

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
INLAND WETLANDS BOARD MEETING

November 13, 2007

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

Absent: Walter Slavin

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

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 9:32 p.m. Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2007-121-SPA-SR:** Summary Ruling application requesting a determination of “no regulated activities” in connection with the development of a 16 unit affordable housing community in accordance with Sec. 8-30g of the Connecticut General Statutes located at **76 Governor Street** in the RA zone. Owner: 76 Governor Street LLC. Appl.: Stephen Zemo. Auth. Agent: Matthew Ranelli, Esq. *65-day action period ends 12/20/2007. Received 10/16/2007. Walked 11/11/2007. For determination.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the Board had walked the property on 11/11/07 and made a determination that there are no wetlands on the site or within the regulated area of proposed activity. Mrs. Willis asked the Agent if drainage issues could be handled by the Planning and Zoning Commission in the review of the Site Plan. The Agent confirmed that this was correct.

Dr. Gelfman motioned, seconded by Mrs. Willis, to make a determination that there are no regulated activities in conjunction with this application. The motion passed, 5-0.3. Mr. Katz recused, Mr. McChesney and Dr. Autuori abstained.

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

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mrs. Willis, to approve the minutes of October 30, 2007. The motion passed, 8-0.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 9:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary

APPROVED / REVISED
MINUTES
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION MEETING

November 13, 2007

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

Absent: Walter Slavin

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

Public hearings were held prior to the meeting.

At 9:35 p.m., Chairman Mucchetti called the meeting to order.

PENDING ITEMS

1. **#2007-042-REZ-A** [Submitted prior to 5/1/2007, adoption of new zoning regulations]
(1) Petition to amend the text of the zoning regulations of the Town of Ridgefield to revise certain sections of the Housing Opportunity District (HOD) regulations, to permit residential development under Sec. 8-30g of the Connecticut General Statutes, and related amendment to the Comprehensive Town Plan and (2) petition to change the zoning map of the Town of Ridgefield from CDD to HOD and related amendment to the Comprehensive Town Plan, for 153± acres of land located at **616 Bennett's Farm Road**. Owner: Eureka V, LLC. Appl./Auth. Agent: J. Casey Healy, Esq. *Received 5/1/2007. Public hearing commenced 7/10/2007, continued to 9/4/2007 and continued to 9/18/2007. (5 days to set public hearing plus 21 days to continue public hearing to 9/4/2007 plus 14 days to continue public hearing to 9/18/2007 =40 days of 65 day extension used). Public hearing closed 9/18/2007. Discussion held 9/25/2007. 10/2/2007 next discussion date set for 10/9/2007. Draft overlay regulations requested from Planner 10/9/2007. 65- day action period ends 11/22/2007. PD update re draft overlay regulations 10/16/2007. Draft overlay regulations discussed 10/23/2007. Discussion held and Draft of Proposed Decisions by Planner requested 10/30/2007. For action.*

There were four separate actions taken on this application.

The Planner explained her memorandum dated Nov. 12, 2007, which detailed the issues involved and actions/decisions needed from the Commission related to the issue of the interveners. The memorandum presented the Commission's Findings of Fact based on claims listed in documents submitted by the two interveners.

The Planner explained that the Commission would need to review her summary of 1) the two intervention actions that were taken during the public hearing process, 2) the dates of the interventions, 3) the Commission's recognition of the interventions, and 4) the claims put forth in the intervention statements, along with 5) the notes from the discussions answering those claims, both during the public hearing process and in discussions that followed.

The Planner was complimented by all on the thoroughness and quality of her work on the Findings of Fact. She asked the Commission to carefully review the material, and note any additions, corrections or deletions needed. She asked for the Commission's acknowledgement that the proposed resolutions (in conjunction with the Findings of Fact), sufficiently address the claims of the interveners. The Commission's proposed actions must answer the claims, she said.

Mr. McChesney asked the Planner if she was looking for a motion which acknowledges that the Commission agrees with the Findings of Fact. The Planner said that the Commission needs to make any corrections or modifications they feel are necessary, if any, and then make a motion stating that the Commission accepts the statements in the memorandum as correct and acceptable.

Mr. Katz felt it would be appropriate to state that the Commission acknowledged, the intervener's concerns, but did not necessarily address them, since the Commission had only dealt with the application per se, and not specifically with the concerns of the interveners.

The Planner said that was true, however, she noted that the Commission's actions with regard to the application itself also happened to address many of the concerns of the interveners.

Dr. Autuori asked if, in acknowledging the intervener's concerns, the Commission would be indicating it had fully addressed those concerns. He was looking for clarification as to what his vote would actually mean.

The Planner explained that, in this voting, the Commission would be addressing how thoroughly their discussions have looked at, and perhaps answered, the concerns of the interveners. A yes vote, she said, would basically be acknowledging that the statements put forth in her Memorandum are correct, with regard to addressing the concerns of the interveners.

To this, **the Chairman** added, "...based on the discussions that we've had and the work that we've done on Resolutions #1, #2, & #3."

Dr. Autuori said that he did not, necessarily, agree with the conclusions of the Memorandum, and was still unsure how to vote.

Mr. Katz explained in detail what a yes vote would mean, saying that the areas the Planner has presented in boldface type indicate the ways in which the Commission has acknowledged the concerns of the interveners. A yes vote would not indicate that a commissioner necessarily agreed with these concerns.

Dr. Autuori now was satisfied that he understood what was being asked of him.

Ms. Willis suggested some changes to part 2(b), in which specified the Phase II Route 7/35 sewer plant. The Planner suggested changing the wording to the following: "Evidence is in the record to show that part of the area included in the Phase II district of the Route 7/35 sewer plant.....".

Discussion continued on proposed changes to the wording, if any. Ms. Willis suggested the following: "Part of the area is included in the Phase II district...". Mr. Katz said that the fact that this is taken from the Water Pollution Authority indicates that it is part of Phase II of the project. It was decided to simply add the word "is" between "area" and "included," and leave the rest as is.

Ms. Willis noted that Mr. Fossi found wording on the map, in which the project is referred to as the "proposed 7/35 sewer district." Therefore, Mr. Fossi said, the Commission's language should duplicate that, as: "proposed additions to the 7/35 sewer district."

The Chairman asked if this language was agreeable to the maker of the motion, Mr. McChesney. It was. Also, it was verified that the Planner was clear on the changes that the Commission was suggesting. She was.

The Planner also added the name of the watershed in question, the Saugatuck.

The Chairman summed up the changes.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Walsh, to accept the Findings of Fact prepared by the Planner, as amended by the Commission, in reference to the interventions filed under §22a-19 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The motion passed, 7-1. Dr. Autuori was opposed.

It was confirmed that the following resolutions needed to be dealt with in the order presented.

Resolution #1:

The Chairman outlined the changes to the Plan of Conservation and Development, which had been proposed by the Commission, (text amendments to pages 50 and 54,

as presented and discussed, with the addition of the changes to the language on p. 2, item (b) in the proposed resolution.

Ms. Willis suggested some minor grammatical changes, which were accepted by the maker of the motion.

Dr. Autuori discussed the reason for his decision to vote against this proposed resolution, specifically with regard to 2(e) of the resolution, disputing the stipulation allowing larger developments “when meeting an identified and overriding Town need.”

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to APPROVE amendments to the Plan of Conservation and Development on pages 50 and 54, acknowledging the need to consider multi-family developments for affordable housing, and providing Housing Opportunity Development regulations for this purpose. The motion passed, 7-1. Dr. Autuori was opposed.

Resolution #2:

The Chairman noted that this resolution is to approve an HOD regulation, modified as the overlay zone, with very minor modifications in the resolution made in the form of boldface and underscore.

The Planner, noting that the modifications to the resolution are fairly trivial, said that the attached regulation is the “cleaned up” version, which incorporates the Commission’s changes and its reasons for them. This is the regulation which should be presented, as per the advice of counsel.

The Chairman suggested eliminating from the additional reasons section, #2, any text following “...the largest affordable housing development ever considered in the Town of Ridgefield.” The Commission agreed with the Chairman that the rest of the sentence should be deleted, as “it weakens the strength of the sentence.”

Ms. Willis again pointed to a grammatical problem, which was corrected.

Mr. Katz felt that the resolution should include mention of what the Department of Health had stated in their letter, and also stress the need to protect steep slopes and ecologically sensitive areas, as suggested by the applicant. This information should follow the mention of Aquarion Water Company in #1, under additional reasons, he felt.

The Planner said that the resolution, as prepared, recognizes the Commission’s modifications and its reasons for them. She questioned the need for Mr. Katz’ additions, saying that items #1, #2 and #3 on p. 2 are designed to respond specifically to 8-30g, and the responsibilities placed on the Commission by that statute.

Mr. Katz said that the Commission had come up with specific numbers for slope protection, which the applicant did not.

The Chairman explained that, while that information is relevant and very important in the decisions the Commission has made, it is not needed to address the balancing tests under 8-30g.

Mr. Walsh suggested that the Commission find a different location for Mr. Katz' addition. Mr. McChesney suggested that it could be a new paragraph #4, under additional reasons. Mr. Walsh said that would not be appropriate, as it would become confused with the reasons for the modifications that were made to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public.

The Chairman repeated her formerly stated point, that the Planner feels that this information is not appropriate to include in this section, as it doesn't address the balancing test of 8-30g.

The Planner said that the attachment to the regulation and the reasons that are in each of the various sections make Mr. Katz' suggestion unnecessary. (Steep slopes are mentioned on p.4 of the proposed resolution.) Mr. Katz withdrew his suggestion.

The Chairman summarized the few small corrections/modifications that were made to Resolution #2.

Dr. Autuori said he would vote against the motion because, first and foremost, the HOD Regulation on p.9 states that all dwelling units within the HOD shall be served by public water and Town of Ridgefield municipal sewer systems. Both Ridgefield sewer systems empty their treated effluent into the headwaters of the Norwalk River, he said. The POCD, on p.86, states that, due to the limited flow of the Norwalk River, the sewer system at Rts. 7 and 35 should be reserved primarily for public health concerns in existing residential areas.

Dr. Autuori felt that, as planners, the commissioners need to "look into the future and anticipate the real problems that lie ahead... and anticipate the solutions that may be required, and do [their] best not to foreclose those solutions through careless action." During the hearing, questions were raised about the present capacity of the Norwalk River and its ability to handle any additional effluent from the Rts. 7 and 35 plant, he said. Issues were raised about the Gilbert and Bennett plant further down stream, and the implications for Long Island Sound; issues concerning the public health and welfare, although not specific to Ridgefield, he said. "We have, in the vicinity of the application," Dr. Autuori said, "large areas, (the Ridgefield Lakes, in particular), which have small houses on very small lots, with old septic systems, up on hills cascading down into lakes and other water bodies." Many of these old systems are fragile and/or failing, he said. If we go forward with this application, the sewer treatment plant would have to be expanded. Dr. Autuori noted that questions were

raised during the hearing as to the Norwalk River's capacity to accept additional effluent. To further increase the load on this river, Dr. Autuori said, would in all probability begin to foreclose [the Town's] ability to address very real public health problems, which are, or soon will be, occurring in areas such as the Ridgefield Lakes, he said.

A high density affordable development of this type, Dr. Autuori felt, would not outweigh the need for protection against these types of problems, with the danger of foreclosing the future ability to provide septic relief paramount among them. These very real problems clearly outweigh the need for the type of affordable housing that is being proposed, he said, adding that there are alternatives and a balance which can be achieved – by adapting solutions similar to those proposed by one of the interveners. He gave the example of a lower density development, which could use onsite septic systems, thereby preserving whatever additional capacity the Norwalk River might have.

Mr. Katz elected not to debate the points made, but stated his own decision to vote in favor of the resolution. While he does so “with trepidation,” he said, there is little value in attempting to deny 8-30g. The courts don't look kindly on conjecture, he said, and, if a Commission is going to have the ammunition to defend a position which “intensely modifies” an application for affordable housing brought before it, it must do so with all the evidence it can muster, and in concretized terms. Mr. Katz said that he feels the Commission has done so, guided by the Planner and counsel. To respect all the Commission has done to keep the Town out of court and able to achieve a balance of affordable housing, a vote of “Yes” on these resolutions is imperative, he said.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Mr. Katz, to APPROVE the amendment to the zoning regulations, (a modified version of the applicant's proposal), creating a new Section 4.4, “Housing Opportunity Development – HOD” as an overlay zone, with standards and criteria for affordable housing development, and designating 616 Bennetts Farm Road as eligible for affordable housing development under this new overlay regulation. The motion passed, 7-1. Dr. Autuori was opposed.

Resolution #3:

The Chairman described the modest amendments to the resolution denying the proposed zoning map amendment.

Mr. Katz requested the addition of a #3, on p.2, which would say, “The applicant has testified that no new zone is required to accommodate this application.”

Ms. Willis wanted to insure that it would not appear that the site was seen as ideal.

The Chairman said that, in context, this is support for a motion of denial on the rezone. “The public interests have been protected by reasonable changes to the

applicant's proposed amendment to the zoning text, by creating an overlay zone that responds to the need for affordable housing by permitting a high density, multi family development on the site," the Chairman quoted from the resolution. This is an affirmative statement, she added, which the Commission's rationale for there being no need to rezone the property.

Discussion continued, with the Commission deciding to add language, as follows: "The applicant acknowledged that no new zone is required to accommodate the application," as #3, on p.2.

Mr. McChesney motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to DENY the application to amend the zoning map and the rezoning of property located at 616 Bennetts Farm Road, because it has been designated as eligible for Housing Opportunity Development under a new HOD overlay zone. The motion passed, 8-0.

2. **#2007-112-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 as required by Section 3.3.D.2. of the zoning regulations for (1) display and sale of art at **Garden of Ideas**, a non-residential use in a residential zone, and (2) as required by Section 3.4.D.3, for the location of an accessory structure in the front yard. Property located at **34 Craigmoor Road** in the RAA zone. Owners/Appls.: Joseph H. Keller and Ilsa L. Svendsen. *Received 10/9/2007. Public hearing commenced 11/7/2007 and continued to 11/13/2007.65 day action period ends 1/17/2008. For action.*

Dr. Autuori motioned, seconded by Mr. Fossi, to draft a resolution of approval, with conditions, for the Special Permit.

Mr. Fossi wanted to add the language provided by the applicant defining the proposed hours of operation: May through October, weekends only.

The Planner confirmed that it was a draft approval which was being requested.

Mrs. Willis asked about the sign size.

The Planner said that the applicants are not asking for a new sign. Just the same, Mrs. Willis wanted to have a condition saying that the sign could not be larger than the one that is currently there.

The Planner said that this is not appropriate; the Commission can only require that the applicant not exceed the size limits permitted in the zoning regulations. She again stated that the applicant is not requesting any changes to the sign.

Mr. Walsh spoke next. He said that he had given this application much consideration and thought. Ultimately, his conclusion was summed up as follows: "Why are we introducing this commercial use into a residential zone?" Mr. Walsh called the garden a "phenomenal facility." However, the type of conditions the Commission is grappling with is "a clear indication" that not many at the table are

comfortable with the concept of a commercial enterprise in a residential neighborhood. He sees the Commission's struggle with this application as their sincere effort to accommodate something that they like and appreciate, but he sees this evolving into a real problem.

Chairman Mucchetti echoed those sentiments, saying that she is simply not comfortable with the use, and she will not support the Commission's trying to find a way to permit a retail commercial use in a residential zone, "as lovely as it is." "We're setting a precedent," she said, describing the applicant's intention to bring in art from outside vendors, saying, "Retail is retail. Either we allow it or we don't." The Chairman, noting that no neighbors came out in support of this proposal, said that the application will not have her support.

Dr. Autuori spoke in favor of the applicants, saying that they are old fashioned Ridgefield farmers, who have beautified their large property and kept it in a natural condition. He noted that the Commission had already heard from the neighbors in a previous forum, and that their every concern had been addressed in the current application: 1) they moved everything away from Craigmoor Rd., 2) they limited the number of statues, and 3) they respected the setbacks. If we had more of this type of land use in Ridgefield, the Town would have a better chance of keeping it's ambiance into the future, he said.

Dr. Gelfman agreed, saying that the Commission can make judgments. This application is unique in its contribution to the Town, he feels. He stated his support of the applicant's proposal.

The motion to draft the resolution of approval passed, 4-2-2. Mr. Fossi, Dr. Autuori, Dr. Gelfman and Mrs. Willis were in favor, Mr. Walsh and Mrs. Mucchetti were opposed, Mr. McChesney abstained, and Mr. Katz was recused.

3. **IF PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED: #2007-123-SP:** Special Permit under Section 9.2 as required by Sec. 5.2 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to (1) construct a 3,543 s.f. branch bank, with drive thru facilities and related improvements and (2) as required under Sec. 7.5 permission to process earth materials on site. Property located at **14 Danbury Road** in the B-1 zone. Owner: JMF Realty, LLC. Appl.: Webster Bank, N.A. Auth. Agent: Ward J. Mazzucco, Esq. *Received 10/16/2007. Walked 10/28/2007. Public hearing commenced 11/13/2007. 65-day action period ends 1/17/2008. For action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that the public hearing was continued to 11/20/07, and the item was tabled.

4. **#2007-127-SP:** Special Permit application under Section 9.2 as required by Section 3.4 of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to construct an accessory structure in the front yard on property located at **219 Nod Road** in the RAA zone. Owner: Christopher Gaydos. Appl.: Christopher and Nora Gaydos. Auth. Agent: Luigi

DiMeglio. *Received 10/23/2007. Walked 10/28/2007. Public hearing commenced 11/13/2007. 65-day action period ends 1/17/2008. For action.*

Mr. Fossi motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the application as presented by architect Doug MacMillan at the public hearing. The motion passed, 8-0.

5. **#2007-128-REV(SP):** Revision to Special Permit under Section 9.2.A.7.e of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations to permit upgrades to the existing site, building façade and wall signage on property located at **720 Branchville Road** (Ancona's Market and Wines/Liquors) in the B-1 zone. Owners: Joseph P. Ancona and John C. Ancona. Appl./Auth. Agent: DCA Architects/Planners, LLC. *Received 10/23/2007. Walked 10/28/2007. 65-day action period ends 12/27/2007. For action.*

Rick Zini, of DCA Architects/Planners, LLC, representing the applicant, said that the owners wanted three specific improvements: the site lighting, the immediate entrances to both Ancona's Market and the liquor store, and, originally, to put a sign wall up. There was no final agreement between the owner, the architects, and the AAC with regard to the sign wall, so the owners decided to withdraw that part of the application. The improvements to the vestibule areas of the market and the liquor store both remain within the footprint of the existing canopy, he said. They have basically reverted back to the original arch that was there.

The owner wanted to take out the small elliptical arches that were between each column striation, but, both he and the AAC felt these arches were in keeping with the design of the building, so they will be repaired and kept. Mr. Zini's firm is replacing the columns which support the canopy, and the owner has reported issues with maintenance. Consequently, the decision has been made to use brick piers, despite the wishes of the AAC to use wood. Building changes are minimal, Mr. Zini reported.

Site work was designed by Artel Engineering, and the only change proposed for the site is the site lighting; fourteen new poles in total, (with eighteen fixtures), which deletes the old style fixtures that are non-compliant. Mr. Zini said that the owner is opting for the "basic shoebox light fixture on a 14' pole, with the required shields to control the light." Artel was asked to do a spill ratio study, Mr. Zini said. The only spill would be into the driveway access from Rte. 102, because, presently, the entrance has no lighting, and this is considered to be a safety issue, he said.

Dr. Autuori confirmed that the lights were full cutoff.

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Dr. Autuori, to approve the application as presented on the revised plans prepared by architect Rick Zini, acknowledging that the plans for the wall sign portion of the application had been withdrawn. The motion passed, 8-0.

NEW ITEMS

6. **#2007-076-SP-VDC: 451-465 Main Street.** Owner: E.A.L. Associates. Color coordination of signs. *For discussion/action.*

Chairman Mucchetti noted that there was no report forthcoming from the Village District Consultant, and the matter was tabled.

7. **#2007-133-REV(SP)-VDC:** Revision to Special Permit under Sec. 9.2.A.7.e as required by Section 5.1.d of the Ridgefield Zoning Regulations and Village District Application under Section 8.3 to replace an existing drive-up kiosk with a new drive-up kiosk unit on property located at **2 Prospect Street, Hudson City Savings Bank** in the CBD zone. Appl.: EnviroSpace, Inc. Owner: Charles Knoche. *65-day action period ends 1/17/2008. 35 days to receive VDC report ends 12/18/2007. For receipt, schedule walk if necessary and refer to VDC.*

Raymond Martin, of EnviroSpace, Inc., representing the applicant, provided conceptual drawings and plans for the Commission's review. He said that the applicant wants to replace the existing drive-up kiosk with a new kiosk, with the addition of an ATM. Nothing is being changed to the island other than the footprint of the kiosk, which increases by about double. The kiosk will serve the same function, and drivers will approach from the same direction, Mr. Martin said.

After meeting with the AAC, there were two recommendations put forth. The application originally called for a metal façade in a cream color on the lower section and a blue "branding color" on the top. The AAC wanted either a clapboard façade, like what is currently on the building, or brick. The applicants will be meeting with the AAC again to make that decision.

The other suggestion made by the AAC, he reported, was to replace the doors with six panel doors, align the heads, and match that with the cream color of the building, with small identification lettering on the sides. The applicant will meet with the AAC again to show the façade in brick with the pediment in a cream color, and, also, in real clapboard with some corner trim, plus, a roof line which would have a gable roof running the length of the kiosk, (about 10' 10"), and a gable end on the short end, (about 3' 7"). They have made the kiosk as small as they could to handle the equipment inside, he said.

Mr. Katz asked if there was a report from the AAC. The Chairman and Planner said they had not received one.

The Chairman said that this is not in the historic district. But, the Planner said, it is in the Village District.

Mr. McChesney said that the doors are shown to swing outward, and that would be blocked by the 16' retaining wall. Mr. Martin said that was only the initial concept, and had been changed.

Dr. Autuori asked if the lights were fully shielded. They were. He asked Mr. Martin if the applicant was in agreement that all the lighting on the site would be in

conformance with the new regulations. Mr. Martin said, the lighting for the proposed changes would comply with the regulations.

Owner Charles Knoche said that the location of the island will stay the same.

Mr. Martin asked if the office was waiting for a report from the AAC. The Planner said she would need the report from the AAC and the revised drawings.

Chairman Mucchetti noted that additional information and revised plans would be forthcoming from the applicant, and a report was expected from the Village District Consultant. The item was discussed with the applicant present, and discussion on any decision was tabled for receipt of additional information and minutes from the VDC.

COMMISSION WALKS

There were no site walks scheduled.

REQUESTS FOR BOND RELEASES/REDUCTION

There were no requests for bond release or reduction.

CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Mucchetti pointed out the following correspondence:

- Letter dated 11/8/07 from Commission counsel Thomas Beecher, response to inquiry dated 11/3/07 written by Dr. Autuori, confirming that Commissioners are obligated under the law to comply with orders handed down by the courts in matters of appeal before the Commission.

MINUTES

Mr. Katz motioned, seconded by Mrs. Willis, to approve the minutes of October 30, 2007 with some minor revisions. The motion passed, 8-0.

Chairman Mucchetti reluctantly raised her gavel to end the meeting of the Commission, the final meeting for Commissioner James McChesney, who has served for 35 years in his position. The Commission and the Planner were united in their praise for Mr. McChesney's service, and saddened by his leaving.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Caponetti
Recording Secretary