



Town of Hamden
Planning and Zoning Department

**Hamden Government
Center
2750 Dixwell Avenue
Hamden, CT 06518**

**Tel: (203) 287-7070
Fax: (203) 287-7075**

June 23, 2009

MINUTES: THE PLANNING SECTION, PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION, Town of Hamden, held a Regular Meeting on Tuesday, June 16, 2009 at 7:00 p.m. in the Legislative Council Chambers, 2372 Whitney Avenue, Hamden, CT and the following was reviewed:

Commissioners in attendance:

Joe McDonagh, Planning and Zoning Chair
Ann Altman, Planning Section Chair
Ralph Riccio
Lesley DeNardis
Peter Reynolds

Staff in attendance:

Leslie Creane, Town Planner
Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner
Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney
Stacy Shellard, Clerk

Ms. Altman called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. She introduced the panel and reviewed the procedures. She advised there would be a Public Hearing and Special Meeting for the full Planning and Zoning Commission immediately following this meeting.

A. Regular Meeting:

Ms. Altman advised the Commission that item 1 and 2 would be heard together and reviewed the procedure. Mr. Kops, Assistant Town Planner advised that regardless of the vote this evening, if there was not a favorable recommendation for the application, there would still be a public hearing at the Zoning Section meeting on 6/23/09. If there were a negative referral, there would have to be 2/3 majority vote by the Zoning Section Commission to approve the application.

- 1) **Zoning Regulation Amendment 09-912**
Establishment of Spring Glen Village District Regulation
Planning Section review and referral to Zoning Section
File available for review in the Planning Office and the Office of the Town Clerk
Spring Glen Civic Association, Inc., Applicant
- 2) **Zoning Map Amendment 09-913**
Creation of a Village District Overlay
Planning Section review and referral to Zoning Section
File available for review in the Planning Office and the Office of the Town Clerk
Spring Glen Civic Association, Inc., Applicant

Mr. David Hennigan, 64 Waite Street, addressed the Commission and stated that he is representing the Spring Glen Civic Association, Inc. He submitted to the Commission a petition with a 162 signatures to

amend the Zoning Regulations to establish the Spring Glen Village District Overlay. He submitted to the Commission a copy of his presentation:

I am representing the petitioner, Spring Glen Civic Association, Inc., in the matter of zoning regulation amendment 09-912 and zoning map amendment 09-913. We are petitioning to amend the town of Hamden's zoning regulations to establish Spring Glen Village District Regulations and for the creation of a Spring Glen Village District Overlay map.

Ten years ago, Connecticut's zoning statutes were amended to allow local zoning commissions to establish village districts as part of a community's zoning regulations. By definition Village District regulations are place specific and regulate at the neighborhood scale or an even smaller area, as is the case in the petition before you tonight.

More than thirty Planning and Zoning Commissions have established or provided for the use of Village Districts in municipalities ranging from urban (like Stamford and Norwalk) to rural (like Madison and Kent).

Tonight I wish to briefly explain why we believe the creation of the Spring Glen Village District is desirable and necessary. I will also explain our reasons for some of the specific regulations in the document before you. As I will illustrate with several quotation, the creation of a Spring Glen Village District will help to achieve the goals for Spring Glen spelled out in the Hamden Plan of Conservation and Development (2004), the document that by statute guides town zoning. You might want to look at the map as a visual aid for my remarks.

- A. The Spring Glen neighborhood evolved as a rough sphere with a nodal business district near its center. This model of neighborhood development, in which all residences are within walking distance of a nodal business district, is precisely the kind that urban designers are trying to recreate today. One of the primary goals of the Village District regulations and overlay map is to preserve this separation between the commercial section of Spring Glen and its residential sections. The regulations seek to prevent the conversion of residences on Whitney Avenue into commercial uses. (See P. of C. D. 126). In the event that one of the major civic institutions on Whitney Avenue, a church, synagogue or school, were to sell its property, the Village District regulations will help insure that the property is not developed in a way that threatens the residential character of that part of Whitney Avenue. P.of C. D. specifically states there should be "no physical expansion" of the commercial district in Spring Glen (page 131).
- B. A second major goal of the Spring Glen Village District Regulations is to maintain pedestrian safety in the neighborhood. Preventing commercial development outside of the business district will reduce the number of cars pulling on and off Whitney Avenue. The regulations also prohibit drive-through windows, and some uses like "gas station" which lead to high volumes of cars pulling on and off of Whitney Avenue for quick commercial transactions. The Spring Glen business district already has two drive-through windows and one gas station. We believe additional businesses of this sort will create a tipping point were residents, especially the elderly and school children, do not feel safe walking down Whitney Avenue. This will create the same sort of problem we see on Dixwell Avenue today, were even to go a quarter mile everyone drives rather than walks. Spring Glen is home to two schools and four major places of worship on Whitney Avenue. It is vital residents of the neighborhood that Whitney Avenue remain "walkable." P. of C. D. describes Spring Glen as "walkable," with established limits of commercial areas (118)
- C. A third major goal of the Spring Glen Village Regulations is to maintain the look and feel of the neighborhood. The Village District regulations are intended to allow for change and development in the neighborhood, but insure that scale, site orientation and look of the

neighborhood are preserved. The Village District Regulations, by statute, provide for a Village District Consultant. This Consultant will make recommendations to the commission in regard to projects that fall under the regulations. The Planning and Zoning commission will have a legally defensible option to say no to changes or development in Spring Glen which would detract from the neighborhood in ways defined in the Village District Regulations. We believe that this will lead to better design proposals, not block development.

- D. A fourth goal of these regulations is to encourage development of the Spring Glen business district into a mixed use area with retail shops, offices and restaurants which are on scale with the neighborhood and cater to neighborhood residents. Instead of allowing one large office building or box store, these regulations are intended to encourage a variety of uses as well as approximately eight additional dwelling units in the area targeted for redevelopment in the town sponsored Charette (Eaton center). P of C.D., calls for protection of the business district with “neighborhood village-based retail/service centers” (131)

I now wish to very briefly address some potential concerns raised in regard to the Village District Regulations:

- Are the Village District regulations a burden, cost or excessive restriction on homeowners on Whitney Avenue? We have tried to craft regulations which are nothing like a “historic district.” If you look at what is exempt under section I.B. from the regulations, there is very little left to be regulated. The regulations will primarily effect new construction if existing properties are sold or demolished.
- Is now the right time to pass village district regulations or should we wait until after town-wide zoning regulations are passed? Since mid-February, the Town Planner, assistant town planner and town counsel have encouraged us to submit the overlay ahead of the town-wide regulations if we so desire. The regulations have been crafted to work with both the existing CDD-3 zoning and proposed T 3.5 zoning in the Spring Glen Village district. In light of the Village District regulations it may be helpful to add a few definitions to the town-wide regulations, like a definition of a “driveway” as opposed to a “parking lot,” or a more precise definition of a “kiosk for retail sales or rental.” We do not think this will delay the town-wide regulations.
- Do owners of residences and businesses in Spring Glen who will live within the Village District want it passed? Thus far we have the signature of the owners of more than 100 of the 140 privately owned residences and businesses that fall within the district. We hope to gather even more signatures and present them to the planning and zoning commission at the hearing on June 23.

As a conclusion to these remarks, I want you to know that we believe Spring Glen is a neighborhood that already works. It is a desirable place to live and affords its residents a high quality of life. The scope for change and development in Spring Glen should be relatively narrow in order to preserve those qualities that maintain the neighborhood as a desirable place to live. We believe the Village District Regulations are the best zoning tool available to accomplish this goal.

Ms. Altman thanked Mr. Hennigan for his presentation. She thanked the Town Planner and the Assistant Town Planner for working with the Spring Glen Civic Association.

Mr. Kops, Assistant Town Planner read his comments:

The proposed amendments to create a village district represent a significant step in Hamden's zoning history, introducing a new, localized approach to maintaining the unique character of a neighborhood. The leaders of the Spring Glen Civic Association have spent several months preparing and refining the

application, seeking to find the right balance between the rights of individual property owners and the good of the local community. The review of the proposed amendments considers several aspects, including their conformance with State Statutes and the Plan of Conservation and Development, potential impact, approval process and the impact of the proposed change to the Zoning Map.

Conformance with the Village District Act and the Plan of Conservation and Development:

In evaluating the proposed amendment to the Zoning Regulations, the Commission must determine if the proposed change is consistent with the State Statute allowing village districts. The department's review indicates that the language does comply with the provisions of Section 8-2.j. There are a few minor changes that should be considered.

In Section I.B.2. the quotation marks around the word footprint should be eliminated, since the word is commonly used in zoning regulations. In Section 6.B. In the first paragraph the phrase “zoning officer” should be changed to “Zoning Enforcement Officer.”

The Commission must also determine if the proposed village district regulations are consistent with the current Plan of Conservation and Development.¹ That document calls for the preservation of the attractive qualities of the Spring Glen Neighborhood.² Moreover, this Commission has submitted an application to amend the POCD in a manner that makes the support of village districts in general even more explicit.

Impact on Affected Properties:

The impact of the proposed regulations differs between the residential, R-4 and the non-residential, CDD-3 zones. In the residential zone the most significant items are:

- The construction of a new single-family home will require Site Plan approval rather than a Zoning Permit.
- No new construction of multi-family or office buildings will be permitted.
- With minor exceptions, expansion of any structure in a manner that increases building coverage will require Special Permit approval.
- Any conversion of a building or structure into a use other than as a single-family home will require Special Permit approval.

These changes will impose restrictions on the current rights of residential property owners. However the applicant is submitting a petition in support of the application, signed by the affected owners. Assuming there is substantial support for the proposed amendment, the department does not object to these local restrictions, which are intended to benefit the entire Spring Glen neighborhood.

In the CDD-3, commercial and mixed-use zone to be governed by the proposed amendment the following items are the most significant:

- Small businesses offering services or retail (less than 1,500 square feet of gross leasable space) will require only a Zoning Permit.
- New single-family homes will require Site Plan approval.
- No building will be larger than 16,000 square feet in gross floor area.

¹The Town of Hamden, “Plan of Conservation and Development 2004”.

²Ibid., pp 118 and 131.

- Office, retail and similar buildings will be restricted to 10,000 square feet of gross leasable space
- Density will be restricted to four dwelling units per acre.
- No take-out restaurants will be allowed
- No drive-through windows will be permitted for any use.

These changes impose restrictions on the current rights of non-residential property owners. However the applicant is submitting a petition in support of the application, signed by the affected owners. Assuming there is substantial support for the proposed amendment, the department does not object to the restrictions. These are local regulations that will apply to only a small area and once again are intended to benefit the entire Spring Glen neighborhood.

That being said, as the Commission is well aware, zoning regulations constitute an imperfect tool that is difficult to calibrate. The proposed restrictions may over time block desirable as well as undesirable development. The issue of building size could be handled effectively by the type of design guidelines found in form-based zoning, such as SmartCode. The limit of four apartments per acre is more restrictive than the existing density of accessory apartments above businesses. And the restriction on drive-through windows will prohibit the banks and pharmacies from development that many would consider to be desirable. The Spring Glen Civic Association will need to monitor the situation very carefully to ensure that mixed and non-residential uses remain sustainable and that the neighborhood continues to offer a variety of amenities within walking distance.

Evaluation of the Approval Process:

In both zones any project and activity not exempted in Section I.B. must be reviewed by the Spring Glen Village District Consultant, a volunteer professional selected by the Planning and Zoning Commission. The consultant makes a determination whether or not an application is consistent with the desirable characteristics of the neighborhood and then submits a recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The Planning and Zoning Department believes there should be one consultant to handle applications from any village districts created. Thus the title should be changed from Spring Glen Village District Consultant to Village District Consultant. In addition, the position of consultant should be for a term of one year, subject to renewal by the Commission.

Proposed Change to the Zoning Map:

The proposed overlay is also consistent with the POCD. There are no flaws in the application and the area designated to be part of the overlay is appropriate.

Mr. Kops read the recommendations of the Planning & Zoning Department:

The Planning and Zoning Department recommends the Planning Section send the Zoning Section a recommendation to approve the proposed amendment of the Zoning Regulations, with the minor changes noted above, which are underlined in the attached copy of the proposed amendment. The text should be labeled Section 619.

The Department does not believe that these changes alter the proposed regulations to such an extent that a new application would be necessary. However, if the Assistant Town Attorney determines otherwise, staff suggest approving the language as submitted and then making these specific changes as part of the general amendment of the Zoning Regulations soon to come before the Commission.

The Planning and Zoning Department also recommends the Planning Section send the Zoning Section a recommendation to approve the proposed amendment of the Zoning Map.

Finally, the Planning and Zoning Department recommends that the Spring Glen Civic Association conduct a systematic annual review involving the owners of residential and commercial properties within the district, as well as residents outside the SGVD, to assess how well the new regulations are working, for the next few years. It may then propose any changes that are deemed appropriate.

Ms. Altman asked for comments from the Zoning Section Commissioners:

Ms. DeNardis asked Mr. Kops to elaborate how the Village District Consultant with regard to how an application would move through the process. Mr. Kops advised the members that the Village District Consultant would be a volunteer who was a qualified landscape architect, architect., or planner. There is a requirement that any application sent to a consultant must be reviewed within 35 days and the consultant provides an advisory opinion to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The Planning and Zoning Commission makes the final decision.

Mr. Reynolds asked when the annual review of property owners was being done, how would the Commission know that the the property owners had been asked. Mr. Kops advised the Commission that it is a recommendation and not a requirement.

Mr. McDonagh thanked the Spring Glen Civic Association and the Planning Department. He read page 1 second paragraph of the proposal and noted that the word demolition is used. Asked if demolition is an appropriate word to use since P&Z has no jurisdiction. Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney advised there is language in the Village District regulations that allows the removal of certain buildings. It is allowed and uses removal of certain buildings.

Mr. McDonagh read his comments:

1. When considering a village district overlay for a residential neighborhood, there are really only two constituencies to consider: The residents of the neighborhood would, of course, be primary; and the residents of the entire Town would also be considered, though secondary. But when considering a village district overlay for a commercial neighborhood, a third constituency has to be considered, the commercial property owners. I would hope that we will hear from a number of the commercial property owners at the public hearing on June 23, regarding the impact that the Spring Glen Village District overlay will have on them. Frankly, I would prefer to have input from them before voting on these regulations.
2. The SGVD Regulations make clear (Section V(A)) that the model for any new commercial development should be the west side of Whitney Avenue. "...[P]roposed structures should compliment, rather than imitate, the architectural styles found in the commercial/mixed use district on the west side of Whitney Avenue...The present structures on the east side of Whitney Avenue...shall not be used as a model." But in fact, there is no consistent architectural style on the east side. There are some charming buildings: The building that houses the veterinarian and Paul & Eddy's; Park Central; and the last building, that houses Café Amici. But if you plucked the other four buildings up and dropped them on Dixwell Avenue south of the Parkway, none of them would look out of place. The fact is, what is worth imitating isn't the style of the west side, but rather the character, scale and placement of the buildings along the street. Ironically, this is exactly what Smart Code, and the new zoning regulations, aims to accomplish. In fact, there is one building on the east side, the Wachovia

- Bank building, that has some appeal, and in part, it is because that building, too, is directly on Whitney Avenue, and not set back.
3. Section V(B)(2): Current regulations (for CDD-3 zones) calculates the number of dwelling units permitted based on the size of the units themselves. I think the restriction in the SGVD overlay is too restrictive. I understand that in the new regulations, both T-3 and T-3.5 will have the same limitation, of four units per acre. But I think, once the regulations are in place, we might want to re-consider this. Currently, there are four mixed-use buildings in the Spring Glen commercial district: 1640 Whitney Avenue (Park Central); 1658 Whitney Avenue (Glen Hair Salon); 1660 Whitney Avenue (Galasso's Clock & Watch); and 1670-1678 Whitney Avenue (Café Amici). The last has three one-bedroom units, and sits on a quarter acre. Both 1658 and 1660 Whitney are on 0.09 acres, and have one apartment each. If any of these buildings were destroyed – and 1670-1678 Whitney is one of the buildings that does have charm – they could not be rebuilt, at least not with their upstairs apartments. Only Park Central, at 1640 Whitney Avenue, is large enough to permit its upstairs apartment.
 4. Section IV(D)(3): What is a kiosk? There is no definition provided. Dictionary.com defines kiosk as, among other things, “a small structure having one or more sides open, used as a newsstand, refreshment stand, bandstand, etc.” If another vendor applies to put a soft drink vending machine in front of a building, is that banned? In my opinion, this section is reactive planning. It is not good planning. It is a reaction to an application, without any thought given to what the prohibition accomplishes, except to keep that one application from being offered again. And if we are going to be entirely honest, if the application had not been from Red Box, but instead had been from Best Video, there would not have been any neighborhood uproar.
 5. Section IV(D)(3): The same paragraph states that “no drive-through window is permitted for any purpose.” This is another example of bad planning. What purpose is served by banning drive-through windows? Is it concern for pedestrian safety? Positioning drive-through windows in the back of buildings – as our new zoning regulations will require – would solve that problem. Can anyone argue that the Wachovia Bank drive-through window poses a safety risk to pedestrians? Of course not. Is it concern about late-night traffic? Any bank is going to have an ATM machine; if it is not in a drive-through location, it will be available nevertheless on the side of the building, and it will promote automobile traffic, so banning drive-through windows accomplishes nothing. And further, is a drive-up ATM machine the same as a “drive-through window”? An argument could be made this it is not. (I note that the new regulations will define “drive-through” as “relating to or conducting exchanges with clients who drive up to a window and remain in their automobiles.” A drive-up ATM may not be a drive-through window.)

But to the point of bad planning: There are currently two banks in the Spring Glen commercial district, Wachovia Bank and Bank of America. Both would be prohibited from rebuilding if they were destroyed. And even more important, banning a drive-through window would guarantee no improvements to Eton Center (the Walgreen's lot), because the Bank would be prohibited from conducting business as normal without the option of a drive-through window. We also know that pharmacies are currently committed to the concept of a drive-through window; whether it makes commercial sense or not is irrelevant to the Planning & Zoning Commission. The fact is, by banning all drive-through windows, we are guaranteeing either that Eton Center will continue to be as it is currently (“not a model for massing, orientation and style,” as the Village District regulations state), or will be, in a few years, vacant. And we are, for all practical purposes, removing banks from future development. But consider what a bank does; it is a vital and necessary part of any commercial district. Ask the people of East Side what they want most to see on State Street; it's a bank, because a local

neighborhood bank helps to establish a neighborhood commercial district, perhaps more than any other institution. When people are asked what defines a neighborhood commercial district, there are four businesses mentioned: Banks, dry cleaners, grocery stores and pharmacies. Banning drive-through windows – and I am not talking about drive-through food establishments – effectively bans banks, and probably bans both pharmacies and dry cleaners. And besides, our new regulations will require a special permit for any drive-through window, (and ban drive-through restaurants in T-3.5 zones), giving the neighborhood ample opportunity to prevent a true threat to pedestrian safety.

I am fully supportive of the Spring Glen Village District overlay. I believe these regulations provide valuable protections for the neighborhood, and represent a valuable model for other neighborhoods in Hamden to follow. If Section IV(D)(3) were modified to read, “No drive-through window is permitted for restaurants,” I will vote in favor of the regulations.

Ms. Altman stated that as a commissioner she is inclined to do what the people want. There seems to be a desire for a Spring Glen District Village and a tremendous amount time was spent to come up with what would be appropriate and desirable for the neighborhood. However, she feels that if this application were to pass, it may not be good for the district. If a bank had to close, it would not be able to reopen with a drive-through window. There are other neighborhoods that would want a bank and allow a drive-through window. If the Spring Glen Neighborhood can prove that everyone is in favor of this proposal then she would vote to recommend it. There are 215 miles of road in Hamden. There is only 1 mile of road that would affect residents and business differently than the rest of the town if this were to be approved. She questioned how much attention should be paid if only 1, 2 or 5 people object. It is a difficult judgment call. She feels this could make a neighborhood go downhill. It is what the public is in favor of at the public hearing she would have to agree. It would be sad to see Spring Glen set in stone as a Village District and deteriorate despite everyone's good intentions. If recommending to the Zoning Section, the planning section may want to include comments made this evening.

Mr. McDonagh is concerned about the 4 residential units per acre. He objects fundamentally to one sentence which is section IV-D-3. This would not allow a drive-through window or a kiosk. Ms. Altman said that the applicant has stated this issue is extremely important and it would be something that the Zoning Section would have to decide. Mr. Lee advised they would need a formal motion to adopt some of the suggestions that Mr. Kops had made in his memo. Ms. Altman stated that Mr. Kops comments does not include drive-through and kiosk. She asked if the members of the Planning Section wanted to make a motion they could include the comments of the Assistant Town Planner and any additional comments that have been made. Mr. Lee stated to the Commissioners that depending on the motion and what changes would be made to the application, it may have to be re-advertised. The Commission discussed with Mr. Lee what would be needed if they sent an unfavorable recommendation to the Zoning Section. Mr. Lee advised for the application to be approved, there would need to be a super majority vote to pass.

Mr. Reynolds made the motion to recommend accept the Zoning Regulation Amendment 09-912 and Zoning Map Amendment 09-913 to establish a Spring Glen Village District with the recommendation of Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner. Ms. DeNardis seconded the motion.

Ms. Altman asked for further discussion:

Mr. Riccio asked if the motion to remove no drive-through window could be included. Ms. Altman advised that Mr. Reynolds motion excludes any discussion of the drive-through window except what is stated in the application which is to exclude drive through windows.

Ms. Altman advised the Commissioners that there would need to be 3 votes in favor of Mr. Reynolds motion for it to pass. ***Mr. Reynolds voted in favor of the motion. Ms. Altman, Mr. Riccio, Ms. DeNardis voted against the motion. The motion failed.***

Ms. Altman asked if there were another motion. Ms. DeNardis asked if the application was voted down would the Zoning Section be able to approve it. Mr. Lee advised the Commissioners that a modification to the motion could be a negative recommendation with an explanation why the Planning Section is not recommending the application.

Mr. Riccio that stated he would need to further review the application for the proposed Spring Glen District before recommending the application to the Zoning Section. He said a bank may not want to come into Spring Glen if they could not have a drive-through window. Mr. Kops advised that the proposed regulations had been sent to the Commissioners, the abutting properties and affected properties of Spring Glen prior to the meeting. The Commission discussed what recommendation would need to be made to send to the Zoning Section.

09-912

Ms. DeNardis made a motion to give a negative recommendation for Application 09-912 for discussion at the Zoning Section with Mr. Kops recommendation because of the drive-through window issue. Mr. Riccio seconded the motion. Ms. DeNardis, Ms. Altman, Mr. Riccio voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Reynolds voted against the motion. The motion passes.

Ms. Altman asked for clarification on the correct vote for Application 09-913. Mr. Kops advised the Commissioners that there would need to be regulations to apply to the proposed amendment. Since a referral is being sent to the Zoning Section and there are no objections to the formation of the overlay district and no objections from the Planning and Zoning Department, then there should be a favorable recommendation to the Zoning Section.

09-913

Ms. DeNardis made a motion to make a positive referral for the creation of a district overlay. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- 3) **C.G.S. 8-24 09-282**
Whitney Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue Intersection
Easement-Traffic Signal System
Town of Hamden, Applicant

Ms. Altman reviewed the application and asked for comments from the commission. There were none. Mr. Kops, Assistant Town Planner read his comments and recommendations.

Mr. McDonagh made the motion to refer the C.G.S. 8-24 09-282 for the Easement-Traffic Signal System at the intersection of Whitney Avenue and Hawthorne Avenue with a favorable review to the Legislative Council. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. McDonagh made the motion to add C.G.S. 8-24 09-283 for a access easement at 374 Treadwell Street to the agenda. Ms. DeNardis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- 4) **C.G.S. 8-24 09-283**
374 Treadwell Street
Access Easement

Town of Hamden, Applicant.

Ms. Altman reviewed the application and asked for comments from the commission. There were none. Mr. Kops, Assistant Town Planner read his comments and recommendations. He stated to the Commission that his memo says re: 274 Treadwell Street and it should say re: 374 Treadwell Street .

Mr. McDonagh made the motion to refer the C.G.S. 8-24n 09-283 for the access easement at 374 Treadwell Street with a favorable review to the Legislative Council. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Old Business/New Business

1. Review Minutes of May 19, 2009

Mr. McDonagh made the motion to approve the Minutes of May 19, 2009 as written. Ms. DeNardis seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

C. Adjournment

Mr. McDonagh made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Stacy Shellard, Clerk of the Commission