

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD

November 8, 2006

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz, Vice Chair/ Secretary
James McChesney
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Walter Slavin
Lillian Willis

Absent: Patrick Walsh

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

A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 8:21 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2006-106-SR:** Summary Ruling application for regulated activities within upland review areas to construct a single-family residence on property located at **Tanton Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owner/Appl.: Gabrielle Kessler. Auth. Agent: JFM Engineering, Inc. *Received 10/10/06. Walked 10/22/06. Public hearing commenced 11/8/06, 35-day action period ends 12/13/06.*

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out that the public hearing was continued to 11/21/06. She asked Conservation Commission member Carol Stoddard, present in the audience, to request a letter and comments from the Commission to be available for the continued hearing. Discussion on the item was tabled for the continued hearing.

NEW ITEMS

2. *For distribution* – **2007 IWB Meeting Schedule** (mailed 11/2/06)

Chairman Mucchetti asked if there any changes or corrections needed for the proposed meeting schedule for 2007. There were none.

Mr. Fossi made a motion, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the 2007 meeting schedule as presented. The motion passed, 8-0.

3. **#2006-116-SR:** Summary Ruling application to create a grazing pasture within wetlands and upland review areas on 3.599 acres of property located at **61 South Olmstead Lane** in the RA and RAA zones. Owners/Appl.: Bruce & Robin Augustadt. *65-day action period ends 1/11/07. For receipt and schedule walk.*

The Agent informed the Board that the revised and resubmitted application included a plan prepared by consultant Kate Throckmorton of Environmental Land Solutions, on behalf of the applicant. Ms. Throckmorton will be available to present the application to the Board on 12/5/06.

Mr. Katz made a motion, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to acknowledge receipt of the application. The motion passed, 8-0.

There was some discussion regarding the need for another site walk, to review the new plan. The Board scheduled a site walk for 11/19/06.

BOARD WALKS

- **#2006-116-SR: 61 South Olmstead Lane;** Augustadt. As noted above, the site walk was scheduled for 11/19/06.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2006-085-SR: 25 Lookout Point,** Kathleen & Andrew B. Wile, request for release of bond. IWA recommends release of \$1,500.00 (see attached note on memo attached)

Chairman Mucchetti read the comment by the Wetlands Inspector in her memo pertaining to the bond release. She writes, "It is certainly refreshing to visit a job site and find that the work is done according to the approved plan."

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. McChesney, to reduce the bond amount to \$1,500 as recommended by the Agent and the Wetlands Inspector. The motion passed, 8-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

- Letter from the Agent to Don Longo, contractor for the on-going wetlands mitigation work at **11 Old Stagecoach Road.** **Chairman Mucchetti** noted that the Agent's letter confirmed that cleaning of sediments (as a maintenance measure) at the pond inlet would be considered part of the overall mitigation work.

MINUTES

Mrs. Willis made a motion, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the minutes of 10/17/06. The motion passed, 7-0-1. Dr. Autuori abstained.

Mrs. Willis made a motion, seconded by Mr. Katz, to approve the minutes of 10/24/06, with a few corrections. Chairman Mucchetti added a few corrections, with agreement from the makers of the motion and the second. The minutes were approved with the corrections by a vote of 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

November 8, 2006

Present: Michael Autuori
Joseph Fossi
Nelson Gelfman
John Katz, Vice Chair/ Secretary
James McChesney
Rebecca Mucchetti, Chairman
Walter Slavin
Lillian Willis

Absent: Patrick Walsh

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

A public hearing was held prior to the meeting.

At 8:28 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. Request for determination of suitability of a proposed use for the MCDD zone, c/o Planning Director. Re: Health & Wellness Center for **901 Ethan Allen Highway**. *For continued discussion/action.*

The Chairman referred the Commission to information they had received from the applicant, Drs. Richard Lipton and Jay Klarsfeld.

Dr. Lipton recalled what he felt had been the main issues at the last meeting, namely: to distinguish this entity from the average gym, and to prove it would meet the requirements for medical use set forth by the Commission in its MCDD zone regulations. In relation to the stipulation that the practitioners at the facility be certified or licensed in the state of Connecticut, Dr. Lipton said that they had assumed that this condition for use had been met by having the certified dietician and the massage therapist, who were both state licensed individuals. However, the fact that these individuals were state licensed did not remedy the fact that the primary service provider at the facility, the fitness instructor, was not licensed by the state.

Dr. Lipton addressed the Commission, detailing the various elements of support material he and his co-applicant had submitted for consideration. They had drawn up a modified description of their services, specifying that these services were to be offered “by appointment only,” with supervision by a trained professional. They felt

these were the strongest distinguishing characteristics between their business and that of a walk-in gym. Dr. Lipton referenced an article in the Danbury News Times, (included in their packet), which confirmed the trend in medicine toward combining fitness centers with other elements of health and wellness. He also referenced testimonials, included, recommending their service professionals, and finally cited a letter from a Practitioner Licensing Investigations agency, which noted that the State of Connecticut does not certify or license fitness professionals.

Dr. Lipton discussed the evolution of Board certification and licensing for fitness professionals, explaining that states have deferred to national organizations, like the National Academy of Sports Medicine and the Aerobics and Fitness Association of America, both of which his fitness instructor, Ms. Maturo, is a member. He said there are currently no states that certify fitness professionals, however, another organization, the National Board of Fitness Educators, is in the process of developing examinations for Board Certification of Fitness Professionals. His fitness instructor intends to become board certified, if that becomes available.

Mr. Katz felt that, because he was concerned with the long term use of this space, he wanted a modification to the wording regarding the “appointment only” aspect of this operation to include the use of the equipment, which will be available by appointment only, as well.

Dr. Lipton said he had no problem with the change, and that it was “entirely consistent with the intent”.

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Planner how the new information presented addressed the criteria within the regulations.

The Planner reminded the Commission that it was up to them to discern whether or not this application conforms to the definition as presented in their regulations. She said she did not want to make that decision for them, but rather reminded them that the certification in the state of Connecticut seemed to be the “sticking point,” and that Dr. Lipton had addressed that concern.

The Chairman said she understood that the application was originally brought to the Commission because it didn’t appear to comply with the zoning regulations. She asked the Planner if, given the additional input from Dr. Lipton and the amended wording as suggested by Mr. Katz, the intent now appeared to be more in compliance, where “... the regulations and the intent are supported by what’s being proposed here”.

The Planner said since this is not a revision to the special permit, but a discussion about the use, the job of the Commission is to see if this use fits the regulation. She felt the only way she and Zoning Enforcement Officer Richard Baldelli were going to be comfortable with this would be to have a record of the discussions at the Commission meeting two weeks prior and at this meeting. She explained why this is

such a serious issue in zoning, giving an example of two storage facilities which were radically different in nature, explaining that, in zoning, “storage is storage”. The concern is for the potential of a distortion of the intent for usage in the future. She said that what the Commission is trying to establish with this discussion is that this is not an ordinary fitness center, and not an ordinary gym, which could then open the door for a Gold’s Gym type facility in the future, which would not be permitted.

Dr. Autuori said that, in a number of venues, when licensure is not available, accreditation of certification is a worthy substitute. There was some discussion. Dr. Autuori said that the certification/accreditation issues carry the weight of what the Commission’s intent would be visa vie licensure. Mr. Katz said that the difficulty was certification or licensure, but was specific to the State of Connecticut licensure. The Chairman agreed. The Planner read from the regulations, supporting this.

Mr. Katz said that the complication here is delineating this use so that, in the future, anyone going to the record would find that it was the intent of this Commission to allow the use at this location. I don’t think anyone could argue that the proposed use is not a piggyback benefit of having a healthcare facility at that location. The challenge is to state the Commission’s interpretation of the regulations to indicate that the use is identified with the medical facility that was originally established, and that this is an amplification of services being made available to people under the care of physicians at this location.

Dr Lipton added that he felt the addition of the word “only,” as in “supervised only by an accredited professional,” should be added to the description of the fitness aspects of this facility.

Mr. Katz mentioned alleged violations that needed to be remedied, and the Chairman said that Dr. Lipton may not be aware of these violations, as the letter was addressed to Dr. Klarsfeld and had just gone out that day. She intended to discuss the letter later in the meeting, under "Correspondence."

Mr. McChesney said he felt these violations were secondary to settling the issue at hand, and he didn’t want to “muddy the waters” by bringing them into discussion then. The Chairman said that this was why they were not being introduced at that point in the meeting. Mr. Katz said that he couldn’t see permitting anything until the violations were cleared up. The Planner explained that the Commission wasn’t going to be granting anything at that meeting, but rather making a determination as to whether or not this application meets the use requirements put forth by the Commission for the MCDD zone. She added that Mr. Baldelli’s letter stipulated that no zoning permit would be issued until the violations had been cleared up, and she felt that the violations could be “quite easily corrected”.

Mr. Fossi wanted some clarification as to what exactly the connection between the fitness and the medical facilities was. He mentioned Mr. Katz’ statement that use of

the fitness services would be available to people under the care of physicians at this location. He said that this was not how he had understood it. He understood that they could be referred by any doctor and come from anywhere.

Dr. Lipton said that was correct, and added, “we clarified at the last meeting, there is a walk-in element, or a direct referral or self-referral mechanism..... not for the purposes of using services, but people can self-refer, and, in fact, we do anticipate a significant proportion of that. Not each and every service will be medically directed. The intent will be medical, but they all will be supervised and there will be no walk-in traffic for the provision of services.” He then went on to address the minor violations. Discussion took place and he said that they would do whatever was appropriate or necessary.

Mr. McChesney commented on the lights, saying he felt they were more of an architectural feature than a lighting feature, and that he didn’t think there was any uplight that violates the zoning regulations. He does not find them to be objectionable uplighting. Discussion ensued.

The Chairman brought the discussion back to the issue on the agenda, which is the suitability of this use within the zone. She asked the Planner what she would need from the Commission.

The Planner said that what she needed was a consensus from the Commission that under the narrow interpretation of the use as presented, including the additional discussion of that evening, the use either does or does not meet the regulation.

Dr. Autuori said that he felt it was appropriate, and Mr. Katz and Chairman Mucchetti agreed. However, the Chairman did not want this interpretation to be a “toe in the door” for future uses that might not be appropriate. She said she supported physical fitness as being closely related to good health, but feared, if not handled correctly, that permitting the use in the medical office zone might create problems for zoning enforcement in the future.

Mr. McChesney asked the Planner if there was a need to modify the wording of the regulation as it is today, or could the supplementary document support her now and in the future.

The Planner said that Dr. Autuori made a point that the accreditation is meeting the intent of the definition. It does not, however, meet the literal wording of the definition – their provider is not a Connecticut licensed professional. This is a problem for zoning in a court of law, because the literal language in the court of law is what sticks. She cautioned the Commission to be aware that, if they allow this, they should make a point of saying that they feel they feel the accreditation is equivalent to a Connecticut state certification as far as the regulations are concerned. This could protect the zoning commission if challenged later on.

Ms. Willis said she didn't think they could say that because they would be assuming to know what the State of Connecticut would require for certification.

Dr. Gelfman said that there had been mention of a society that accredits fitness professionals.

Dr. Lipton asked for rewording to the effect that accreditation, "in the absence of state licensing," would be acceptable, and reiterated that, in this case, state licensing is not available. He stated that it is his position that, if state licensing is available, it should be required. He mentioned that the organizations that Ms. Maturo is accredited by, one of which is specifically recognized by the National Commission for Certifying Agencies, are credible and respected organizations. He added that the National Board of Fitness Examiners will be establishing accreditation on the basis of examination. Ms. Maturo said that would enable fitness professionals to be board certified.

Dr. Gelfman questioned the applicants about the specific qualifications and authority and origin of each of the organizations cited. Much discussion followed.

Ms. Maturo said there are a few states that are inquiring about licensing for fitness professionals. "There is more awareness," she said. No state currently has licensing.

Dr. Lipton said that continuing education units are referenced as requirements toward taking the NCCA exam.

Dr. Gelfman asked if they had any idea when the exam would be available, and Ms Maturo said she did not. Dr. Lipton confirmed that it was not available now.

Dr. Gelfman wondered whether the Commission could amend their language.

Mr. Katz suggested the Commission could specify, "certified or licensed by the State of Connecticut or equivalent," or simply drop "State of Connecticut". He didn't think that this would not require a public hearing because it would be making the regulation less restrictive. The Planner said that a public hearing is required to change the regulations.

The Chairman stated that she didn't see how this would close the door to a "Gold's Gym".

The Planner said that what she would be looking for from the Commission is a statement to the effect that "this tenant space will be occupied by someone who meets the following criteria". She wanted the wording to clearly state that it is only under these conditions or criteria, (which would be clearly listed), that this use meets the regulations. It would be the important criteria mentioned ("by appointment only," "accredited professionals," "supervised activity,") that would distinguish this from an ordinary gym.

Ms. Willis asked if the State of Connecticut has a list of national organizations which it recognizes. Everyone agreed that it did not.

The Chairman recognized Dr. Lipton who was prepared with a draft of language he felt might be helpful.

Dr. Lipton suggested, “the professional providing services is accredited by a recognized national organization in a field that is not otherwise recognized, licensed or accredited by the State of Connecticut”, as language which could prevent the problems anticipated. He reiterated the criteria previously cited as conditions to be added and spelled out. Some discussion followed.

The Chairman asked the Planner how to proceed. She asked if the Planner needed a motion that the Commission finds this a suitable use within the zone based on the following parameters. The Planner said that, yes, and that a letter would need to go out stating that the Commission finds this particular use suitable based on the stated criteria.

It was agreed that the Planner would draft a letter.

The Chairman asked, “How would this be enforced?” The Planner said that Mr. Baldelli would have to enforce this. The Chairman asked if he would have to go in requesting proof of licenses. Mr. Katz said the first line of defense would be the owner of the building.

The Planner said that, in this particular case, they are covered by the fact that there is one owner of the entire building. That is not always the case. She stressed that one of the things that should be referenced is that, in the MCDD zone, under the definition of medical offices, this use, under the following narrow criteria, is considered to meet the intent of the regulation.

Mr. Katz added the following wording: “...use of the equipment and the services of a professional are both by appointment only.”

Dr. Lipton stressed that your typical gym would have a hard time meeting the criteria, specifically the condition that the client be supervised only by an accredited or licensed professional.

The Chairman stated that the Commission needs to be clear about what they are asking the staff to enforce. She reiterated the Commission’s request that the Planner draft a letter. Mr. Katz asked the Planner if she felt that was fair, and she said she would rather do that than try to put something together that evening.

By consensus, the Commission agreed to request a draft letter from the Planner, to summarize the discussion and conclusions pertaining to the proposed use in the MCDD zone, and to outline the parameters within which a “health and fitness center”

would qualify as a permitted use within the zone. The letter will be reviewed and finalized at the 11/14/06 meeting.

2. Commission discussion – proposed updates to zoning regulations.

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Commission to move this item to the end of the agenda. The Commission agreed unanimously, and all other items were discussed. The Commission returned to this item at 9:20 p.m.

The Chairman referenced the Planner's summary of questions and comments dated 10/26/06, itemizing page by page the comments received from members of the public on the proposed zoning regulations.

The Commission went through the list item by item, and the Planner will forward comments and consensus decisions to the consultant, Glenn Chalder of Planimetrics. Discussion ended with the residential zone regulations; the Commission will continue discussion on 11/14/06, beginning with the business zones. Discussion on the "bulk" regulations (setbacks, floor area ratio, lot coverage, building height, etc.) will be continued on 11/28/06, with the consultant.

(Note: The recording secretary was not present for this item. These brief notes on item #2 and summary of the work session discussion were provided by Betty Brosius, Director of Planning.)

NEW ITEMS

3. For distribution-PZC and APA 2007 Meeting Schedule (mailed 11/2/06)

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the meeting schedule for 2007 for the Inland Wetlands Board had been approved, and the calendar for the Planning and Zoning Commission was identical. She also noted that the Aquifer Protection Agency calendar for quarterly meetings was enclosed. The Planner explained that the APA calendar could also be approved by the Commission, in its dual role as the APA.

Mr. Fossi made a motion, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the proposed calendars for 2007. The motion passed, 8-0.

4. **#2006-040-S-SR:** request for 90-day extension in which to file a 3-lot conventional subdivision map and associated deeds for approved subdivision located at **48 Peaceable Hill Road** in the RAA zone. Owners: Suni P. and William P. Harford. Auth. Agent: JFM Engineering, Inc. John F. McCoy, VII, P.E. For approval.

Mr. McChesney made a motion, seconded by Mr. Katz, to grant the 90-day extension to file the map, as requested by the agent for the property owners. The motion passed, 8-0.

5. **#2006-113-REV:** revision to Special Permit under Section 312.0 as required by Section 411.0 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to use a portion of the premises as a fenced parking area on property located at **33 Ethan Allen Highway** in the B-1 zone. Owner/Appl.: Dennis Salzbrunn. For receipt/action and/or schedule walk.

The Planner said that the new owner of this property, which consists of a Barber Shop with three apartments above it is also the owner of the irrigation company across the street. He is requesting permission to create a parking area on the Barber Shop property, where he intends to park commercial vehicles. This parking area would be fenced. It is in a B1 zone, and that is a permitted usage. The Planner spoke to the owners of the neighboring property, John and Joe Ancona, and neither of them had objection to the plan. Because the Barber Shop property was a special permit, the creation of the new parking area on that lot would be considered a revision to the special permit.

Mr. Katz asked how big the lot was. The Planner, referring him to the map in the handout, replied “.33 acres”. Mr. Katz asked if it was to be paved. The Planner said that the lot would not be paved at all; it would be processed.

Dr. Autuori asked about trees on the property. She replied that there are some trees that needed to come down. Dr. Autuori was troubled by the fact that there didn't appear to be plans for any trees to be planted. The Chairman asked if a site walk on the 19th was needed. Dr. Autuori asked if the zoning regulations didn't require islands and trees with a parking area, and the Planner explained that this was not a striped parking area; it was a gravel lot without stripes. Even so, he asked if the regulations exempted gravel lots, or if there was a requirement for the planting of trees. The Planner said, “every ten spots, but this is a small parking lot and does not require the islands.

Dr. Autuori commented that this property was in Branchville, and that it would be part of what will become “our second village center,” he said. Consequently, he stressed that the Commission needs to view this application with great care.

Jim McChesney asked if the Planner could make reference to the Branchville Center study and examine what it shows for this particular area. The Planner said she would.

After some discussion, the Commission decided unanimously to add the item to the site walk schedule for 11/19/06.

6. For distribution-Proposed Amendment to the Zoning Regulations, **Sec. 305.01.C** new subparagraph (h) and (i)-Exempt Directional Signs for Real Estate Open Houses.

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the Planner's memorandum about a meeting with Zoning Enforcement Officer Richard Baldelli and Board of Realtors directors Dick Walter and Charlie Knoche. She noted that a proposed revision to the zoning

regulations was attached for review by the Commission. The amendment would provide for temporary real estate signs for open houses on the weekends.

After a short discussion regarding the times of specific open houses and when the signs would be needed, and also some minor grammatical corrections to the proposed regulations, it was decided that the amendment was simple, and that a public hearing could be scheduled for December 12th.

Mr. Katz made a motion, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to schedule the hearing for 12/12/06. The motion passed, 8-0.

7. **#2006-114-ACC-FC:** proposed accessway in connection with first division of property located at **135 Old Branchville Road** in the RAA zone. Owner: James Pember. Auth. Agent: Donnelly, McNamara and Gustafson, P.C. For receipt and schedule walk.

Dr. Autuori made a motion, seconded by Mr. Katz, to acknowledge receipt of the application and to schedule a walk for 11/19/06. The motion passed, 8-0.

8. **#2006-115-SP:** application of Special Permit under Section 312.0 as required by Sections 402.0 and 318.0 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to create an accessory dwelling from an existing historical house located at **300 West Lane** in the RAA zone. Owners: Elizabeth T. and Marshall H. Odeen. Appl: Marshall H. Odeen. *65 days to schedule public hearing ends 1/11/07. For receipt, schedule walk and public hearing.*

Chairman Mucchetti explained that the applicant was working with the Ridgefield Historical Society and the Planner on the Special Permit application to remove additions from a 1740's house and to preserve it as an accessory apartment while building a new house on the lot. The Planner stated that Zoning Enforcement Officer could not issue a permit to allow two houses on one lot, and the accessory apartment option was a method to preserve the historic structure. Bonds could be required in the special permit approval to ensure the conversion of the existing old house into the apartment, after the new house was built.

Dr. Autuori made a motion, seconded by Mr. Katz, to acknowledge receipt of the application, to schedule a site walk for 11/19/06, and a public hearing for 12/5/06. The motion passed, 8-0.

9. **Report** by Director of Planning re **563/593 Main Street** null and void subdivision. c/o PD.

Chairman Mucchetti asked the Planner to explain the expiration of the time to file the subdivision map for the four-lot subdivision on Main Street, previously approved by the Commission.

The Planner noted that this was the Coffey/Mele subdivision on Main St. She had spoken to the applicant's attorney, Ryan Baltrush, and they had agreed on the language for the documents for the driveway easements and the open space liens that had to be placed on each of the lots. She explained that the surveyor had finished the maps, but, Mr. Mele would not agree to the signing of the maps because he still had some serious concerns about the three year limit on his stay and also about what he perceived to be an encumbrance on his property with the driveway easements for the accessway. Since the second (and final) extension for filing was to expire on Nov. 7, the Planner has discussed the matter with the Commission's counsel to see if there was anything the Commission needed to do. He advised that the matter simply needed to be reported in detail at the regular meeting of the Commission and recorded in the minutes. The Planner explained that, according to the Connecticut State Statutes and the laws on extensions to file, this subdivision is now null and void, and the applicants would have to come back and reapply as a brand new application. She said that both she and Mr. Baltrush had encouraged Mr. Mele to meet the deadline for signing, noting that, if he did not, there would be additional expense, the need for a new application, and meetings with the Commission. Mr. Mele did not change his mind.

There was no formal decision or action needed by the Commission.

In response to the Planner's explanation and at the suggestion of Commission counsel, Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Slavin, to acknowledge that the subdivision approval is null and void as a result of the map not being filed within the statutory time period. The motion passed, 8-0. (A copy of the minutes with this acknowledgement will be placed in the subdivision file.)

COMMISSION WALKS

As noted above, the Commission scheduled a site walks for Sunday, November 19, 2006 for the following:

- **#2006-113-REV: 33 Ethan Allen Highway, Salzbrunn**
- **#2006-114-ACC-FC: 135 Old Branchville Road, Pember**
- **#2006-115-SP: 300 West Lane, Odeen**

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

- **#2006-022-SP: 520 Ridgebury Road, St. Elizabeth Seton Church**, request for release of \$81,000.00 bond (see attached memo) PD recommends 100% release.

Mr. McChesney made a motion, seconded by Mr. Katz, to release the bond as recommended by the Planner. The motion passed, 8-0.

CORRESPONDENCE

- **Chairman Mucchetti** pointed out hand-outs of sample regulations from New Canaan and Wilton, pertaining to the preservation of historic structures.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mrs. Willis, to approve the minutes of 10/17/06. Mrs. Willis offered some minor corrections. The motion to approve the minutes with the corrections passed, 8-0.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the minutes of 10/24/06. The motion passed, 8-0.

(Note: The discussion of all agenda items from #3 to the end of the agenda was concluded at 9:20 p.m. As noted in item #2 above, the Commission returned to the work session on the proposed zoning regulations. The recording secretary left at 9:20 p.m. and the minutes for item #2 were provided by the Planner.)

Hearing no further discussion following the completion of the work session under item #2, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary