

APPROVED / REVISED  
MINUTES  
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

October 27, 2009

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

*The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting was held prior to the Inland Wetlands Board meeting. At 9:30 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.*

**PENDING ITEMS**

There were no pending items.

**BOARD WALKS**

There were no site walks to be scheduled.

**REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION**

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

**MINUTES**

**Mr. Mische** motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to approve the minutes of October 13, 2009. The motion passed, 7-0-2, with Chairman Mucchetti and Mr. Chipouras abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius  
Inland Wetlands Agent

APPROVED / REVISED  
MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

October 27, 2009

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, Director of Planning

At 7:00 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order, for a joint session with members of the Village District Consultant group (the Architectural Advisory Committee). The joint session was adjourned at 7:47, and the regular meeting agenda of the Planning and Zoning Commission was addressed beginning at 7:48 p.m.

**JOINT SESSION WITH THE VILLAGE DISTRICT CONSULTANT:**  
**#2009-006-MISC:** Joint meeting with VDC/AAC to discuss VDC By-Laws.

The following members of the Village District Consultant (Architectural Advisory Committee) were present for the discussion of the Village District By-Laws: John Kinnear (Chairman), Jeff Mose (Vice Chairman), Suzanne Benton, Helen Dimos, Gene Smith, Glenn Lounsbury.

**Chairman Mucchetti** noted that the Planning and Zoning Commission had adopted by-laws for the Village District Consultant on 1/13/09. It was agreed that the various Articles of the by-laws would be discussed in sequence.

Article I required no discussion, as it dealt with naming the agency and stating the dates of its establishment. Under Article II, Mr. Mose pointed out that the definition of what is described in "Purpose" was brief and may be incomplete. For example, signs are not mentioned. The Planner noted that the Section 2 in that Article refers to specific sections in the zoning regulations, which clearly define the parameters of review. It was also noted that the by-laws had been adopted, and any "word-smithing" or changes would require amendments to the by-laws.

**Mr. Katz** pointed out that the review of signs should be limited to the architectural and design issues, and not to the content/wording of the sign itself. There was some discussion about reviewing content as it pertains to the read-ability and clarity of a sign

within the village, and how that may be a pertinent part of the review. It was agreed that content, as it relates to compatibility of design, character, etc. is a legitimate area where the VDC may make recommendations that could be considered by the applicant and the Commission. Mr. Mose says that the VDC makes it clear to the applicant that they cannot regulate content of signs, but they offer suggestions and recommendations for change.

This followed with a general discussion about the need to make sure that applicants understand that the VDC is offering recommendations and that the VDC cannot require changes. Chairman Mucchetti noted that applicants seem to think that the recommendations are “conditions” that need to be followed. The office has dealt with applicants who leave the VDC meeting thinking that they need to completely redesign their projects based on what they hear, and this has caused confusion.

**Ms. Dimos** asked for clarification of the difference between recommendations made by the AAC and the VDC. It was established that both are advisory agencies. Mr. Walsh noted that recommendations are often included as conditions in the Commission’s approval of Village District applications. It was emphasized that there is a need to make sure that recommendations represent the majority opinion of the VDC. Ms. Dimos agrees that applicants sometimes seem confused during the discussion of members of the VDC, and it is important to establish the recommendations that represent the majority opinion of the agency.

**The Planner** suggested that the VDC outline the parameters of the review at the beginning of each meeting, so that the applicant knows what is going to happen, and that the comments are advisory recommendations and not “approval” or “denial” of an application. Mr. Lounsbury suggested educating the applicants as much as possible before they appear at meetings, so they know what to expect. A hand-out of information is recommended. The Planner noted that this is already done by office staff, as much as possible, but it may be improved.

**Chairman Mucchetti** points out that there are differences between dealing with professionals for large projects and homeowners or small business owners who have limited resources and limited understanding of the process. The Charter of the town requires that motions, seconds and votes be taken to establish the majority opinion. The consensus must be formalized.

Articles III and IV referred to membership and terms of office, and election of officers. Chairman Mucchetti noted that the VDC can be a committee of one, or it can be a body of members; the AAC currently serves as the VDC. The schedule for election of officers within the agency is noted as the month of December, which parallels the schedule following by the P&Z Commission. Article V deals with setting agendas and scheduling meetings.

**Chairman Mucchetti** noted Article VI, which deals with the Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. She noted that the list was developed to some extent based on

complaints that have been received in the office by applicants who have felt intimidated and disturbed during the review process. The office staff has had to deal with the after-effects of discussions where applicants have disagreed with the review, and have felt that they were treated in a condescending manner at VDC/AAC meetings. As a town agency, members are serving the public, and it is important to treat applicants fairly. The whole application process is intimidating, and applicants should not leave meetings feeling that they have been treated unfairly.

**Ms. Benton** asks about how to deal with arrogance on the part of applicants. Some applicants are very difficult to deal with. Chairman Mucchetti says that some applicants are confused with the advice that they receive and gives the recent CVS “Beauty 360” application as an example. The applicant left the meeting thinking that they had to completely redesign the project to add a separate entrance door for the space, which was outside of the purview of the VDC responsibility. The Planner had to spend a considerable amount of time explaining to the applicant that the review of the VDC was limited to the sign, and that there was no requirement for a separate entrance door. What the office hears is that the applicants are intimidated and frustrated by the process.

**The Planner** agrees with this assessment, and notes that the perception on the part of the applicant may be incorrect, but nevertheless it is a negative experience that sometimes leaves them frustrated. It may not be a criticism of the VDC agency as a whole, but the applicant may have an issue with comments made by one or two members in particular. In any case, there is a communication breakdown that is difficult to correct. The method of delivery of recommendation to the applicant is not always perceived as positive. On the other hand, the Planner often receives very positive comments about AAC/VDC reviews, and applicants find the recommendations to be very helpful, so the issue is not an across-the-board criticism.

**Ms. Dimos** asks if the frustration is primarily from developers, or from single, small-business owners and homeowners. Are they first-time applicants, or are they experienced? She feels that the AAC/VDC spends extra time with individuals who are starting businesses or moving to town for the first time. They try to encourage them and help them with their applications. They emphasize that their opinions are advisory, but that the suggestions may help them to do better business. They may be shorter with comments to those who “ought to know better.”

**Mr. Mose** felt that was the case with the CVS application. The representative was from the other end of the state, and he came to the meeting with high expectations and an arrogant attitude. He was professional, and he was trying to draw a corporate line. The AAC has a short period of time to review multi-million dollar designs, and to try to make changes to projects that will have a lasting effect on the aesthetics of the community.

**Mr. Fossi** agrees that Ridgefield is a beautiful town, and it is largely due to the efforts of the AAC. He feels uncomfortable that the comments seem like scolding, but he also feels that plans presented by some small business owners should be accepted as “good enough.” There is a need to “pick and choose battles” so that important projects are

properly scrutinized (and may be rejected), and others are given less scrutiny because they really are small issues.

**Mr. Kinnear** feels that even the small applications, collectively, can have an impact on the looks of the town. The AAC/VDC essentially offers thousands of dollars worth of expert and professional advice to applicants at no charge. He feels that the bar needs to be high. The suggestions about the sign for the TerraSole restaurant, for instance, were meant to be constructive advice. Signs are an important part of the visual impact that a town makes on people.

**Mr. Katz** suggests that the delivery of the message (suggestions) may need to be changed, but in the end, if the applicant disagrees with the advice, then there is a need to move on.

**The Planner** points out that her frustration is the advice that is given relative to matters that are zoning regulations and not under the purview of the AAC/VDC. When applicants are told that their multiple signs do not comply with zoning regulations, or that a sign is bigger than allowed by zoning, or in the case of the CVS application that a new entrance door is required, then the applicant is confused. Zoning information should only come from the Planning and Zoning staff. It is extremely appropriate for the AAC/VDC to say that two signs are not appropriate or attractive for the design, or that the size of a sign is out of character with surrounding neighborhood, aesthetically and practically, but the decision on the size of the sign is the purview of the Commission and its zoning regulations.

**Ms. Dimos** says that a separate entrance is absolutely a VDC issue if it affects the attractiveness of the project. The Planner agrees with that comment if it is a recommendation, but she notes that applicants are coming away thinking that they need variances, or that their proposal doesn't comply with zoning regulations. Whether or not an application meets zoning regulations is not for the AAC/VDC to decide.

**Mr. Katz** feels that the emphasis of the word "recommend" to applicants is important. Mr. Walsh says that boilerplate language in the minutes that "this is a recommendation" may be important. Mr. Kinnear points out that the language is already on the minutes.

**The Planner** repeats that AAC/VDC recommendations about issues related to numbers of signs, sizes of signs, etc. relative to design and aesthetics are extremely important, but ultimately it is the Commission who will be making the decision. And the decision may be a denial if the second sign or the size of the sign is inappropriate. The recommendations of the AAC/VDC can be key to the final decision of the Commission.

**Chairman Mucchetti** noted the next paragraph in the by-laws, pertaining to attendance, and that a 2/3 attendance record is required for members, or there may be cause for removal from the agency. Amendments of the by-laws require a vote of the Planning and Zoning Commission at a regular meeting.

**Ms. Dimos** asked if it is helpful for the Commission to know the design reasons for the recommendations of the AAC/VDC, and it was agreed that it would be helpful. Ms. Benton asked again for clarification on issues like signs that are too big. Mr. Walsh emphasized again that it is the Commission's purview to determine if the sign meets the regulations for size, but that the AAC/VDC comments on the aesthetics of the sign and the size of the sign relative to its appearance are key to the decision-making of the Commission under Special Permit review. It is important to know the design reasons behind the recommendations of the AAC/VDC.

**Mr. Mose** adds that the pre-meeting comments from the Planner on details of the application are helpful.

**Mr. Mische** emphasizes that the AAC/VDC is a wonderful resource and is key to making projects better. He adds one last comment, that it is important for the applicant to understand that AAC/VDC minutes are "recommendations" because they are often confused by the process.

**Mr. Mose** cited an example from New Fairfield, where the Chairman of the ZBA gave a pre-meeting explanation of the process and the role of the agency. The Planner thinks that it is also important for the applicants to know the expertise of the AAC/VDC members, and introductions are important.

All agreed that joint meetings of the AAC/VDC and the Commission are helpful and discussions like this should be done again.

There were no votes taken or decisions made, and the discussion ended at 7:47 p.m. The AAC/VDC members left to convene their own regular meeting in another room.

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA (beginning at 7:48 p.m.):**  
**PENDING ITEMS**

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

**Heidi Samokar** of Planimetrics was present to discuss draft Chapters 11, 12, and 13, for Community Services & Facilities, Transportation, and Utilities.

There is a need to accomplish three things: (1) to go through the draft infrastructure chapters; (2) the chapter list; and (3) the upcoming schedule for meetings.

In reviewing the chapters, Ms. Samokar reminded the Commission that there is a need to make sure that the drafts accomplish the following: (1) Are the important topics included?; (2) Are the major issues addressed?; (3) Is the tone suitable?, and (4) Are the maps accurate and clear? She would like to know if each chapter is too long or too short, and if the overall format is good.

Starting with Chapter 11, “Community Services & Facilities,” on page 61 where the plan deals with how certain issues affect community services, Mr. Katz felt that there should be an acknowledgement of the fact that the Board of Education consultant has identified a decline in the enrollment of students, and that there will likely be a decrease in school population over the next decade. Dr. Gelfman disagreed, and said that past projections were proven wrong. Ms. Samokar points to statistics that support the fact that the population of the over-55 age group will increase. The entire chapter is dependent on actual demographic projections, but there can be an acknowledgement that history has proven statistics wrong in the past.

There was continued debate on this subject with the final result being an acknowledgement that there will be “fluctuations” in the school population over the decade, but whether or not there will be a decrease or increase should not be identified. Page 61 was not changed.

Under “Town Hall and Annex,” Mr. Walsh informed the Commission that a State decision about probate court has been made, and the offices will be vacated with the court relocated to either Bethel or Newtown. A correction was also made to the reference in some places to the “Annex,” where “Venus Municipal Center” is the proper name for the building as a whole. Planner Brosius asked for a change in the statement that “Space needs at the Annex can be met with internal configurations,” to state instead, “Space needs may require future use of space that is currently leased to others.” It was also acknowledged that handicapped accessibility can be improved.

Under “Public Safety,” it was noted that the Fire Commission finally provided comment, and that has been incorporated into the draft. Ms. Samokar says she has heard from more than one source that a combined fire/police center is desirable. Mr. Katz thought the existing fire station might be considered for additional municipal parking downtown, if the building is abandoned. Not all agreed, and it was decided that the statement was too strong. Ms. Samokar suggested that consideration should be made for use of the building if abandoned, but that a specific purpose should not be identified.

Under “Public Works,” it was noted that there is room at the current site, but there is a need for a satellite facility in Ridgebury. Ms. Samokar pointed out that Ridgefield is one of only a few communities that do not have a pavement management system, and this is a real need. Mr. Katz asked for a correction of the statement that the current site is “industrial in nature,” because he feels it is not. Ms. Samokar notes that the Highway Department finds its current location desirable because the neighbors [there are no adjacent residences] don’t complain about the use. The preference is to say that it is “non-residential.”

Ms. Samokar says that the “Recreation Facilities” section always draws a lot of comment because every town seems to need more fields. There are several options for most towns: (1) cut down on users; (2) go to artificial turf, which is expensive and sometimes controversial because of the fear of chemicals; (3) improve management

of existing fields (include private fields); and (4) build more fields. She asks what the approach should be for this plan? All agreed that the draft statement, stating there are “various options,” is excellent.

**Chairman Mucchetti** asked that the “Bark Park” be added to the list of Parks and Recreation facilities. Ms. Samokar says that Ridgefield’s bark park comes up in internet searches in many “hits” because it is so popular and a good example of such a facility.

Under “Social and Cultural Facilities,” there was considerable discussion about the library. Chairman Mucchetti thought that it would be more appropriate to state “support for the exploration of options to address the library’s needs,” rather than to state emphatically that “the library should be expanded.” There is strong tension about the subject, between the library’s board and the Board of Selectmen. Mr. Katz and Dr. Gelfman strongly disagreed, but Mr. Walsh agreed with the Chairman. Mr. Walsh thought the Commission should not “be in the business to make a recommendation for expansion.” Others should come to that definitive conclusion.

Ms. Samokar asked some basic questions and gained support for the following: (1) All agreed that the quality of service at the library is important and should be maintained; (2) All agreed that library should remain in Ridgefield Center, no matter what. Chairman Mucchetti summarized and supported the general statement to “explore” options for expansion and to keep the library in the center of the village. The consensus was to make this general statement, although some disagreed.

On page 70, for “Other Facilities,” it was noted that the “Teen Center” is known as “The Barn.” Mr. Katz pointed out that there is no outdoor space for the Barn, even though they use the parking lot which belongs to others. He supported the idea that the center may need to be relocated, and options should be explored. It was noted that the Ridgefield Music and Arts Center (RMAC) is currently located in temporary space. Mr. Mische notes that current offerings for teens are limited. Chairman Mucchetti thought that the Boys and Girls Club should be noted as a private facility providing important recreation facilities.

Commissioners wanted to reference specific museums, and it was noted that this had been discussed in more detail in previous chapters.

Under “Education Facilities,” Mr. Katz thought the first sentence should be eliminated. Ms. Samokar noted that on-going studies state that current facilities are adequate to meet current and future needs, and that there is support for holding and maintaining current facilities rather than closing schools. Mr. Mische asked that the words “just beginning to see a decline in enrollment” be changed to say, “recently seen changes in enrollment.” There is no guarantee that enrollment will continue to decline. Dr. Gelfman asked why this needed to be in the Plan at all. Ms. Samokar pointed out that, with an increase or a decline in enrollment, there are space impacts

to the Town. Dr. Gelfman said there is a new study by the Board of Ed's consultant, for 2009.

**Ms. Samokar** asked if there should be more under the "Sustainable Public Facilities" section. There has been quite a lot done, including the acquisition of solar panels as a result of residents' participation in clean energy programs. The Assistant Engineer, Jake Muller, may have additional information on the status of this program. Mr. Muller has also studied methods to save energy by turning off surplus public lighting on streets and for town facilities and parking lots. Mr. Katz says that the town is clearly ahead of the curve on attacking energy waste, and mentioning some general programs is important. Conversely, the Police Department has resisted turning off lights in the parking lots.

Under the "Strategies" on page 74, there was a need to change the reference for "expansion" of the library to "explore options." It was also noted that the parking needs of the recreation center were addressed, but not implemented (number 5 in the list). Under number 9, Mr. Walsh objected to the reference to "excess capacity" in the schools, because it may not be a condition that lasts throughout the decade. Number 9 was eliminated from the list. Under number 11, "an aging population" was changed to "demographic changes." Mr. Katz objected to the definitive statement in number 10, that the town should add and update Housing Authority units. The term "assess the needs" was substituted. Chairman Mucchetti pointed to the need to change the same language on page 70.

**Mr. Katz** said that the proposed changes make the document more "wishy-washy," and Ms. Samokar acknowledged that the requested changes are developing as a particular tone for the entire document. Mr. Katz said that this is a "Plan of Conservation and Development," not a "Plan of Proposed Conservation and Possible Development." He objected to the lack of support to tackle specific issues (such as the library and schools), and to be more definitive. The document may be useless, and simply a document to meet statutory obligations.

**Mr. Mische** says that there are certain issues where specific recommendations are appropriate, but in other areas there is a need to be more general. He disagrees with Mr. Katz. Mr. Fossi agreed with Mr. Mische's position. Others need to identify the specific needs, and the Commission needs to make the Plan flexible. Ms. Samokar notes that this is the chapter where most communities struggle the most, because it is not the Commission that is responsible for the follow-through on the items that are identified. Dr. Gelfman feels strongly that keeping the library and Town Hall on Main Street is important, and the Commission should not be afraid to state it. Mr. Katz says that the idea of "expansion" for any of the town facilities in the next decade is unrealistic, due to the economy.

Under Chapter 12, "Transportation," Ms. Samokar says the challenge for this cycle is that reliable data for traffic is not available. The numbers actually show a decrease in the Route 7 traffic counts, and we can assume that the recent construction for the road

widening has had an impact on people using local roads like Ridgebury. She looked at statistics from 1995, 2000, 2005 and 2007. It would make more sense to look at the numbers when the road is completed. Mr. McChesney agrees, and thinks that there will be a major change once the section between the Danbury border and the airport area is completed. Ms. Samokar says it is important to continue reviewing access management on both Route 35 and Route 7. Making pedestrian movement easier in the downtown area is also important. Dr. Autuori confirmed that the Plan does not recommend a “Super 7” highway through Ridgefield.

**Mr. McChesney** asked about the bus routes on the map. The small loop off Briar Ridge Road may be incorrect; it is assumed that the bus goes into the Boehringer Ingelheim site, off Shadow Lake Road. That section will be checked and corrected on the map. Ms. Samokar says that looking at potential land uses will be important in the future, because of the potential impact on traffic. The idea of “Transportation Demand Management” (TMD) is introduced in the plan, and the Commission may consider requiring larger employers to incorporate alternative forms of transportation into the planning of any expansion of business.

Roadway standards are in the Town Code, and it was agreed that the Code may need to be reviewed for improvement, keeping in mind the need to preserve rural character. The pavement management system is mentioned again in the Transportation section. The “Public Transit” section was found to be adequate, with minor editing changes. Additional shuttles to the Branchville station and the Harlem line are needed. Also, Ridgefield has cut support for the HART bus, which carries seniors. This can have an impact.

**The Planner** noted that the “Pedestrian Enhancement Area” downtown should be expanded to the east, to include Halpin Lane and the Housing Authority property, and the “arts district.” The roads do not lend themselves well to biking because there is a need for widening that is difficult.

Under Chapter 13, for “Utilities,” Ms. Samokar notes that the State has been working to assign portions of a community (territories) under particular water companies, who would be responsible when expansion is needed. Ms. Samokar also notes that the “safe yields” for water use in 40 years may not be so “safe” any more. By 2050, there will be a need for more conservation, more storage capacity, or additional water supplies.

**Mr. McChesney** points out that the sewer service area shown in the Route 7/35 is incorrect on the map on page 89. Ms. Samokar notes that there is a difference between the existing sewer service infrastructure and the “sewer service area,” which are not necessarily the same. The State Plan of Conservation and Development must be “in synch” with the local map, or there may not be State funding available for sewer improvements. The WPCA creates the “sewer service area” map, and there should be communication between the WPCA, the Commission, and other Town

agencies. The Planner will provide Ms. Samokar with mapping information from the Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA).

It was also noted that Branchville is shown as a “potential future sewer service area,” but we don’t know if sewer service is needed for any development there. The Planner notes that improvements in Branchville may indeed require sewers, but that sewer service is likely to come from the Redding plant, if available. Mr. Katz asks why the Plan should say that we “encourage village development” in Branchville. He says limitations on sewer are good because inappropriate future development is discouraged. He does not want to see increased development.

The Planner points to the first paragraph on page 91, where it says that sewers can lead to increased densities where such increase may not be desirable, but it also addresses the fact that “infrastructure, particularly public sewers, should not dictate development intensity... [but] should support the development patterns and intensities desired by the community.” Any kind of improvement in Branchville might require sewers, but such service should not be of the capacity that it would support large condominium development, for instance. Sewers should support existing business and some improvement, but not large-scale development.

Mr. Katz asked that the following sentence be deleted: “Whether providing sewer service in Branchville will be needed in order to encourage village type development has not yet been determined, but should be explored.” There was not support to do this, because the Branchville Village Plan supports improvements in that section of town. Ms. Samokar will refer back to the Branchville Village Plan in previous chapters.

Ms. Samokar repeats her earlier statement that it is completely the jurisdiction of the WPCA to map out future sewer service areas, but communication with other agencies, such as the Planning and Zoning Commission, is key.

The Town Engineer had input into the “Storm Water Drainage” section. Jake Muller may be able to offer additional comment about the Stormwater Phase II program.

Mr. McChesney wanted to add specific reference to putting the electrical lines on Main Street underground.

The last issue was under “Communications,” and the need to fill cell service gaps. The Economic Development Commission felt that fiber-optic service could be improved. Ms. Samokar found conflicting information about this issue, but learned that fiber-optic installation is on-going with at least some of the providers.

Ms. Samokar passed out a schedule of chapters, adding a new Chapter 4, for “Planning Issues.” She also handed out a proposed schedule for the project, going forward. The next meeting, to discuss the revised draft, will be held on December 1, 2009. Plans will be available for Commission review on November 17<sup>th</sup>. A public

information meeting, for public review, will be scheduled for January 12, 2010. The consultants will take notes and come back to the Commission for final review and editing. The “information” meeting is intended to be informal.

The Commission complimented Ms. Samokar on the work to date. She asked that the Commission or others provide pictures, if available. A photo is needed for the cover. The Planner asked if the request should be made to others, outside of the Commission. She said, yes, it should. Anyone can contribute photos.

2. **#2009-034-REV(SP)**: Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations for new entry door, lobby and exterior entry canopy on building located at **38C Grove Street** in the B-2 zone. Owner: DOSO Realty, LLC. Appl.: Delta Management. Auth. Agent: Jeffrey D. Mose, AIA. *65- day action period ends 12/24/2009. Received 10/20/2009 and draft Resolution of Approval requested (subject to AAC review) For action.*

**Chairman Mucchetti** pointed out the draft resolution of approval prepared by the Planner. The Planner read the comments of the Architectural Advisory Committee, from its meeting held earlier. The AAC voted unanimously, 5-0, to recommend approval of the plans as submitted.

**Mr. Chipouras** motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to adopt the resolution of approval for the application, as drafted. The motion passed, 8-0-1, with Chairman Mucchetti abstained.

3. **\*#2009-096-SP**: Special Permit application under Section 9.2 required by Section 7.5 to permit earth material processing on property located at **48 Peaceable Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owners: William and Suni Harford. Appl./Auth. Agent: Nazzaro, Inc. *65-days to commence public hearing ends 12/31/2009. For receipt, schedule walk and public hearing.*

**Chairman Mucchetti** asked for acknowledgement of receipt of the application and suggested November 8, 2009 for a site walk, and November 17, 2009 for a public hearing.

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

#### **COMMISSION WALKS**

The Commission scheduled a site walk for **November 8, 2009**, for the following item:

- **#2009-096-SP**: Special Permit **48 Peaceable Hill Road**, Harford

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

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

## **CORRESPONDENCE**

There was no correspondence.

## **MINUTES**

**Mr. Fossi** motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to approve the minutes of October 13, 2009. The motion passed, 7-0-2, with Chairman Mucchetti and Mr. Chipouras abstained.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Betty Brosius  
Director of Planning