

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

July 6, 2010

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

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent

A Planning and Zoning Commission public hearing was held prior to the meeting. At 7:37 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2010-057-SR:** Summary Ruling Application under Section 7.5 required by Section 4.3 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations of the Town of Ridgefield for pond and stream dredging and maintenance on property located at **312 Rippowam Road** in the RAAA zone. Owner/Apl.: Roger Provey. *65-day action period ends 8/19/2010. Received 6/15/2010. Walked 6/27/2010. For discussion/action*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized the applicant, Roger Provey, who described the proposed work. New drawings are in the file, received 7/6/10. There was some discussion about the fact that there is no “revised” date on the new plan; it was stamped received in the office on 7/6.

Mr. Provey stated that the pond was created about 1979, and it is fed with a stream, with an outlet into a large wetland. He said it had been relatively silt-free until about 5 or 6 years ago, when the Town did some work to improve the driveway into Sturges Park. He sent a letter to the Town about the problem, but received no reply. When the road is graded every year, more siltation occurs. The native stone spillway on the pond has helped to prevent downstream erosion.

Mr. Provey used the new drawing to describe the work. He showed the origin of the stream and pointed to the path that it takes from the Town property to his property.

The work involves the removal of material from the stream inlet (to be done during low-flow periods) and then removal of silt from the pond. Water from the stream would be pumped around the pond, starting at a “sump pit” above the pond.

Chairman Mucchetti asked what would be done with the material that comes out of the pond, for de-watering. Mr. Provey showed the area on the map (in yellow) where the material would be used. It will not be taken off the site.

Mr. Katz asked if Mr. Provey had reviewed the Conservation Commission letter, and he said, yes. The Agent pointed out the letter from Agent Pardee, which Mr. Provey had not seen. Mr. George Orlan of the Conservation Commission attempted to clarify what the CC meant by “settling basin,” and there was some discussion on that issue. Dr. Autuori was concerned that silty water was not being transported off the site. Mr. Provey felt that the Parks and Recreation Department should do something to prevent the erosion from upstream.

Mr. Katz asked for clarification of the temporary stockpile area, and asked why it was called “temporary” if the intent is to use the material on the site. Mr. Katz also wanted to know where the material would be used, since there should be no depositing of material in wetlands. Mr. Provey explained that the stockpile areas would be used for de-watering of the material before it is spread in non-wetland areas.

Dr. Autuori asked if the sump would be adequate to intercept future sediments. Mr. Provey said no, the sump pit would be for taking up water from the stream and piping it around the pond during the work period. Mr. Provey said the spillway at the top of the pond catches sediments.

There was some discussion about the calculation of the amount of material to be removed from the pond, and Mr. Provey’s method of calculating dry vs. wet soil. Dr. Autuori felt that the quantity of soil is basically the same – the difference is only water that evaporates.

Mr. Mische asked for specifics about the pump, and whether or not the water entering the pump would be clear. It is important to pump clean water if it is to be discharged into the stream on the neighboring property. Wetlands Agent Pardee has recommended a Type II settling basin at the discharge point. Agent Brosius explained that a “Type II” basin is described and illustrated in the *2002 CT Guidelines for Soil and Erosion Control* (DEP Bulletin 34). Agent Brosius feels that this concern is valid; Ms. Pardee says it is needed to protect the downstream property in the event that there is a “surge” of rain.

Mr. Fossi commented on the equipment proposed for the dredging. The machine has a front loader, but no bucket to provide a “reach” into the pond. Mr. Provey said that the loader could hold approximately ½ yard, which amounts to 500 trips for 250± cubic yards. Mr. Provey admitted that the process would be slow and painful, but the smaller machine is better for the wetland area than a larger machine. He says that if the material is dry it should only take a few days. The machine has wide rubber tracks and it is light. The pond has a hard-pan bottom, so the machine will be

adequate. Mr. Fossi repeated the desire for a Type II “stilling basin” at the discharge point, and the applicant agreed that one could be installed.

Mr. McChesney asked if the contours of the pond would remain the same. Mr. Provey said they would. He wants to preserve the existing edges (slopes) of the pond. Mr. McChesney then asked about the water that leaks under the dam. Mr. Provey said that a small amount of material (gravel) could be placed at the edge of the dam, to fix the small “breach.”

Mr. Katz was concerned about the distance of the stockpile areas from the pond and stream. It appears to be about 200 feet distant, and the travelway goes through the wetlands.

Chairman Mucchetti asked for confirmation that the pathway was an area that was created from soil deposits when the pond was built in 1979, and that it does go through the wetlands. Mr. Provey confirmed that the travel area would be on the existing man-made path that goes through the wetlands from the pond to the back of the house. It is in wetlands but the path is dry, and has been there since the pond was created in the 70’s. It is very stable.

Mr. Katz asked if there would be spillage in the wetlands during the course of the work, since there would be hundreds of trips with the machine. Mr. Provey agreed that there may be some spillage. Dr. Autuori asked if the path would remain stable throughout the construction, and Mr. Provey said that it would. There was some discussion about putting fabric down on the path, but it did not seem to be practical or necessary. The time of year for the work is critical; it should be done in dry periods.

Mr. Mische pointed out that the access (travelway) from Areas A and B is not shown on the plans.

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out that the application was listed for discussion and action, and asked if the Board was ready to proceed. Mr. Katz wanted to know if Agent Pardee was satisfied with the new plans, but it was confirmed that she did not have time to review the revised drawing.

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to draft a resolution of approval for the application, pending receipt of additional comments from the Wetlands Agent relative to the new plan submitted on the day of the meeting. Mr. Chipouras asked that the plan be amended with the correct revision date.

The motion for the draft resolution passed, 9-0.

NEW ITEMS

2. **#2010-063-PD:** Summary Ruling Application under Section 7.5 required by Section 4.3 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations of the Town of Ridgefield

for pond dredging on property located at **625 Ridgebury Road** in the RAA and RAAA zones. Owners: Robert and Lessley Burke. Auth. Agent/Appl.: Nazzaro, Inc. *65-day action period ends 9/9/2010. For receipt and schedule walk.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a site walk for July 11, 2010.

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Mr. Mische, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site walk as suggested. The motion passed, 9-0.

BOARD WALKS

The following item was scheduled for site walk on **July 11, 2010:**

- **#2010-063-PD:** Summary Ruling **625 Ridgebury Road**, Burke

The following items had been previously scheduled for site walk on **July 11, 2010:**

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)

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2006-103-SR:** request to release remainder (\$2,500.00) of bond; **20 Peaceable Street**, AMD Homes, LLC.

[Note: Mr. Walsh recused himself from discussion and participation on this item.]

Chairman Mucchetti referenced the letter received from AMD Homes, and a separate letter received from engineer Steven Trinkaus.

The Planner pointed out an email message received from the neighbor at 113 High Ridge (Mr. Egan), distributed and read individually by the Commissioners. The Planner stated that the engineer's letter appeared to cover the requirements of the Commission's letter of April 7, 2010, when the bond was first reduced.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to release the bond in full. The motion passed, 7-0-2, with Mr. Walsh recused and Mr. McChesney abstained.

CORRESPONDENCE

There was no correspondence.

MINUTES

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the minutes of June 15, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the minutes of June 22, 2010. Chairman Mucchetti asked to add reference to the audio tapes used in preparation of the minutes, under the Agent's signature as preparer of the minutes. The motion included the requested changes and passed by a vote of 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius
Inland Wetlands Agent

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

July 6, 2010

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

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning

A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 8:17 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 and closed 6/22/2010. Draft Resolution of Approval requested 6/22/2010. 65-day action period ends 8/26/2010. For action.*

[Note: Dr. Autouri recused himself from discussion and participation on this item.]

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

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the application according to the resolution as drafted. The motion passed, 8-0-1, with Dr. Autouri recused.

2. **#2010-039-SP:** Special Permit application for Major Home Occupation at **50 Laurel Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owner/Appl.: John E. Proctor and Jennifer M. Ferrandino. *For clarification and explanation of Commission actions of June 22, 2010.*

Chairman Mucchetti referenced the Planner's memorandum of June 23, 2010, explaining the results of the two 4-4 votes (one to deny the application and one to approve), actions taken by the Commission at the meeting on June 22, 2010. At the time, there was some confusion over the need (or not) for further action by the Commission. The Planner subsequently spoke to Commission Counsel.

The Planner explained that a 4-4 vote of the Commission is a failure to reach a majority conclusion, and is therefore a denial of the application. She reminded the Commission that it had taken a similar action on a home occupation application several months earlier, with the same result. In this case, the result of the 4-4 votes is conclusive, and therefore no further action is needed. The application has been denied.

Chairman Mucchetti said the item was on the agenda for clarification because the public was unsure of the outcome of the vote, and it had been agreed to discuss the matter further on July 6th.

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 and closed 6/22/2010. Draft Resolution of Approval requested 6/22/2010. 65-day action period ends 8/26/2010. For action.*

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

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the application according to the resolution as drafted. The motion passed, 9-0.

4. **#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. Tabled 6/22/2010 pending receipt of AAC minutes. Motion to deny remains on table. For discussion/action.(tentative)*

Chairman Mucchetti explained that the applicant had not responded to the Planner's phone calls regarding the status of the application, and action should continue to be tabled. The applicant has the option modify the request and return to the table for additional AAC and Commission review.

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to table the application. The motion passed, 9-0.

5. **#2010-060-SP-VDC:** Special Permit under Section 9.2 required by Section 8.3 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for signage on property located at **32 Prospect Street (Nature's Temptations)** in the CBD zone. Owner: Jeff A. Konchalsky. *Received 6/15/2010. Walked 6/27/2010. 65-day action period ends 9/9/2010. For action.*

[Note: Mr. Walsh recused himself from discussion and participation on this item.]

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing was closed, and asked for discussion and action on the application. The Planner reminded the Commission that action would include both the Special Permit considerations and review under the Village District regulations.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to approve the application as presented, including the recommendations of the Village District Consultant in minutes dated June 22, 2010. The motion passed, 8-0-1, with Mr. Walsh recused. [This is a final action.]

NEW ITEMS

6. **#2010-062-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e as required by Section 3.2.C.1 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to construct a brick-sided concession stand at the baseball field in the Venus Municipal Complex located at **90 East Ridge Road** in the RA zone. Owner: Town of Ridgefield. Appl.: Ridgefield Babe Ruth. Auth. Agent: Stefano Zandri. *65-day action period ends 9/9/2010. For receipt, schedule walk if necessary. (for review by AAC on 7/13/2010).*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a site visit on July 11, 2010. She noted that the applicant was still working out details with the Health Department and the WPCA, but the application should nevertheless be received.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule a site walk for July 11, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

7. **#2010-064-PRE:** "Pre-submission concept" request under Section 9.2.E of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for site development on property located at **901 Ethan Allen Highway, Ponds' Edge Professional Park**. Owner: Ridgefield Professional Office Complex. *For discussion.*

Chairman Mucchetti recognized Dr. Joel Klarsfeld and Project Manager Paul DiNardo, present for the pre-submission discussion.

Dr. Klarsfeld explained that the property at 901 Ethan Allen Highway had been purchased by his partnership in 2005, after having been essentially empty for almost 18 years. It was a watch-making property, and then Perkin-Elmer, and then SVG

Lithographics. The doctors requested a change to allow medical use, and the Commission subsequently created the MCDD zone for the property. The existing building was split into two buildings, and the north building has been renovated for medical offices, for specialty medicine services, Danbury Hospital use, radiology, and ambulatory surgery. In the future, fitness use will be a logical addition.

The doctors have spoken to various entities who have had interest in the south building, but none has been successfully signed on for use. Looking at the future of medicine, there are needs that will be generated for the aging population. There will be a need for “memory care” units, specifically for Alzheimers patients. The northeast is woefully underserved for these types of facilities. There is a progression of care that needs to be provided, including daycare, living units, and skilled nursing. The facilities have to be built to very specific requirements. The doctors have visited facilities like this, and have identified a company with interest in purchasing land where the south building is currently located.

Dr. Klarsfeld mentioned the Route 7 Corridor Study, and was pleased with the interest in looking at the corridor with an open mind for possible changes in the currently permitted uses. What they would like to propose is changing the northern part of the property to a B-2 Business Zone, splitting off a parcel on the south as an ARHD zone (Age-Restricted Housing Development), and reserving about nine (9) acres with frontage on Danbury Road as MFDD (Multi-Family Dwelling Development). The MFDD area is known as the “gateway to Ridgefield,” and is characterized by residential uses to the north and south. Although the doctors have a concept drawing of a corporate facility that might be built there, the MFDD seems more appropriate in this location.

Mr. Katz asked if the MFDD units would be related in use to the “memory care” facility on the property. Dr. Klarsfeld said that had been considered, but they were “not at that stage yet.” At this time, it is contemplated that it would be a mixed-age facility. Mr. Katz asked if the ARHD facility would include skilled nursing, and if approval of licensing would be required. Dr. Klarsfeld said only a Skilled Nursing Facility (SNF) would require the certificate of need.

Dr. Klarsfeld stated that the memory care facility would be a completely different building from what is there now. The existing south building would be demolished.

Mr. Katz asked if the doctors’ argument is that residential on Danbury Road is better than corporate for that location. Dr. Klarsfeld said yes, and the density would be about 35-50 units. The existing water tower at that location would come down.

Mr. Katz asked if Dr. Klarsfeld was aware that both the former and the to-be-approved Master Plan for the Town [the Plan of Conservation and Development] strongly recommend that corporate land not be re-zoned for residential use. Dr. Klarsfeld said that in order to re-zone the portion to MFDD, the remaining lands would have to be re-zoned to B-2. There is a setback issue between the CDD lands

and adjoining residential use that cannot be achieved under the current requirements (200 feet minimum). He said that he was not aware of the recommendation of the POCD.

Dr. Autuori asked if Ridgefield would profit economically from a memory care facility such as is proposed. The answer was yes. But then he asked if Ridgefield needed more high-density residential development, and higher density development in general.

Dr. Klarsfeld said that their proposal tries to look at the big picture of the property. They are also trying to satisfy the nearby residential neighbors, who would prefer this use over manufacturing. He mentions again that the Danbury Road corridor is the “gateway” to the town, and the residential use seems to be more appropriate.

Dr. Autuori asked if the ARHD could be accomplished without also converting the nine acres to MFDD. Dr. Klarsfeld was not sure. He reminded the Commission that someone could, under the CDD, come in and propose a 60K+ commercial building in that location.

Dr. Autuori asked about the proportion of open space to buildings. The Planner confirmed that the proportion was 80% open space, and 20% buildings. Dr. Autuori then asked where the owners would be in relation to the 80/20 ratio if the ARHD were split off and just the North building remained. Dr. Klarsfeld felt that could still be accomplished. He reminded the Commission that a large portion of the original SVG building was removed, which increased the available coverage.

Dr. Gelfman thought the proposed MFDD area is a lovely span of open space. He prefers to see it remain open. Dr. Klarsfeld said that the homes would not be located on the road, but would be over the ridge and out of sight.

Mr. Fossi asks what benefit would result for Ridgefield with the creation of 30-50 residential units on what is now CDD land. He has trouble seeing the benefit.

Mr. McChesney pointed out that a large portion of the proposed ARHD site is wetlands, and the south building is the only buildable portion of the site.

Mr. Mische asks about the acreage for each of the proposed sections. Dr. Klarsfeld said the whole parcel is about 50 acres, the ARHD is about 13 acres, the B2 section would be about 27 acres, and the MFDD would be about 9 acres. Mr. Mische asks about the existing footprint of the north and south buildings on the site. Mr. DiNardo confirmed that the north building is about 85,000 s.f. and the south building is about 65,000 s.f. Dr. Klarsfeld said that the memory care building would be a smaller footprint than the 65K south building, probably somewhere between 45,000 and 65,000 s.f.

Mr. Katz asked if the contractor could agree to a maximum size building. The Planner pointed out the ARHD regulations, which allow 15% to be covered by buildings and 25% to be covered by buildings and drives. The Planner also said that the remaining CDD land (without the MFDD) could still support another corporate building adjacent to Danbury Road. Finally, the Planner pointed out that, although the POCD does not recommend re-zoning corporate land, it does support the study of the Route 7 corridor in general, to determine if other/new uses might be appropriate, because of the underutilization of properties in that area.

Dr. Autuori asked if the memory care facility were built, would the remainder need to be re-zoned from CDD to B-2. The answer was no, but the remainder would have to be in conformance with zoning requirements. Dr. Klarsfeld pointed out that the problem is the setback requirement of 200 from CDD to residential use.

Mr. Walsh asked if it would be possible to create a specific zone to allow the memory care facility, accommodate the setbacks, while retaining the characteristics of the CDD.

Mr. Katz said that without severely compelling data and evidence he would not support the conversion of business property to additional residential. It will kill Ridgefield. Residential is not good. This town is getting too big, and it does not have the infrastructure or the temperament to support additional population. That is the truth; the real estate industry doesn't want to hear that, but it is the truth. More to the point, he says, corporate development on a nine-acre piece is a sensible kind of corporate development. There will not be new 100-acre corporate parks any more. Manufacturing is done in China and Mexico; this would not be manufacturing. A tastefully done commercial building is not offensive. Residential development on the nine-acre parcel should not happen.

Chairman Mucchetti asked Dr. Klarsfeld if he felt he had what he needed to go forward. He said he did have a sense of what the Commission would like to see. There seems to be support for the Alzheimers/Memory Care facility, if the property owners can work out the issue of the setbacks to CDD use.

Mr. McChesney echoed Mr. Katz's remarks and said he would prefer not to see any change to MFDD. Dr. Gelfman, on the other hand, did not oppose the residential concept. Mr. Fossi felt that a change from CDD to residential use is not appropriate. Mr. Mische was concerned about potential road cuts on Danbury Road for any use on that portion of the property, because of the dangerous Buck's Hill Road intersection. Mr. Chipouras was generally not in favor of rezoning corporate to residential use. Dr. Autuori supports the idea of the Alzheimer's use. It was generally agreed that rezoning to B2 would allow too much coverage on the land, although wetlands and topography on that site are a limiting factor.

The Planner felt that creating a new zone might be more complex than modifying existing zones. She asked for consensus that a zoning amendment might be

appropriate, for instance, modifying the setback requirement for CDD from residential use. A distinction might be made for setbacks from multi-family or institutional residential use.

Chairman Mucchetti summarized the discussion and all agreed that there is support for the Alzheimer's facility, but not multi-family. There was not support for re-zoning to B2 at this time. It was recommended that the owners work with the Planner to resolve setbacks and other issues for the Alzheimer's facility.

There were no actions or votes taken on this item.

8. **#2010-065-VDC:** Village District Application under Section 8.3 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for replacement signage on property located at **368 Main Street, Wells Fargo** (formerly Wachovia Bank) in the CBD zone. Appl./Auth. Agent: Sign Lite, Inc. Owner: Wells Fargo Properties, LLC. *65-day action period ends 9/9/2010. 35 days to receive Village District report ends 8/10/2010. For receipt, schedule walk if necessary.*

Chairman Mucchetti asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested a drive-by inspection as part of the July 11, 2010 site walk schedule. It was noted that the application would be reviewed by the Village District Consultant on July 13, 2010.

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the drive-by inspection as suggested. The motion passed, 9-0.

COMMISSION WALKS

The following items were added to the walk schedule for **July 11, 2010:**

- **#2010-062-REV(SP):** Revision **90 East Ridge Road**, Town of Ridgefield
- **#2010-065-VDC:** Village District **368 Main Street**, Wells Fargo Properties, LLC (drive-by)

The following items had been previously 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)

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Peer review letter from the Commission's consultant and response from the applicant's engineer for the project at **112 Old Branchville Road**, and revised plans
- New pages (cover and Table of Contents) for the zoning regulations.

- Route 7 Corridor Study aerial maps and Meeting Summary for the June 17th meeting.
- Letter to the Commission from AAC Chairman John Kinnear, re illuminated signs.
- AAC minutes of the meeting of June 22nd, for BMW of Ridgefield and Stop & Shop
- Article on making your home “green”
- Comments from the ZEO and the Fire Marshal, re the Binn application

MINUTES

Mr. Chipouras motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the minutes of June 15, 2010. The motion passed, 9-0.

Mr. Mische motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the minutes of June 22, 2010, with correction to the date of the meeting. Chairman Mucchetti asked to add reference to the audio tapes used in preparation of the minutes, under the Planner’s signature as preparer of the minutes. She also asked that the explanatory paragraph at the end of item #2 be removed, since the information was obtained after the meeting. The motion included the requested changes and passed by a vote of 9-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:18 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius
Director of Planning