

November 23, 2011

MINUTES: THE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS, Town of Hamden, held a Public Hearing and Regular Meeting on Thursday, November 17, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. in the 3rd Floor Conference Room, Hamden Government Center, 2750 Dixwell Avenue, Hamden, CT. and the following will be reviewed:

Commissioners in attendance:

Wayne Chorney, Acting Chair
 Fran Nelson
 Bill Reynolds
 Steve Walsh, sitting for Jeff Vita
 Andrew Holding, sitting for Elaine Dove

Staff in attendance:

Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner
 Holly Masi, Zoning Enforcement Officer
 Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney
 Stacy Shellard, Commission Clerk
 Genovieve Bertolini, Stenographer

Mr. Vita called the meeting to order at 7:04 p.m., reviewed the agenda and meeting procedures, and the panel introduced themselves.

A. Public Hearing

- 1) **11-6436** 375 Main St, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 570.b to permit an 9 foot high fence where a maximum of 6 feet is allowed. R-2 Zone, Michael Tullo, Applicant

Mr. Francis Teodosio, Attorney, addressed the Commission and stated that Mr. Tullo owns the property in the name of his LLC. He reviewed the application and the location of the fence. He submitted pictures of the fence (exhibit 1) and said that the Commission may want to go out and see the property. Mr. Teodosio explained that from the street line to the back of the property the topography slopes down and the property owner is trying to keep the fence line level across the property. The reason for the variance request is because the way this property and the property next door are situated.

Mr. Holding asked if the variance is for a fence that has already constructed and Mr. Teodosio said yes. Ms. Holly Masi, Zoning Enforcement Officer, stated as a point of clarification this application came in response to an enforcement action being taken on the property. Ms. Masi said that she had received a complaint and that she went out to the property to inspect it. She notified the applicant of the violation and the applicant filed the application to remedy the violation.

Mr. Teodosio reviewed the portion of the fence that requires the variance. He said that the neighboring property has a deck which towers over the fence and it intrudes on the privacy of his client, and the neighbors do not get

along. He said that it is understood what his client's responsibility is and why a variance is needed. Mr. Teodosio said the meeting tonight is about a fence and not the relationship between neighbors.

Mr. Holding asked how long is the fence that is above 6 feet.

Mr. Mike Tullo, 375 Main Street, addressed the Commission and said that the portion of the fence that is above 6 feet is approximately 55 to 60 feet in length.

Mr. Walsh asked if there is a retaining wall. Mr. Teodosio reviewed with the Commission the pictures that had been submitted and said that they show different angles of the fence in respect to the neighbor's porch, the location of the homes, the fence and topography of the property.

Mr. Chorney asked Mr. Teodosio if the privacy issue comes from the neighbor or his client. Mr. Teodosio said that the neighbor's house is close to the fence and their lights shine into his client's house. Mr. Chorney asked if the issue is because of the neighbor's lights and if it is it would be handled by the Planning Office. Mr. Chorney said that a six foot fence is permitted by the zoning regulations and if there is a porch you will always be able to see over a fence. Mr. Holding asked if the part of the fence that is over six feet is situated away from the neighbor's house. Mr. Teodosio said that it is his client's privacy that is of concern. Mr. Nelson said that the neighbor looks in the back yard and not into his client's house and Mr. Teodosio agreed.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor of the application. There were none.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments against the application:

Ms. Masi stated that a letter (exhibit 2) was submitted from Tom & Carol Migdalski. Mr. Teodosio stated that he has reviewed the letter and feels it has nothing to do with the application. Ms. Masi read the letter into the record.

Mr. Bob Florio, 9 Benham Hill Place, addressed the Commission and stated that his rear yard abuts Mr. Tullo's property and feels that the fence should stay within the topography of the property. The fence comes into his yard and is over 14 feet in height and encroaches near the wetlands. He has no issues with a six foot fence as long as it stays within the topography of the land.

Mr. Rick Mut, 355 Main Street, addressed the Commission and stated that his property is on the reverse side of Mr. Migdalski and Mr. Tullo's property. He has lived on Main Street for 10 years with has a wife and children and they brought the house for the future. It is a nice wooded area and has privacy. It is all changing and the fence is a monstrosity. Mr. Mut said that rules have been broken, and is that he is concerned with future problems.

Ms. Carol Migdalski, 395 Main Street, addressed the Commission and said it was stated that the hardship is the height of fence and asked if this was correct. She said that a comment was made that there is an area of the fence that is 5 ½ feet high. Ms. Migdalski feels that there is no section of the fence that is 5 ½ feet high. Ms. Masi stated that her concern is for any portion that exceeds six feet in height. The applicant represented in his plan what the heights are for the fence and it is the board's decision whether to accept the information provided. Ms. Migdalski said that it was stated there is a privacy issue and many trees have been removed. Ms. Migdalski would like to know why the trees were removed.

Ms. Carla Digirolamo, 18 Breckenridge Court, addressed the Commission and stated that she is familiar with the area. The height of the porch or house on the neighboring property should not be in question. Ms. Digirolamo reviewed the topography of the house at 395 Main Street and she stated that this will not change.

Mr. Tom Migdalski, 395 Main Street stated that when it was brought to his attention from Mr. Tullo's attorney that the lights were shining into Mr. Tullo's house, he adjusted the lights. Mr. Migdalski said he has placed new lights on the garage and if they are offensive to anyone he will adjust them.

Mr. Vincent Wren, 425 Main Street, addressed the Commission and stated that he does not object to a 6 foot fence, but if the variance is approved it would set a precedent.

Mr. Mike Sulzbach, 385 Orange Street, New Haven, addressed the Commission and stated that the topography of the property has been changed by Mr. Tullo because the landscape ties are placed with the fence on top of them. He feels there is no hardship and the privacy issue is self created. The Tullos have removed the vegetation and the obstructions that provided privacy, and then constructed the fence.

Ms. Masi stated that Mr. Tom Vocelli, Inland Wetland Enforcement Officer has inspected the property and he has no issues with the wetlands. Any activity in the future may be in the regulated wetland area, but the fence does not concern Mr. Vocelli.

Mr. Teodosio stated that his comment about the 5 ½ feet is the width of the section of the fence and when it goes up on the posts it will be higher. He reviewed the area with the Commission. He feels it would be good idea if the Commission were to view the property and see both sides of the fence. The hardship is the privacy issue and the topography of the property. Mr. Teodosio said there is animosity in the letter that was presented to the Commission. He asked that there are issues that have been raised in the letter and they should not be considered. Mr. Teodosio stated that the two property owners on both sides of the fence are involved in an adverse possession case in regards to where the fence sits. The hardship is the privacy problem with the deck towering above the fence because it is different than just a porch. The acting chairman of the Commission characterized it as something that occurs all over Hamden. Mr. Teodosio said that the pictures showing the fence line staying the same even though one portion is over 9 feet, and this is because that is where the property drops off. He said that the hardship is not self inflicted, and if the Commission can see where the trees were removed.

Mr. Michael Tullo, 375 Main Street, addressed the Commission and stated that he and his wife like the wooded area, and that this is his dream property. The property was overgrown and there is no lawn. He removed the spruces and pine trees on the Main Street side of the front of the property which reveals the abutting property. If the Commission visits the property they can see the stumps of the trees that have been removed. Mr. Tullo said that between Mr. Migdalski and his property there is a wide open driveway. The 5 ½ foot fence that was put up does not provide enough privacy. He said that when the Migdalski sit and have dinner, they look up at his property and take pictures. Mr. Tullo said that he did not exchange bad words with Mr. Migdalski and only asked him to stop taking pictures and to give him brotherly advice. He said that he would like to keep them as good neighbors. He feels he is being attacked not the reverse. He invited the Commission to come to the property to see what has been cleared. He has removed brush and leaves from the property. Mr. Tullo said that the Migdalski put up a vinyl garage and other properties have cleared their lots to have a lawn and he would also like a lawn. He said he has sent letters to introduce himself. Mr. Tullo said he will be planting and there will be privacy. Mr. Tullo said he is offended by the complaint read by Ms. Masi at this meeting. Ms. Masi stated that it was submitted as part of the record at this meeting. Mr. Tullo stated that a wedge of the wetland material was removed by someone and he is trying to get the land back to its original state. The mature trees cut down were old and dangerous and falling down and Mr. Tullo is concerned about his safety. A tree fell on his neighbor's shed and smashed it.

Mr. Rick Moot explained to the Commission that the tree fell during the winter storm last Christmas.

Mr. Chorney stated that he asked Ms. Masi to read the letter submitted. Ms. Masi said the letter was submitted at this meeting for the public hearing. Mr. Chorney explained that if Mr. Tullo will be doing any placing of fill on his property he must contact the Planning Office. The ZBA is only concerned with the height of the fence.

Mr. Tullo said that he has had the land surveyed and paid a soil scientist see where the wetlands are located. He has spent over \$12,000.00 to do things right. Mr. Tullo said his family has been in Hamden since 1912.

Mr. Lee said that if the Commission is going to do a site visit the public hearing should remain open until the next meeting.

Mr. Chorney said that this request is similar to a past application and pictures have been presented from both sides. He asked the Commission if they were satisfied with what was presented at this meeting. The Commission had a discussion with regard to what was presented at this meeting.

Mr. Chorney closed the Public Hearing.

- 2) 11-6440** 130 Pelham Ave, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 220, Table 2.3 to permit a side yard of 6 feet where 12 feet is required for a detached garage. R-4 Zone, Douglas Strauss, Applicant

Mr. Douglas Strauss, Applicant, addressed the Commission and stated that that a tree had fallen on his garage during Hurricane Irene. His house was built in 1928 and the proposed garage would be built in the same location.

Mr. Holding asked if the garage would be built within the same footprint. Mr. Strauss said that the garage would be 20 feet by 24 feet. Mr. Chorney asked why he would like to expand the length of the garage. Mr. Strauss explained that he collects antique cars and they tend to be longer in length. Mr. Chorney asked if the side yard setback would remain the same. Mr. Strauss replied yes. He stated that the garage would be going deeper into the property and his property is similar to those in his neighborhood.

Mr. Chorney asked if the proposed garage would be detached. Ms. Masi explained that the garage would be detached and that the applicant is requesting the variance because it would not be built within the required rear yard set back. Mr. Kops said if the garage were proposed within the required rear yard set back it could be placed 3 feet from the rear yard property yard and 3 feet from the side yard property line.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor and against the application and there were none.

Mr. Chorney closed the public hearing.

- 3) 11-6441** 20 Brinsmade Rd, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 220, Table 2.3 to permit a front yard of 38 feet where 40 feet is required for the new construction of a house. R-2 Zone, Ethan Chorin, Applicant

Attorney. Michael Sulzbach, Representative for the applicant, addressed the Commission and reviewed the application. He submitted an A-2 survey and explained that the proposed house would conform more to the zoning regulations than the existing one. He submitted a picture of the house as it exists today and said that it is uninhabitable and cannot be saved. The new house would be built on the existing foundation and the garage is being eliminated. If the application is denied the existing house needs to be demolished, but the foundation would remain.

Mr. Chorney asked if the proposed house would be a single story. Mr. Sulzbach reviewed the proposed elevation plans for a 2 story house. Mr. Kops advised the Commission that he lives on this street and he has spoken with the applicant. The house needs to be demolished and be rebuilt. The request to build a two story house is more appropriate than a single family house. A single story house would require a larger foot print and there are slope and wetland issues on the property. Mr. Sulzbach said that the slopes and wetlands are a hardship and the location of proposed house cannot be moved because of the proximity of the wetlands.

Mr. Chorney asked if there was city water and a septic system. Mr. Kops said there is well water and a septic system.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor of the application:

Mr. Bob Oleivera , 25 Brimsmade Road, addressed the Commission and stated that the house has been abandoned for 8 or 9 years. He explained that when the door of the house was opened you could smell the mildew. He would like to see a new house built because it would increase the property values in the neighborhood.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments against the application. There were none.

The Public Hearing was closed.

- 4) 11-6442** 169 Perry Rd, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 220, Table 2.3 to permit a 25 foot rear yard where 40 feet is required for an enclosed porch. R-2 Zone, Greville Liburd, Applicant

Mr. Greville Liburd, Applicant, addressed the Commission and reviewed the proposed application and the location of the proposed porch. He said that because the property is wedged shape is difficult to construct anything that would not be close to the property lines, or add to the existing non conformities. His yard is not easily accessible and he and his wife are both senior citizens who would like to be able to enjoy sitting outside.

Mr. Holding asked if the plot plan submitted was drawn to scale and Mr. Liburd replied yes. Mr. Liburd explained that if the proposed porch is approved, when it is completed the house would look the same as other homes that are in the neighborhood.

Mr. Chorney said that the well located on the property is only 24 feet from the rear of the house. Mr. Liburd advised the Commission that he has received an approval from QVHD. Mr.Chorney said that a deminimis determination has been received from the IWC.

Ms. Masi explained that the applicant had applied for a zoning permit and it was determined that it did not meet the setbacks. There was a deminimus review and did not need to go before the IWC with an application.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor and against the application and there were none.

Mr. Chorney closed the public hearing.

- 5) 11-6443** 91 Swarthmore St, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 220, Table 2.3 to permit a side yard of 11.8 feet where 12 feet is required for an addition, R-4 Zone, Peter Kosinski & Pam Chambers, Applicants

Mr. Peter Kosinski, Applicant, addressed the Commission and reviewed the elevation plan and the plot plan. He explained that he has two small children and only one bathroom located on the second floor. He would like to add a dormer and a bathroom. The proposed addition would stay within the existing footprint of the house. Mr. Kosinski said that for the aesthetics of the house he would like to continue the roof line and will encroach only 4 inches over the required setback. Mr. Chorney asked if he was staying within the established footprint of the house and Mr. Kosinski replied yes.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor and against the application and there were none.

Mr. Chorney closed the public hearing.

- 6) 11-6444** 48 Russell St, Requesting variances of the following: Section 220, Table 2.1 to permit 34 percent building coverage where a maximum of 25 percent is allowed. Section 220, Table 2.1 to permit 33 percent impervious surface coverage where a maximum of 30 percent is allowed for a detached garage. R-4 Zone, Ryan Sweeney, Applicant

Mr. Ryan Sweeney, Applicant, addressed the Commission and reviewed the layout of his property and the proposed plan for an 18 x 24 foot garage. He said that the existing garage is in disrepair. He would like to make the garage bigger to allow a storage area for his work truck and there is no room to park in the existing driveway.

Mr. Chorney said that the property is a corner lot and the side yard and front yard requirements are different from an interior lot. Mr. Chorney asked Ms. Masi to clarify the request for the impervious surface request. Ms. Masi said that the lot is small and may already be non-conforming, because the house predates the zoning regulations. Mr. Sweeney explained that the the current impervious surface requirement is 30 percent⁵ and he is asking for 33 percent impervious surface coverage. Ms. Masi said that the proposed increase only negligibly increase what already exists.

Mr. Nelson asked if the proposed 18 foot wide garage would be large enough for Mr. Sweeney needs and he replied yes. Mr. Sweeney said that he would like to keep the size of the proposed garage as close to what already exists because the back yard is small.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor of the application. There were none.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments against the application:

Ms. Meg Barone, 37 Russell Street, addressed the Commission and said she is not against the application. She is concerned and reviewed the parking that exists on Mr. Sweeney's property. She stated it is dangerous because it is located up against the sidewalk. Ms. Barone's is also concerned with the existing gardens on the neighboring property because they are beautiful and would like that they be protected.

Mr. Sweeney advised the Commission that he misstated the width of the garage and it will be 14 foot wide garage. He said that he will also be planting a garden and if any damage is done to the existing gardens he will restore.

Mr. Chorney closed the public hearing.

7) 11-6445 5 Brinsmade Rd, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 220, Table 2.3 to permit a front yard of 28.6 feet were 40 feet is required for the relocation of a two car garage. R-2 Zone, Steve Nero, Applicant

Mr. Nelson advised the Commission that he is friends with the applicant, but it would not impede his decision. Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney asked if he worked together or did work for Mr. Nero and Mr. Nelson replied no.

Mr. Steve Nero, Applicant, addressed the Commission and reviewed the application. He explained that the existing septic needs to be replaced because it is failing. He reviewed the location of his neighbor's well and reviewed the location of his septic system that must be placed 75 feet away from the well. If he left the garage as it exists, once the septic system is installed a steep slope condition would exist. Mr. Nero reviewed with the Commission the location of the existing garage and the location and size of the proposed garage.

Mr. Nero said that the surveyor said that the setback being used is based on the original sub-division setbacks. Mr. Kops said that research was done and the original sub-division approval which was for a 35 foot setback. Mr. Nero said that with a 35 foot set back his front yard, his request would be for 21 feet.

Mr. Nelson asked if the hardship is the need for the septic system and it would become difficult to access the existing garage and Mr. Nero replied yes. Mr. Nero reviewed with the Commission the location of his house located on a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor of the application and there were none.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments against the application:

Mr. Bob Oleivera, 25 Brimsmade Road, addressed the Commission and stated that he is concerned because there had been a ditch that created runoff into his basement. The water table in the neighborhood has a high water table. He asked the Commission if the variance request would bring the septic system feet closer than the required 75 feet. Mr. Nero advised that septic system would be 75 feet 2 inches away from Mr. Oleivera's well. Mr. Nero advised the Commission that he has received approvals from QVHD and the State for the location of the new septic system.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor and against the application and there were none.

Mr. Chorney closed the public hearing.

- 8) 11-6446** 35 Corporate Ridge Rd, Unit 6 & 7, Requesting a variance of the following: Section 591, Table 5.5, to permit 6 parking spaces where 8 spaces are required for an auto repair shop. M Zone, Troy Clark, Applicant.

Ms. Laura Clark, Property Owner, addressed the Commission and advised them that if the variance is approved there is a pending Special Permit application and Location Approval application. She reviewed the history of Mr. Troy Clark's business as a hobby shop located in a different unit, and that he is now going to make it a full time business to be located at this location. Ms. Clark reviewed the history of the property and the parking regulations for the owners of the units. A homeowners association was just recently formed. Ms. Clark reviewed the variance request and said there are owners of other units that would allow them use of their parking spaces and would be willing to put it in writing. The vehicles that the applicant would be working with will be picked up and brought to the site, and would only remain on the site for 1 or 2 days. They would be stored inside the units and when the work is completed returned back to the owner of the vehicle.

Mr. Nelson he is an abutting neighbor and reviewed the original approval and available parking for the existing units.

Mr. Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney, advised Mr. Nelson that he may want to recuse himself because he is an abutting property owner. Mr. Nelson said that he knows the original project and the conditions that has been set. Ms. Clark reviewed a previous variance granted for the setbacks.

Mr. Chorney asked if Mr. Nelson can be called upon to present facts about the property, strictly for presentation of facts, but not vote on it. Mr. Lee replied yes. Mr. Chorney advised the applicant that only 4 Commissioners would be allowed to vote and for the variance to be granted they all must be in favor of it or the applicant could choose to continue the public hearing until the next meeting where there could be five Commissioners.

Mr. Troy Clark, Applicant, addressed the Commission and advised that there will not be cars parked outside at night. The vehicles will be picked up, serviced and returned. He will be a small business and should never have more than two vehicles on the premise at a time. He previously was approved for a hobby/repair shop located at unit 14 at this address. Ms. Clark explained that Mr. Clark will be the only employee and sometimes an intern will be on the premise. Ms. Clark does the bookkeeping for the business on the weekends. There was a discussion of the approvals for the previous location.

Mr. Lee asked the applicant if they wished to continue and Mr. Clark said yes.

Mr. Chorney asked Mr. Kops what the State requirements are for the proposed application and the location approval.

Mr. Kops said that the State accepts what is approved by the Town. He said that the P & Z Commission looks at the number of parking spaces on site and the uses on site. The variance being requested is because of the number of spaces on the site.

Mr. Holding asked if the property owner controls any of the spaces. Ms. Clark said that the by-laws allow them to use two spaces because they own the two units. There was a further discussion about the allowed parking spaces by a unit owner and the parking requirements in the zoning regulation.

The Commission discussed with the applicant the proposed use of the units. Mr. Chorney asked the applicant if he would accept a condition that the business would be a pick up service only for vehicle. The applicant said yes. The commission reviewed with the applicant the proposed parking inside the units.

Mr. Chorney asked for comments in favor and against the application and there were none.

Mr. Chorney closed the public hearing.

B. Regular Meeting

a. Discussion and voting on Public Hearing items.

11-6436

Mr. Holding made the motion to deny Application 11-6436. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Mr. Holding stated that no hardship was shown and the fence is over the height allowed. *The motion passed unanimously.*

11-6440

Mr. Nelson made the motion to approve Application 11-6440. Mr. Walsh seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson said that the fallen tree crushed the garage. The garage will be within the same foot print and the increase would be to the rear of the property and would not encroach into the side yard. *The motion passed unanimously.*

11-6441

Mr. Nelson made the motion to approve Application 11-6441. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson said that the original house is being demolished and the applicant will build a new house on the property. The garage would be removed which created a non-conformity and the new house would be placed within the same footprint and on the existing foundation. The hardship is the existing foundation. The existing house will be rebuilt. *The motion passed unanimously.*

11-6442

Mr. Reynolds made the motion to approve Application 11-6442. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Mr. Reynolds said that the angle of the lot is the hardship for an existing structure. Mr. Nelson stated that the applicant needs to stay 24 feet way from the well as required by QVHD. *The motion passed unanimously.*

11-6443

Mr. Holding made the motion to approve Application 11-6443. Mr. Nelson seconded the motion. Mr. Holding said that the roof line is over by only 4 inches and it is a minimal change in the footprint. *The motion passed unanimously.*

11-6444

Mr. Reynolds made the motion to approve Application 11-6444. Mr. Walsh seconded the motion. Mr. Reynolds said that it is an existing non-conforming lot in Spring Glen, and the garage needs to be rebuilt. The motion passed unanimously.

11-6445

Mr. Reynolds made the motion to approve Application 11-6445. Mr. Walsh seconded the motion. Mr. Reynolds said that the hardship is the placement of the septic system impeding the driveway. Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Holding and Mr. Chorney voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Nelson abstained. Therefor, the motion passed 4-0-1.

11-6446

Mr. Reynolds made the motion to approve Application 11-6446. Mr. Walsh seconded the motion. The Commission discussed the parking that goes with the property and that the applicant has given specification of what he intends to use the property for. Mr. Chorney said that the applicant has stated that he will do pick up only, like a concierge service, vehicles will be stored indoors at night and no vehicles stored outside. There should be a confirmation prior to a zoning permit being issued where the outdoor spaces will be. Ms. Masi said that the location of the outdoor spaces will be decided during the P&Z approval. Mr. Chorney said that the signage should be typical of a storage area and not change the appearance to make it look like an industrial park. Mr. Holding said that the condition of no vehicles stored outside overnight should satisfy the concern.

The Conditions of Approval:

- 1) No outdoor storage at night 2) No tow trucks to be stored outside 3) All vehicles will be brought to the property by the proprietor.*

Mr. Walsh, Mr. Holding, Mr. Reynolds and Mr. Chorney voted in favor of the application. Mr. Nelson abstained. Therefor the motion passed 4-0-1.

b. Approve Minutes of October 20, 2011

Mr. Nelson made the motion to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2011 meeting as written. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

c. Old Business

Mr. Chorney discussed parking on sidewalks in the southern end of Hamden. Ms. Masi said that she has referred the issue to the Mayor's Help Desk.

d. New Business
2012 Meeting Schedule

Mr. Nelson made a motion to approve the 2012 meeting schedule. Mr. Reynolds seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Request for acceptance of a second application for 135-145 Sanford Street

Mr. Lee advised the Commission that an application for this location was denied by the ZBA last month. The applicant is allowed to come back to the Commission with a modified application because it will be for affordable housing.

e. Adjournment

Mr. Reynolds made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Nelson. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 9:03 p.m

Submitted by: _____
Stacy Shellard, Clerk of the Commission