made an offer for a condition and limitation on direction of traffic, it doesn't have to be adopted by the Commission. However, most of the complaints from neighbors were from those who live to the north.

Mr. Katz asks how such “third party” conditions can be enforced. Mr. Walsh agrees with that concern; how would the Town enforce traffic to be directed to the south?

Mr. Fossi again offers to withdraw or modify the suggested condition. He will drop the “south-side” traffic provision, recognizing that it would be difficult to enforce. The applicant may voluntarily observe this provision, but it does not have to be a condition.

Chairman Mucchetti summarized the proposed conditions for a draft resolution of approval:

- Small vehicles are to be used for deliveries of materials and supplies.
- The hours of operation will be from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday.
- Emergency vehicle trips will be permitted, and are an exception to the restriction of hours of operation.

The Chairman called for a vote on the motion to approve the application.

The motion failed by a 4-4 vote, with Commissioners Chipouras, Fossi, Mucchetti and Walsh voting in favor of the motion, and Commissioners Katz, Gelfman, McChesney and Mische voting against. Dr. Autuori was recused.

There was some confusion about how to proceed, and a suggestion from the Chairman to continue discussion of the application at the meeting on July 6th. She felt that the application cannot be approved or denied without a majority. She suggested that the Commissioners review the materials in the file, and prepare for further discussion.

Mr. Katz asked that the matter be referred to counsel for advice.

3. **#2010-044-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.4.D.3 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to construct a replacement two (2) car garage with a studio above in the front yard on property located at **120 Prospect Ridge** in the RA zone. Owner/Appl.: John Weatherley. Auth. Agent: Robert Grasso. *Received 5/4/2010. Walked May 16, 2010. Public hearing commenced 6/1/2010 and continued to 6/22/2010. 65-day action period ends 8/26/2010. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing was closed, and asked for discussion on the item.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the application as presented. Mr. Katz asked that this be a final vote on the application.

Chairman Mucchetti stated that the resolution should be a draft because the Planner was not present to support the request for final resolution.

The motion for a draft favorable resolution passed, 9-0.

4. **#2010-045-A:** Proposed amendment to the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations, **Section 3.3.D.1** (Accessory Dwelling Unit) to eliminate one-acre minimum size requirement when using septic. *Public hearing commenced and closed 6/15/2010 and draft Resolution of Approval requested. Commission initiated. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the Planner's memorandum and her suggestions for modifications in language to the proposed amendment, including an "s" after "sewers" and the word "private" in front of "wells."

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to adopt the proposed amendment with the changes suggested by the Planner. The motion passed, 9-0.

5. **#2010-055-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e required by Section 7.2.E.11 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to permit "welcome" and "thank you" signs on property located at **125 Danbury Road, Copps Hill Shopping Center** in the B-1 zone. Owners/Appls.: Equity One Realty & Management NE, Inc. Auth. Agent: Laura Schmitt, Property Manager. *65-day action period ends 8/19/2010. Received 6/15/2010. PZC to walk site individually. For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out that the applicants were meeting with the Architectural Advisory Committee, and minutes were not yet available. She suggested tabling discussion until the AAC minutes were received.

Mr. McChesney said he was ready to deny the application as presented, because it represented inappropriate and unnecessary signage at the shopping center. He is disappointed in the drawings because they seem like pure advertising for the owner of the center. The proposed locations are not appropriate.

Mr. McChesney made a motion to deny the application, and it was seconded by Dr. Gelfman.

Mr. Katz agreed that the design is ancillary to the location, and although the Commission is supportive of businesses in the community, there is no history of "welcome" and "thank you" signs promoting that purpose. This is over-signage, and inappropriate.

Mr. McChesney said he was afraid that this would set precedent for other commercial centers in town.

Mr. Fossi pointed out that the AAC often requests changes to the design and that the applicant may come back with something entirely different than the drawings received with the initial application. He is in favor of waiting for the AAC report prior to making a final decision. **Mr. Mische** agreed; there is a process in place, and the Commission should allow it to unfold.

Chairman Mucchetti said that the motion to deny can remain on the table, and discussion will continue when AAC minutes are received. She also noted that Peter Hill, Director of Public Services, had approved the proposed location for the signs at the entrance on Copps Hill Road (for sight lines).

The item will be scheduled on the 7/6/10 agenda, pending receipt of the AAC report.

6. **#2010-058-SP-SR:** Special Permit **599 Branchville Road**, Binn. *Request to re-schedule walk from 6/27/2010 to 7/11/2010 c/o Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy VII, P.E.*

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to re-schedule the site walk for this item to July 11, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

7. **#2010-059-SP-SR:** Special Permit **599 Branchville Road and 4 Stony Hill Terrace**, (Binn Animal Rescue and Sanctuary), Binn/ CT DOT (under contract by Binn) *Request to re-schedule walk from 6/27/2010 to 7/11/ 2010 c/o Auth. Agent: John F. McCoy VII, P.E.*

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to re-schedule the site walk for this item to July 11, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

NEW ITEMS

8. **#2010-061-SIGN:** Request under Section 7.2.C.10 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for a temporary Community Sign to be located on the Parks & Recreation Facility property, **195 Danbury Road** in the RAA zone. Owner: Town of Ridgefield. Auth. Agent: Stephen Zemo, 9-11 Memorial Committee. *For receipt/discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized Stephen Zemo, who presented the application. The sign is to be posted in front of the Parks & Recreation Facility at 195 Danbury Road, in the location where the 9-11 Memorial will be erected.

Mr. Zemo said that the sign would be 4' X 5' in size, and is intended for fund-raising. About \$5,000 has been raised so far for the memorial, and about \$10,000 more is needed. The steel for the monument has been identified in New York, but federal approval of the selection is needed prior to Ridgefield receiving it. The request is for the sign to be posted (for fund-raising) through September 11, 2010.

Mr. Chipouras motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the temporary Community Sign Board as presented, through 9/11/10. The motion passed, 9-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

The following items were re-scheduled for site walks on **July 11, 2010:**

- **#2010-058-SP-SR-FL:** Special Permit **599 Branchville Road**, Binn
- **#2010-059-SP-SR:** Special Permit **599 Branchville Road and 4 Stony Hill Terrace**, Binn and CT DOT (under contract by Binn)

The following items were previously scheduled for site walk on **June 27, 2010:**

- **#2010-054-SP:** Special Permit **112 Old Branchville Road**, Boehringer
- **#2010-056-SP:** Special Permit **304 Main Street**, Kalkstein
- **#2010-060-SP-VDC:** Special Permit **32 Prospect Street**, Konchalsky

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2007-045-SP-SR:** Request for release of \$1,000.00 balance of bond, **140 Wilton Road West, Louis and JoAnne Price.** *IWA recommends 100% release.*

Mr. Chipouras motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to release the balance of the bond as requested. The motion passed, 9-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

MINUTES

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the minutes of June 8, 2010. The motion passed, 6-0-3, with Commissioners Mische, Chipouras and Gelfman abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius

Director of Planning

(from notes provided by Chairman Mucchetti, and audio tapes)