

APPROVED / REVISED  
MINUTES  
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

September 29, 2009

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

Absent: Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Inland Wetlands Agent

At 7:30 p.m. Vice Chairman Walsh called the meeting to order. [Note: Dr. Autuori arrived at 7:31, after the vote for item #1.]

**PENDING ITEMS**

1. **#2009-085-SR:** Summary Ruling application under Section 7.5 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations for the Town of Ridgefield for repairs and rehabilitation of the sanitary sewer system at various locations throughout **Sewer District 1** in the Town of Ridgefield. Owner/Apl.: Town of Ridgefield, CT Water Pollution Control Authority. Auth. Agent: Max D. Caldwell, Chairman, W.P.C.A. 65-day action period ends 12/2/2009. For receipt and schedule walk.

**Vice Chairman Walsh** briefly described the application. The Agent suggested 10/18/09 for a site walk.

**Mr. Mische** motioned, seconded by Mr. Chipouras, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site walk as suggested. The motion passed, 7-0.

**BOARD WALKS**

The following item was scheduled for site walk on **October 18, 2009:**

- **#2009-085-SR:** Summary Ruling **Sewer District 1** in the Town of Ridgefield, WPCA

**REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION**

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

The packets mailed and at the table included the following correspondence:

- Memo dated September 27, 2009 from Agent Brosius to the IWB, information and attachments about the application for **Water's Edge Way**
- Copy of letter dated August 31, 2009 from Lee Lyman of Lycott Environmental, Inc. to the Mamasasco Lake Improvement Fund, re management of Mamasasco Lake and overview of its condition

## **MINUTES**

**Mr. McChesney** motioned, seconded by Dr. Gelfman, to approve the minutes of September 15, 2009. The motion passed, 6-0-2, with Dr. Autuori and Mr. Chipouras abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Vice Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius  
Inland Wetlands Agent

APPROVED / REVISED  
MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

September 29, 2009

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

Absent: Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman

Also Present: Betty Brosius, Director of Planning

At 7:33 p.m., Vice Chairman Walsh called the meeting to order. Item #1 was addressed as the last item on the agenda, with discussion concluding at 9:35 p.m.

**PENDING ITEMS**

1. **#2009-016-POCD: PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT**, Town of Ridgefield Workshop.

**Heidi Samokar**, consultant planner from the firm of Planimetrics, LLC, was present to lead the work shop session on the update to the Plan of Conservation and Development.

Ms. Samokar stated that her goal was to get feedback from the Commission on the draft chapters prepared by Planimetrics, and to plan for next steps. She asked if the Commissioners had reviewed the chapters, and most responded affirmatively.

Ms. Samokar handed out a “cheat sheet,” listing the goals for reviewing the topics and strategies in each chapter:

- Are the important topics included?
- Are the major issues addressed?
- Is the tone suitable? [This will be important when there are delicate issues.]
- Are the maps accurate and clear?

She would also like to determine if the length of each chapter is appropriate, and if the overall format is working. The format is similar to the 1999 plan. She suggested proceeding chapter by chapter. She noted that in some cases she carried over language from the 1999 plan, in some cases she quoted directly from the input that was received from others, and in some cases she used her own language.

The chapters were discussed in the order of page numbering.

**Community Character.** Progress made in the past 10 years was noted. She asked about a notation on page 4, where someone had suggested a “hometown hero” program, to recognize contributions from the citizenry on an annual basis. It was agreed that such recognition is often done by other organizations in the community, and it was not necessary to make a recommendation in the Plan.

**Planner Brosius** said she was concerned that the chapter might be too brief, but had no specific recommendations for additional input. Mr. Walsh wanted to add some more recognition and emphasis for the historic resources in town. Ms. Samokar noted that there will be a separate chapter for historic resources, but will also include a “historic” reference under character. Dr. Autuori thought that “open fields” should be included in the paragraph about protection of scenic resources and areas. Mr. Katz thought this was a valid point considering the “conservation” nature of the document. It will be added to #1 on page 5 (Protection of resources) and on page 2, in the “Physical Character” section.

**Mr. Katz** wanted to mention the Ridgefield Playhouse for Movies and the Performing Arts. Keeler Tavern and Tiger Hollow should also be mentioned. Mr. Walsh suggested that Ballard Park be mentioned. It could be added to the Ridgefield Center paragraph. Mr. McChesney noted that the list could go on and on; many places should be mentioned. Mr. Mische likes the idea of adding photographs, especially if they can be labeled.

**Ms. Samokar** noted that the entire Plan will continue to relate back to the Community Character section.

**Natural Resources.** Ms. Samokar said she thought people would be looking here for mention of energy, and talks about sustainability appear on page 7. This will also be mentioned in chapters such as Community Facilities.

**Dr. Autuori** noted the “Resources for Preservation” section and asked again about adding open fields. Ms. Samokar explained that this preservation section is geared more toward the public health perspective. She would include fields in sections pertaining to habitats.

**Ms. Samokar** also explained that “preservation” means that these are the “can’t touch” resources – watercourses, wetlands, very steep slopes, floodplains. Conservation deals more with aquifers, floodplains, and unique habitats. She asked if the map in the chapter should be broken down into the two categories. With the small scale map it is hard to see some of the categories. For instance, flood plains are hard to distinguish. It was agreed that the map is for general purposes, and it is adequate as it is.

**Ms. Samokar** noted that Ridgefield is one of few communities where the center of town is not on top of a particularly sensitive area.

She pointed out on page 11 the “Overarching Principles” section, where various topics are broken down in paragraphs. She asked the Commission for comment on the sidebar, where “Buildable Land” is discussed. It was agreed that the language was an excellent compromise of previous discussions, and it should remain as proposed. Dr. Autuori added that the language doesn’t “close the door” to future discussions on the topic, but it has suggestions for future discussion if needed.

**Dr. Autuori** wanted to add something about encouraging that large areas of open space be preserved. There should be incentives and bonuses for density. He referenced this in relation to PRD subdivisions, where larger areas of open space are typically preserved. There may be other ways to accomplish this. There was some discussion about how the number of lots in a PRD is determined. Mr. Katz pointed out the Cioffoletti case, where the court referenced the number of lots that could be created in a conventional subdivision as the determining factor for the number of lots in a PRD. The Planner stated that a new regulation could be created that would have other standards, such as an overlay for a conservation cluster. The court decision about maximum number of lots was specific to the PRD regulation as it was written. More research may be needed to address this issue.

**Dr. Gelfman** was concerned about the consequences of the Cioffoletti decision and did not want to duplicate any regulation that would permit a subdivision similar to Kendra Court. Mr. Walsh offered some comments to clarify that the desire would be for a new regulation, to preserve more open space. The Planner suggested that there should be general language about the preservation of open space in favor of allowing smaller lots. Mr. Fossi agreed, and mentioned a specific property as an example where this could work. He emphasized that no specific regulation is being proposed here.

**Mr. Katz** suggested changing “should consider” to “might consider” a new regulation or modifications to the PRD for preservation of more open space.

**Planner Brosius** commented that the map should include public water supply watersheds. There are some sensitive areas, including the Saugatuck and the Titicus. It was agreed that water supply watersheds should be identified.

Under “Protecting Resources” on page 16, the various resources were broken down into categories for discussion. The strategies are similar for all, and were generalized.

**Dr. Autuori** wanted to make sure that air quality was included. He also commented on adding the word “protection” in addition to “preservation” under vernal pools. Mr. Katz thought preservation is a stronger word and is more appropriate. Dr. Autuori is looking for the language that the Inland Wetlands Board can legally administer.

**Planner Brosius** had some suggestions for additions to the ground water protection section, including language about protecting stratified drift aquifers, because they may be potential water sources at some point in the future.

The names of the aquifers will be added to the map, using a key.

On page 16, the Planner noted that the Mamasasco Lake guidelines were officially adopted to the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses regulations.

**Dr. Autuori** did not like the idea of suggesting a town ordinance that would require underground oil tanks to be removed. Many disagreed, and it was not changed. Mr. Walsh noted that it is difficult to sell a home, and others are reluctant to buy one, if there is an underground oil tank on the property. Dr. Autuori continued to disagree, saying that the tanks can be tested. Mr. Mische feels that they will all fail eventually, and he thinks the language should remain.

Dr. Autuori also disagreed with the recommendation for septic system maintenance. It was pointed out that this is a suggestion, not a mandate. Dr. Autuori also did not like the wording that flood plains act as “shock absorbers”, and asked for different wording. He also likes the idea of a regulation that would prevent the cutting of trees. Most disagreed, and said this would be over-regulation.

**Mr. Mische** asked if it was appropriate to talk about water consumption. He knows that the water table has dropped in his neighborhood. Ms. Samokar said that other communities have set up a recording system, to monitor the data and to note where there are trends and areas where problems are concentrated. She is not aware of any community that has an ordinance, and noted that enforcement would be next to impossible.

There was some discussion about the comment on steep driveways, and it was noted that there is a zoning regulation to control the grade for new driveways. It was agreed that this should also be in the town’s driveway ordinance at some point.

**Ms. Samokar** addressed air quality, and said that her research shows decreased air quality near high-traffic highways. Some studies recommend that no daycare, schools, homes, etc. should be closer than 300 feet from highways. Dr. Autuori suggested adding the word “public” in front of the work transit. Mr. Katz suggested adding a general statement that sums up the point made by Ms. Samokar. He agrees that the problem will rarely come up in Ridgefield, but it is worth mentioning it in the Plan.

**Open Space:** Ms. Samokar moved on to the Open Space chapter, and pointed out the sidebar on page 22, which mentions the amount of “Protected Open Space” and “Other Open Space” calculated by staff. The definitions for each are different.

The largest category is the Protected open space, which is land that can be reasonably expected to remain as open space over the long term, and it includes state and federal parklands, parcels owned by the Land Conservancy and the Conservation Commission, town parks (if predominantly used for passive recreation), and some homeowner's association lands. [4,379 acres = 20%] Ms. Samokar pointed out that the HOA lands are difficult to categorize, because the records are not always clear.

“Other” open space is land such as golf courses (active recreation), developed town park lands, water company lands, and some homeowner's association lands that may be developed with structures and facilities. [687 acres = 3%] For instance, the Planner noted the search for land to build a school several years ago, when the town considered using certain parklands. Golf courses are sometimes included in the Protected Open Space, although it is not deed-restricted.

Fields on all of the school properties have not been included as open space, because they are actively used. It is the Commission's “call” if some of these lands should be included. Mr. Mische points out that there is Open Space (dedicated) and then open space with lower case “o” and “s” that is open land, but not especially protected and sometimes actively used. One is a title, the other is a description.

**Mr. Walsh** points out that the reference to 20% Open Space in the last paragraph on page 22 should be “protected” open space and not “preserved” open space, because it is not always “dedicated” by deed-restriction.

**The Planner** noted that it took about 3 weeks of time to go through the open space records and to correct the entries so that they would match up with assessor lot numbers, and then the map could be made. The assessor's records and the GIS system are not linked in a manner that makes it easy to sort out parcels and to generate the maps that are needed for the Plan, as they are in many other towns. The Planner took the opportunity to note that the Town should look at the computer-based record-keeping system for much-needed improvements.

**Dr. Autuori** drew attention to the 30% number for open space at the top of page 23 and recommended that it be “deeded” open space. The Planner pointed out the next two sentences in the paragraph, where the difficulty with achieving that number is emphasized. Ms. Samokar noted that it will be important to hold on to the “other” open space as much as possible, in trying to reach the 30% goal.

In the second paragraph, Dr. Autuori feels that the statement should recommend “preserving and acquiring open space”, and the Town should support open space funding.

Under “Greenways,” Ms. Samokar said that a lot of this information is carried over from the previous Plan. On page 24, the recent State legislation pertaining to sale of former Super 7 right-of-way land is mentioned. Dr. Autuori pointed out a suggested modification in the first greenway paragraph, stating that greenway systems can

contribute to an “enhanced” quality of life (substituting for “high”). He stated that the Commission removed the Super 7 plans from the POCD, and substituted support for the Sugar Hollow Greenway. That should remain the same. Ms. Samokar’s language on this issue was found to be adequate, as long as it is clear that the Sugar Hollow Greenway is the same as the former Super 7 corridor, not something that is adjacent to it.

**Dr. Autuori** wanted to add that it is important to encourage children to use open spaces. Children are spending too much time indoors. Mr. McChesney didn’t feel this needed to be in the Plan, and Mr. Katz pointed out that it is a parenting issue.

It was suggested that some of the trail systems be labeled on the map, including the Sugar Hollow Greenway and the Ives Trail.

On page 27, it was agreed that #1 in the strategies should read: “Continue open space preservation and acquisition efforts.” Dr. Autuori had some notes about increasing open space funding. It was decided that #4 in the strategies covers this issue.

**Historical & Cultural Resources:** **The Planner** asked for the source of the State Historic Districts shown on the map, in particular the West Mountain Historic District and the Titicus Historic District. The Planning Department has no records of these districts. Ms. Samokar says she thinks they were in the last Plan. The West Mountain Historic District is listed on both the National and State registers, and the Titicus showed up in the last Plan. Mr. McChesney asked if there are any detailed maps showing these districts. He also asked about Ridgebury, but it was determined that it was never adopted as an official local Historic District.

**Ms. Samokar** asked if there should be a particular strategy to address the addition of new historic resources and districts. Mr. Katz pointed to the issue of the demolition of the Keeler House in Ridgebury, and all agreed that the strategies should include a recommendation for the identification of additional historic areas and resources. Mr. Katz says that several of the structures in Ridgebury are from the Revolutionary War period.

Ms. Samokar says the best protection is for the Town to own properties, but that is not practical for individual homes. She acknowledged that the Commission is already doing a lot with regulations to promote preservation. Mr. McChesney pointed out that the Historic District Commission actually does more than the Historical Society to preserve historic resources, within the areas of its jurisdiction. The Planner suggests that the Historic District Commission be listed under “accomplishments” on page 33.

**Dr. Autuori** asks if the funding suggestions on page 34 could also be applied to the Open Space section. It was agreed that it would be appropriate.

**Mr. Katz** commented on the adaptive reuse regulation, and Ms. Samokar pointed out that a strategy is to consider this regulation for application in other areas. Mr. Katz is concerned with preserving “zoning integrity” when using this regulation, when preserving older homes. Strategy #8 seems to cover this concern.

**Planner Brosius** pointed out that the Old Playhouse on Prospect Street is now listed on the State register as an historic property, and it should be added to the list. She also suggested that the Village District might be mentioned in the sidebar on page 30, as a regulation where historic buildings are recommended to be preserved.

**Community Structure:** Mr. McChesney commented on the map, and thinks the Commission should include the western entry point at North Salem Road and NY, and South Salem Road on Route 35, and Ridgebury Road at the north by Danbury, and Route 33 at the south by Wilton. All agreed.

**Ms. Samokar** drew attention to the box regarding the Ridgefield Center Study on page 41. It was agreed that the suggestion for two-way traffic on Bailey Avenue should be moved to the bottom of the list. It was left in the study, but only to be “considered.” The Business Improvement District should be added to the list as well.

**Planner Brosius** said that parking areas and sidewalks should be included in the paragraph on providing accessibility in the downtown area, in addition to accessibility for businesses.

**Ms. Samokar** spoke about Branchville, on page 42, where the Plan will reference the Branchville Village Plan. Development in Branchville needs to be flexible, but the elements of the Village Plan should be considered.

Under “other areas” on page 43, Mr. Katz asked about the language in the second paragraph, “It is not expected that these areas should become villages to the same degree as Ridgefield Center...” Ms. Samokar explained that the village elements (parking in the rear, for instance) may not always be appropriate for other areas. Mr. Katz suggested: “...not expected that these areas should incorporate village structure elements...”

**Mr. McChesney** asked about whether putting sidewalks on Route 7 and 35 makes any sense. The Planner pointed out that the Route 7 Corridor Study technical committee promoted the idea that sidewalks should be included on Route 7 from Danbury to Norwalk. After some discussion, it was decided to leave the language as is.

**Ms. Samokar** asked if the chapter was complete enough, and whether more should be incorporated from the Route 35 Traffic Improvement Study, including diagrams. It was decided that the plan should be referenced, but no diagrams would be necessary. The bullets on page 43 should be clarified as being from the Route 35

study. References to street lighting should focus on replacing old lights with decorative lighting, and not adding more lights.

Under “gateways,” it was decided that signage is appropriate, and the general language proposed in the draft is appropriate.

**Housing:** Ms. Samokar pointed out that this chapter changed quite a bit from the last Plan, not in terms of substance, but in terms of how it is organized.

The “multi-family criteria” box on page 48 was discussed first. Amendments added in the past few years are shown. Some thought the word “municipal” should be added in front of the words “sewerage facilities.” There was some discussion about whether this would preclude acceptance of a large DEP-approved system. The word “should” will stay, indicating that municipal sewers are preferred, but that will not prohibit the introduction of some other system.

**Ms. Samokar** said that the language on pages 51, 52 and 53 is new. She asked about whether a benchmark should be established as a goal for affordable units. She included information from the HVCEO Housing Study, completed earlier in the year, and noted that the study says Ridgefield has a need for almost 1,100 units of affordable housing. She tried to include language that recognizes that need, but the words also celebrate the fact that there has been progress made toward adding affordable housing, even if it is only 15 units in one year. The HVCEO study used data relating to jobs, incomes, and other regional data to estimate the need.

**Mr. Katz** points out that this study was done at the height of the real estate market, and it is not realistic to think that goals could be achieved in a depressed market. Today, rents have dropped so much in Ridgefield that the rental units are actually “affordable.” He believes that the constraints to the development of affordable housing should be identified further – traffic and congestion is a big issue. These constraints diminish quality of life, and they should be avoided, even at the expense of not providing affordable housing in some cases. The POCD should take into account that we are aware of these constraints. Mr. Walsh suggested that we look at that language in a second draft.

**Planner Brosius** suggested modifications to the paragraph mentioning the 1,100 units in the HVCEO study. She would identify the need as “theoretical,” and instead of saying that the number is “startling,” she would say that it is “unrealistic and unachievable,” but then she supports the idea of going on to mention the progress that has been made to add affordable units. There has been progress, but it is impossible that the Town would ever reach the 1,100 number. She would eliminate the phrase, “but if measured against a benchmark of 1,100 units, that success is overshadowed,” and add the sentence, “It is also unrealistic that Ridgefield could ever realize the 10% requirement for affordable housing set by the State of Connecticut in its statutes under Sec. 8-30g.” Next, the word “Rather” would be replaced with “Nevertheless,

these figures...” and go on with the suggested language, “should be used to illustrate and educate on the need for affordable housing.”

**Ms. Samokar** then explained that the rest of the section is broken into two segments: Regulatory Approaches (a discussion of regulations that promote affordable housing), and Community-Driven Housing Development (a discussion of proactive efforts to create affordable housing).

The Incentive Housing Zone (IHZ) is mentioned under the “density bonuses” section. The Planner notes that a few modifications may be needed in explaining the IHZ and how the regulation works. It is a design “planned by the Town under regulations that are designed and adopted by the Commission.” Regarding photos, a newer photo of the Governor Street affordable housing project would be desirable in this section.

Proactive methods for affordable housing are listed in the “community-driven housing development” section, including discussion about a Housing Trust Fund. Mr. Katz comments that all suggestions are good, but are unlikely to happen in the next decade because of the economy.

The strategies section was found to be adequate as presented.

**Business Development:** Ms. Samokar asked if this section needed to be longer. Mr. Walsh asked why the 25% target for business tax base should be given up. It represents additional ratables, and the town should continue to seek to attain that level of commercial tax base. He draws parallels with the 30% recommendation for open space.

**The Planner** pointed out that percentages derived from ratios of business tax revenues to total tax base can be deceiving because of the value of homes. When home prices go up, then the percentage of the tax base for commercial property goes down, not because the town is losing commercial properties or businesses, but because the numbers based on values change the ratio. She pointed out that Glenn Chalder of Planimetrics has cautioned the Commission about this issue in early discussions. However, all agree that it is important to establish a goal to increase the commercial tax base. The Planner emphasized that she is not saying a 25% ratio can’t be achieved, she is saying that the ratio fluctuates in direct proportion to housing values, rather than because of lack of commercial growth.

**Ms. Samokar** points out that the recent decrease in housing values will also affect the ratio. The Planner feels that the ratio can be meaningless and deceiving. She supports a goal to increase the commercial tax base, but to be careful about using a fixed percentage.

Regarding the map, the two pinks on the map were too close in color and hard to distinguish. The Planner feels that the large northern portion of the Bennetts Farm

property should be noted as open space; it is zoned as CDD, but will not be developed.

**Ms. Samokar** asked about the note on the map to “Investigate Allowing Limited Retail.” Mr. Katz does not think that this should be included. The Planner suggested that a statement be made in the text about “investigating modifications to zoning” in the Route 7 corridor, but not necessarily implying changing zoning. Mr. McChesney felt that the references on the map should be removed. The Planner feels that improvements are needed in the Route 7 corridor because there is great interest in many of the properties, and the regulations are too restrictive. The language on page 59 seems appropriate, and notations on the map should be removed.

The “Other Considerations” and “Strategies” pages need some modification, but are generally adequate. Ms. Samokar would welcome expansion of the Business section if there are any suggestions.

In summary, **Ms. Samokar** says that next month she will provide sections on Community Facilities, Transportation, and Utilities, and the sections discussed this evening will be updated with the recommended changes. The next work shop will be on October 27<sup>th</sup>. In November, the final draft will be made available.

The Commission thanked Ms. Samokar for her excellent work.

2. Report and draft resolution c/o PD re proposal to permit Special Event banners at **Ridgefield Community Center, 316 Main Street** under Sec. 7.2.C.10 and 7.2.C.11 of the Zoning Regulations. *For action.*

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

**Planner Brosius** presented the draft resolution to approve the posting of one sign at a time at the Ridgefield Community Center, for announcing a community event that would not be held at the Center. She stated that the draft resolution had been reviewed by the Executive Director of the Center, the First Selectman, and the Zoning Enforcement Officer, and all found it to be acceptable.

**Mr. McChesney** motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the resolution as drafted. The motion passed, 6-0-2, with Mr. Katz and Mr. Walsh recused.

## **NEW ITEMS**

3. **#2009-086-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 3.3.D.2 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to operate a major home occupation from the residence located at **155 Tanton Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owner/App.: Felicia Jamieson. *65 days to commence public hearing ends 12/3/2009. For receipt, schedule walk and public hearing.*

**Vice Chairman Walsh** introduced the item and the Planner suggested 10/18/09 for a site walk and 11/4/09 for a public hearing.

**Mr. Mische** motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule the site walk and public hearing as suggested. The motion passed, 8-0.

#### **COMMISSION WALKS**

The following item was scheduled for site walk on **October 18, 2009**, as noted above:

- **#2009-086-SP: Special Permit 155 Tanton Hill Road**, Jamieson

#### **REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION**

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

The packets mailed and at the table included the following correspondence:

- E-mail and attachments from Mr. Guidos of 21 McKeon Place, pertaining to the application at **23 McKeon Place**
- Letter dated September 28, 2009 from Planner Brosius to Desmond McGoey of **72 Revere Drive**, requesting additional technical information for the Special Permit application for filling and grading on the property
- Documentation and photos, including the citation and construction debris information pertaining to fill material dumped at **72 Revere Drive**

#### **MINUTES**

**Mr. Mische** motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the minutes of September 15, 2009. The motion passed, 6-0-2, with Dr. Autuori and Mr. Chipouras abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Vice Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius  
Director of Planning