

**Beacon Falls Planning & Zoning Commission
10 Maple Avenue
Beacon Falls, CT 06403**



**BEACON FALLS PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing Continuation
Application PZC-06252021-2-TA
September 29, 2021
MINUTES
(Subject to Revision)**

1. Call to Order / Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Donald Molleur opened the hearing at 7:00 P.M. and the call was read into the meeting minutes. Public Hearing legal notice was published in the Republican-American on August 12, 2021, and August 19, 2021, and posted to Town website. This is a continuation of the hearing that was opened on August 26, 2021.

Members Present: Donald Molleur (DM), Harry Roscoe (HR), Jack Burns (JB), Marc Bronn (MB), Cody Brennan (CB) Michael Pratt (MP), Howard Leeper (HL)

Members Absent: Robert Starkey (RS) Michael Rupsis (MR)

Others Present: Town Planners Keith Rosenfeld (KR) and Savannah-Nicole Villalba (SN), Attorney Vincent Marino (VM) Attorney Steven Bellis on behalf of Hopp Brook Village (SB)

2. Public Hearing

Chairman Molleur read the following correspondence into the record.

(1) Correspondence between Road Foreman Robert Pruzinsky, re: Hopp Brook Village. Road Foreman inquired into the intent of the access road connected to Oakwood Drive? Everyday or emergency use. Concerns with proposed additional traffic, would be having a stop sign at entrance/exit of development, speed bumps. Speed limit sign added on Oakwood.

(2) Letter from Town Traffic Authority - The applicant proposes to construct 109-single family homes, as a set aside development, through Oakwood Drive, and from the south through a private driveway constructed on an adjoining parcel to the south of the development parcel, which parcel is shown to connect to a public right of way illustrated as the proposed extension of Miller Road from the Bethany-Beacon Falls town line to the southwesterly property line of the parcel south of the development site. The location of the development site provides limited access to it and raises emergency access and public safety concerns. The only proposed access to the development site from within the town is from Oakwood Drive. Oakwood Drive is a cul de sac that connects to Blackberry Hill Road. These local roads provide the only public way to gain access to the development site from the north. In the event of an emergency, emergency response may be delayed as a result of this limited access. Additional viable access points to the development site should be required to limit the risk to the public's health, safety and welfare.

Access from the south is proposed to originate from the existing part of Miller Road in the Town of Bethany. The applicant proposes to extend Miller Road in the Town of Beacon Falls beginning at the town line between the towns of Bethany and Beacon Falls and extending northerly through three parcels

013-001-001, owned by Birmingham Utilities, Inc.,

013-001-0011, owned by Randy & Patricia Bruce and

013-001-0012, owned by The Revocable Trust of Shirley Lautz.

The proposed extension of Miller Road terminates at the southwesterly property line of parcel 013-001-0013, an approximate 80-acre parcel that is owned by or under the control of the applicant and is being held for future development.

Beginning at the southwesterly property line of parcel 013-001-0013, the applicant proposes to access the development site by right of a private driveway, twenty-four (24) feet in width and about 1,200 feet in length.

The Traffic Authority concerns about the viability of the proposed access from the south. The Traffic Authority was not provided with any information from the Town of Bethany establishing that Miller Road is a developed public road of way that can connect a newly constructed road in Beacon Falls. Information should be obtained from the Town of Bethany to support the viability of the proposed southern access.

The proposed extension of Miller Road terminates at the southwesterly portion of the parcel south of the development site. As a result, the proposed southern access to the development site does not front on a public right of way. The Traffic Authority believes that Miller Road should be extended northerly through parcel 013-001-0013 to meet the southern property line of the development site. Miller Road should be constructed to meet street classification and design standards and provide a minimum right of way of 50 feet, pavement width of 32 feet, with a graded shoulder width on each side of 2 feet. Regardless of where it terminates, the proposed extended Miller Road should terminate at its northern point with a cul de sac that meets town standards, to provide for sufficient room for snow plowing and the turnaround of emergency vehicles and school buses. The Traffic Authority has concerns about how the proposed extension of Miller Road will be accessed by the Town for purposes of maintenance, including snow plowing.

The applicant indicated to the Inland Wetland & Watercourse Commission that in an emergency, residents of the development would be able to access/egress the site through the adjacent landfill site. The Traffic Authority notes that the applicant depicts a gravel emergency vehicle access with a new gate on its site plan to connects proposed interior road # 5 to the adjoining property owned by Beacon Heights, Inc. (012-002-0023).

No information has been provided to the Traffic Authority establishing that Beacon Heights, Inc. granted permission to allow its property to be utilized for this purpose. The Traffic Authority has not been provided with any information detailing where the proposed emergency access road would be located on Beacon Height's property-how it would be constructed and how it would be maintained. The Traffic Authority lacks sufficient information to evaluate this proposed emergency access.

The Traffic Authority recognizes and appreciates that the interior road network will be exclusively private property. Measures should be taken to discourage motorists from using the site as a cut through.

Road width of all onsite roads and driveways and the radii of all onsite driveways and street intersections should be adequate to permit normal turning by the largest anticipated vehicle without encroachment on an opposing directional lane or without resorting to wide turns or hazardous maneuvers.

The dense nature of the proposed development raises concern for pedestrian traffic. Sidewalks should be required on both sides of all streets in the development. Authority is concerned that the residents of the development will not be adequately supported by public transportation.

(3) Letter from Regional Water Authority dated September 29, 2021. Re: Hopp Brook Village District. RWA reviewed application. Concerns related to impact of the

increased allowed development density on the water quality of the reserve public water supply source. The proposed zone change would allow 1.8 residences per acre and move the allowed density toward a lesser standard of protection. Concerned with the lack of information in the site plan regarding septic systems. It is unclear why there are separate leaching fields when each group of 16 residences is connected to a single sanitary sewer main. The site plan does not show septic tanks, a connection to the leaching fields, or a reserve leaching field. There is no information regarding percolation testing or test pits. The proposed septic systems do not appear to be individual systems and may be considered a community septic system under the jurisdiction of the CT Department of Public Health or the CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, depending on design flows. Concentrating the septic system effluent into small areas close to the RWA property line could pose a threat to groundwater quality, specifically bacteria and nitrogen pollution. The application also contains conflicting information relating to connecting the residences to a municipal sanitary sewer system. There was no information provided regarding the design, inspection and maintenance of the storm water management system. Storm water treatment systems require regular maintenance to be effective. An inspection and maintenance plan should be developed and included in the site plan. The responsible party for inspecting and maintaining the system should be identified. We recommend storm water systems be inspected at least twice per year, and that an annual report documenting inspections and maintenance be submitted to the town. The RWA would like to receive a copy of such reports.

(4) Correspondence from Naugatuck Valley Health District Head Sanitarian Richard Jackson. Have not received any new information or plans from this project in over two years. I know some preliminary test work was done in the past. If they have individual septic systems for each individual residential home, Naugatuck Valley Health and the State Department of Public Health would regulate those onsite sewage disposal systems. Community septic systems such as two residential homes going into one central septic system would require CT DEEP approval. The overall total design flow could push them into CT DEEP regulation as well. >7500 gallons per day

a. Applicant's Presentation

Attorney Steven Bellis: I did receive a copy of the Regional Water Authority Letter. Did not receive a letter from the Traffic Authority or Planners Letter. Exhibit 19, property description, prepared by a surveyor. Only property asking Commission to change zone. Rest of property would remain R-1. Water authority said PZ did not provide info about storm water management. In BF, stormwater is delegated to Wetlands. Provided information. Approved the stormwater applications. Septic statement – Exhibit 20- from our engineer to Naugatuck Valley Health, proposing individual septic systems – NVHD inspected test pits. Said OK, test pits are fine. Can't get a building permit, without an engineered design septic system for each house. No question that we would go back to NVHD for every single house. Septic systems are near Oakwood. 75 acres below of forest before RWA property.

Miller Road – Exhibit 21- Listed Street in Bethany – goes to Beacon Falls town line. Continues into Beacon Falls as a right of way. ROW goes through three other properties. But ROW existing and legally ROW. Statute in CT – 7-148 – Allow towns to construct streets/highways. Can't block or obstruct travel. I don't need permission from Town of Bethany. I agree that we don't want a cut through.

Miller Road- up to Commission. Put conditions of approval. If Commission felt the applicant to extend pavement on right of way to town line of Bethany, the applicant would be willing to pave outside of their property to have it paved to the Town line.

Manager at Beacon Heights said if and when you wanted emergency access – there is a paved roadway system within Beacon Heights. If we needed it, we can ensure elevation allows firetruck to access.

Sidewalks on both sides. We have sidewalks throughout the whole project.

b. Comments & Questions from Commissioners

Vincent Marino, Town Attorney: Met with staff reviewed application and proposed text amendment. Find problem with proposed text amendment In order to assist application and Commission with advancing this process, we drafted a revised draft text amendment. Commission had a PRDD that was repealed in 2013. PRDD was affordable housing text. Propose that the proposed text amendment be planted in Article 2 Section 22. Standards should employ, should be consistent with POCD, with zoning regulations. Modified the proposed text amendment to ensure they are consistent with current town Zoning regulations. Applicant's is inconsistent with POCD. POCD requires public sewers not septic. We feel risk to public drinking water is too great. We propose public sewers required. Put this proposed text amendment into the record. Giving a copy to the applicant.

Keith Rosenfeld, Town Planner:

On Thursday, August 26, 2021, the applicant's representative stated on the record that PZC 06252021-1-ZC and PZC-06252021-2-TA were part of an 8-30g application. Under 8-30g, an affordable housing application means "any application made to a commission in connection with an affordable housing development by a person who proposes to develop such affordable housing."

Section 8-30g Subsection (b)(1) outlines the procedure for filing an affordable housing application. The statute states that "any person filing an affordable housing application with a commission shall submit, as part of the application, an affordability plan which shall include at least the following:

- a. Designation of the person, entity, or agency that will be responsible
- b. An affirmative fair housing marketing plan
- c. A sample calculation of the maximum sales prices or rents
- d. A description of the projected sequence in which, within a set aside development, the affordable dwelling units will be built and offered for occupancy and the general location of such units within the proposed development; and
- e. Draft zoning regulations, conditions of approval, deeds, restrictive covenants, or lease provisions that will govern the affordable dwelling units."

The Town Attorney is reviewing the Affordable Housing Application for consistency with Section 8-30g Subsection requirements.

[PZC-06252021-2-TA](#)

PZC 06252021-1-TA was reviewed under Connecticut General Statutes Subsection (a) of Section 8-3a which states that, "In any municipality which has a combined planning and zoning commission operating under the general statutes the commission shall state on the record its findings on consistency of a proposed zoning

regulation or boundaries changes thereof with the plan of development of the municipality." Staff reviewed the proposed zoning amendment change for consistency with the Town of Beacon Falls 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development. Comments are as follows: **CGS 8-23(d) Town of Beacon Falls Plan of Conservation and Development Statutory References** Section 1.3 states that plans *shall* consider each and every year -Promote housing choice and economic diversity. ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment consistent with this requirement.***

Section 4.4.1 outlines the Town's Housing Goal as: "The expansion of the housing stock should be of the highest quality ***Staff finds that the proposed amendment is consistent with this goal.***

Section 4.4.2 – Detached single-family housing shall remain the predominant form of housing ***-is consistent with this policy.***

Preserve the integrity and quality of existing neighborhoods, particularly the unique older housing. ***Staff does not find that the proposed zoning amendment consistent with this policy.***

The neighborhood should be the basis for residential development in Beacon Falls, . ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment is consistent with this policy.***

Continue to ensure that residential development includes the preservation of open space. ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment is consistent.***

Recognize the need to provide affordable housing. ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment is consistent.***

Section 4.4.3 – Consider the reduction of maximum density in the rural outlying areas of the Town. ***Staff does not find that the proposed zoning amendment is consistent.***

Town of Beacon Falls Plan of Conservation and Development – 7.1.2 – Traffic and Circulation; This section states that "The Town's requirements for street width and design would be compared with more contemporary back to basics requirements. Standards should be reviewed by the Fire Department but *could include paved road widths of 26 feet, with only 22 feet of pavement required where on street parking is unlikely.*" ***Staff does not find that the proposed zoning amendment consistent***

Section 8.1 – Sanitary Sewer Service reads that, "The public sewer system of a community is a major determinant of the location and intensity of development ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment not consistent with the sanitary sewer service constraints.***

This section also states that, "The COG NV's Regional Plan recommends in Chapter 5 that, in areas with private septic systems, a maximum density of 1 unit per acre where there are minimal soil constraints to 0.5 units per acre where there are severe soil constraints. ***Staff does not find that the proposed zoning amendment is consistent with the recommendations for private septic system.***

Section 8.1.3 – Water Services, states that "All three of the public water companies have adequate capacity to serve anticipated needs from existing and new development. ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment consistent with the concerns in Section 8.1.3 if the applicant can provide documentation that the required PSI levels can be met before the start of construction.***

Section 8.2.1 – Goals, Policies, and Strategies states that the goal for Community Services and Facilities is to "Continue to provide Town residents with a safe and functional public utility system ***Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment has not proven that the systems provide adequate capacity for all the systems (water and sewer). Staff recommends letters being provided by the proper permitting bodies to demonstrate adequate capacity.***

Section 8.2.3 – Recommendations, states: Require the extension of water and sewer service in conjunction with development in accordance with all municipally adopted and coordinated plans. **This is consistent with this recommendation.**

Section 10.2.3 states that Suburban neighborhoods “These are primarily established residential areas of the Town where there are existing patterns of development **Staff finds that the proposed zoning amendment is consistent and had been changed by the applicant at a previous time.**

Section 10.3 of the Land Use Policies, and Strategies outline a goal. “maintain the small-town character and compact development of Beacon Falls by encouraging growth within the traditional core area. **Staff finds that the proposed is not consistent with the Land Use Goal.**

Section 10.3.2 – Policies, to “Promote the continued acquisition of open space **Staff finds that the proposed amendment is consistent.** “Continue to implement the defined sewer service area, in cooperation with the Water Pollution Control area.” **Staff finds that now consistent with the policy.**

Section 10.3.3 – Recommendations, has the following policies to note: 3. The residential densities of all areas outside the core area should be limited to 0.5 to 1.09 dwelling units per acre. **This is not consistent. Proposal much denser.**

HBVD Section 31.1.2 states that the Hopp Brook Village shall not have to adhere to articles 5 (sections 51, 52, 54) of the bf zoning regulations. Many of the items found in ARTICLE V (Site Plans, Special Exceptions)) are in place to protect the health and safety of the future residents of the HBVD, but also those property owners living both adjacent and near. **Staff recommends that the following sections be included within the proposal Section 51.3.4 Drives, Parking and Circulation provides for safe travel conditions. Section 51.3.6 Paving and Drainage allows for a proper safe roadway system. Section 52.6.9 The public water supply facilities and facilities for the disposal of sanitary waste have sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the proposed development. Section 54 Soil Erosion and Sediment Control regulations provide proper provisions to adequately control accelerated erosion and sedimentation and reduce the danger from storm water runoff**

HBVD Section 32.1.2 states that Beacon Falls “road ordinances” do not apply to the HBVD. **Staff recommends that the BF Town Road Ordinances provide for the minimal level allowed in the Town pertaining to the safety and health of both pedestrians and vehicles. It is recommended that the Town Engineer review the specific site plan**

HBVD Section 32.7 states that maximum impervious coverage is for 30% **Staff recommends that the maximum impervious coverage be amended to the established standard of 20%**

c. Comments & Questions from Public

Clerk read following written comments into the record.

Eileen Paul Grammer, 12 Hockanum Glenn Road (August 26, 2021)

Hazel & Paul Summers, 46 Fieldstone Lane (August 26, 2021)

Patricia and Joseph Dosso, 8 Woodland Path (August 26, 2021)

Cathleen Hanlon, 84 Fieldstone Lane (August 26, 2021)

Andrea Waxler & Elliot Kaplan, 83 Fieldstone Lane (August 25, 2021) (pictures, questions comments)

John & Millie Porpora, 48 Twin Oaks Trail (August 25, 2021)

Richard & Patricia Palfy, 7 Twin Oaks Trail (August 25, 2021)

Millie Porpora, 48 Twin Oaks Trail (August 25, 2021)

John & Elisa Harmonay, 5 Twin Oaks Trail (August 24, 2021)

Patricia & John DiBudo, 6 Timberland Way (August 24, 2021)
LeRoy & Pat DeGraw, 29 Chatfield Drive (August 24, 2021)
Tony & Carol Brignola, 27 Chatfield Dr (September 28, 2021)
Selectman Michael Krenesky, 22 Maple Avenue (August 27, 2021)
Eileen Santiago, 7 Hockanum Glen Road (August 26, 2021)
Hazel & Paul Summers, 46 Fieldstone Lane (August 26, 2021)
Hazel & Paul Summers, 46 Fieldstone Lane (September 28, 2021)
LeRoy & Pat DeGraw, 29 Chatfield Drive (September 28, 2021)
Matthew and Riva Sparks, 27 Twin Oak Trail (September 28, 2021)
Patricia & John DiBudo, 6 Timberland Way (September 28, 2021)
Joseph and Margaret Colombo, 45 Twin Oak Trail (September 29, 2021)
Scott Fournier, 1 Twin Oaks Trail, (September 29, 2021)
Andrea Waxler, 83 Fieldstone Lane (September 22, 2021)
Andrea Waxler, 83 Fieldstone Lane (August 26, 2021) images and map

Chris Kopjanski, 138 Feldspar Avenue, Do you have authority to reject this text amendment? **DM:** We have authority. Chris: Applicant can build R-1; chooses to maximize, build something else. Septic issue a big deal. Miller Road is not a road. Planning and Zoning can regulate plans that impacts Wetlands. Town should do own studies. Bought R-1 Zone. Build R-1 Zone.

John Harmonay, 5 Twin Oaks Trail. Other parcel is remaining R-1. Any reason to change the remaining 76 acres in the future. **Attorney Bellis:** Remaining R-1, no current plans. Cant answer about future. **JH:** Can't or won't. Section 8-30, place filing fee onus on Town. Any plan to have Mr. Bellis reimburse town? **DM:** All expenses covered by Mr. Bellis. In event approved, one of the Conditions of Approval is the applicant putting into an escrow account money to cover inspections etc.

Elliot Fuller, 35 Chatfield Drive, my understanding is the connections to existing gas and water via emergency access drive leading to Chatfield yet plans show them dead ending opposite what is known as Twin Oaks Trail. Commission that this is not going to our access road. Also, plans lack detail. Oakwood Drive should show utilities, curbing and type, nearby driveway. Don't see how utilities will connect on the plans. Proposed access road to south defined by two parallel lines that encroaches on private property, yet no rights or access or grading have been acquired by these owners. Is there enough room to construct a 24-foot-wide driveway? Conservation Easement in favor of Town of Bethany will be affected by this development, particularly Twin Oaks trail. An existing condition survey should be provided. Has Aquarion submitted a letter that water pressure capacity will not be affected. Irrigation for both communities be given consideration in these calculations. Agree to disagree about definition about Right of Way. Provided a list of written questions to Commission.

Andrea Waxler, 83 Fieldstone Lane, presented a visual of proposed Miller Road extension. Would like a fully properly surveyed look at this. Where the right of way will be related to our homes. Huge hill, elevation. Steep incline. Not sure if proper for emergency vehicles. This is heavily forested area. Considerable construction, removal of trees. How much of a distance between stone walls and the actual road.

Robert Monroe, 28 Twin Oaks Trail, Chatfield Farms – 231 units. Approx 10k year in taxes. 2.3 million dollars a year. No kids to be educated. Net financial impact. Hopp Brook, assume 109 units, 8000 year in taxes, around 850K income. Probably assume 200 students. 20k per student. Education 4 million. Negative 3.2 million impact.

David Ebling, 14 Dogwood Lane, Conditions of Approval, Miller Road. That gate is our emergency access. We maintain that. If this is approved. COA should absolve Chatfield of any responsibility of maintaining that road, now that development using that road.

Paul Grammer, 12 Hockanum Glenn, Will we need to have more firetrucks? Several accidents on Blackberry Hill Road. How will roads be able to handle increase

Millie Porpora, 48 Twin Oaks Trail, Water Tower – R1. Is that a commercial structure in an R-1 district? Will there be an electrical panel? **DM**: Not sure if there will even be a tank. **Millie P**: Will we need to increase police if we are going to have an increase in population?

Kevin Dokla, 10 Timber Ridge Lane, cisterns, Aquarion should be required to put in advance of any construction being done.

Paul Ansler, 3 Twin Oaks Trail, any intention to bring traffic data from your study up to date? Three-year-old data.

Chris Kopjanski, 138 Feldspar Avenue, Important to speak for tree frog and spotted salamander. Will be impacted by this. Court cases have been won because of the tree frog and the salamander.

Attorney Stephen Bellis: They never shared emails with me. Septic systems adverse impact question- Why we have NV Health District. They won't approve septic system if it caused an environmental impact. Given detailed drawings, not a requirement under 8-30g. I don't have an obligation to give Commission anything more than conceptual plans. About the tank, not a tower. Sits on ground. Up to Aquarion. 250,000-gallon tank. Ms. Waxler, drawing is not correct. Turning sharp right when road goes up to my property. **Andrea Waxler** – we would like an official survey. **SB**: That is not my obligation. There will be no disturbance on your property.

SB: Assumption of 200 students, way off base from evidence we have. Need for more emergency services because of affordable housing? I don't see any data that shows that. Water tank will benefit Chatfield. Can build tank/fire cisterns, will never allow us to build a home without cisterns in place first. Frogs and salamanders were discussed at Wetlands, they handle those issues.

SB: You may not like the statute. Can't change it. Can only abide by it. You are allowed to make modifications to the plan. If we go to court, and judges decide if Town has to do it. Towns always lose. Few cases where they have not lost. Courts have ruled in favor of applicant. Willing to listen to Commissions suggestions ideas.

Reviewing written public comment- **SB**: Concerns have been raised. Judges shot down all the concerns. 500 North v. Stratford decision. Increase burden on schools? Not a reason to overturn affordable housing. 100 new students. I disagree strongly. Did research. Came out to 12 Students. Chatfield was all woods at one point. A lot of people opposed to Chatfield. Ok when you live here. School enrollment is declining over the years. Board of Selectmen said that they did not want sewers. Didn't have or want excess going to treatment plant. Almost worked out a deal with Matt at Chatfield to connect sewers, but Town didn't want it.

Harry Roscoe- In (Andrea Waxler's diagram) – Can you show me where the road will go on this diagram How close will you come; it sounds like you are turning right. **SB**: Look at Exhibit 21.

Keith Rosenfeld, Town Planner – Staff has presented applicant w modified zoning amendment. That is a conceptual site plan. Public and applicant can understand, we have suggested modifications to make the plan better based on our and zoning regulations.

SB: I don't oppose or approve that amendment, but it has nothing to do with my project. By all means propose a text amendment. I don't want to substitute what I submitted for what the planner submitted. My plan doesn't have to abide with your plan of conservation and development. And it doesn't have to fit within your regulations. I can choose to ignore it.

Vincent Marino, Town Attorney – Not asking for your acceptance. It is within right of Commission, to tell him he will implement a text amendment that permits affordable housing, but rejecting what you submitted, and adopting what staff has provided. If you do that, He has to conform to that regulation, which allows him build density at what he requested, in the area requested, based on the plan submitted, with the exception that it conforms to statutory obligations under 8-30g, but also to POCD/Zoning Regs. Mr., Bellis can reject that an appeal that. Attorney Bellis wants it to be site specific. We drafted it, it can apply throughout town. Good planning.

SB: I don't disagree with what Vin has said. We don't use the proposed regulations, we ignore it. I'm going to decline to accept. VM: your acceptance is not required.

DM: Quite a bit of material. Would you consider granting the Commission an extension, to review material, and also that you need to supply this Town to complete the application process. A letter of intent from Aquarion, as the letter you submitted is past twelve months. In the beginning, the letter from the Regional Water Authority – you failed to address, that 1/3 of homes in a Watershed area. That needs to be addressed. I would like to see outline of watershed area, in conjunction to the proposed septic area. A 65-day extension? **SB:** No.

Motion to close public hearing for Application PZC-06252021-2-TA/ Hopp Brook Village. Motion made by Harry Roscoe/Seconded by Michael Pratt VOTE:

Donald Molleur	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Jack Burns	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Harry Roscoe	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Cody Brennan	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Michael Rupsis	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	<u>Absent</u>
Marc Bronn	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Robert Starkey	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	<u>Absent</u>
Michael Pratt	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent
Howard Leeper	<u>Aye</u>	Nay	Abstain	Absent

3. Adjournment

Motion by HL to adjourn hearing for night at 9:06 pm. Seconded by Michael Pratt. All ayes.

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa Daigle
Clerk, Planning & Zoning Commission