

PLANNING & ZONING
COMMISSION
Telephone (203) 563-0185
Fax (203) 563-0284



TOWN HALL ANNEX
238 Danbury Road
Wilton, Connecticut 06897

WILTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES SEPTEMBER 8, 2014 REGULAR MEETING

PRESENT: Chairman Christopher Hulse, Vice Chair Sally Poundstone, Secretary Doris Knapp, Commissioners Lori Bufano, Joe Fiteni, Bas Nabulsi, Peter Shiue, and Franklin Wong

ABSENT: John Comiskey (notified intended absence)

ALSO

PRESENT: Robert Nerney, Town Planner; Daphne White, Assistant Town Planner; Lorraine Russo, Recording Secretary; members of the press; and interested residents.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. SP#392, Jackson, 111 Highfield Road, Accessory Dwelling Unit

Mr. Hulse called the Public Hearing to order at 7:15 P.M., seated members Bufano, Fiteni, Hulse, Knapp, Poundstone, Shiue, and Wong, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest. Ms. Knapp read the legal notice dated August 19, 2014 and referred for the record to a 2-page Planning and Zoning Staff Report dated August 19, 2014; a memorandum dated September 3, 2014 from Jay E. Hanseman to Planning and Zoning Commission; and a memorandum dated September 8, 2014 from Jennifer M. Zbell to Bob Nerney and Daphne White.

Present was Jay Hanseman, Michael Smith Architects; on behalf of the owner.

Mr. Hanseman referenced a site plan showing an existing horse barn, noting that the homeowners would like to use part of the barn as a pool house. He explained that due to the proposed installation of a kitchenette and bath, it is necessary per zoning regulations to apply for a special permit for an accessory dwelling unit within the existing barn.

Mr. Hanseman referenced floor plans and elevations, noting that the existing barn structure would be left essentially intact. Responding to a question from the

P&Z Minutes – 09/08/14 – Page 2

Commission, he acknowledged that the applicants might someday keep a horse there as well, although they are not sure about that just yet.

In response to a question from Ms. Poundstone in connection with item #2 of the Planning and Zoning Staff Report, Mr. Hanseman explained that the homeowners have decided to keep the existing gravel drive rather than convert it to oil and stone as initially proposed, and thus site coverage would not be further increased.

Mr. Wong expressed concern that the existing barn was never intended to be living quarters, referencing an Inland Wetlands Commission (IWC) approval that was issued about 5 years ago when he served on that Commission. He explained that the barn was approved by IWC at that time on the basis of an as-of-right to farming and without any reference to/approval of the structure as habitable space.

Mr. Nerney acknowledged latitude that is given by Connecticut General Statutes to farming uses by right. However, he explained that the subject application did go back before the IWC relatively recently, at which time the proposed subject use was reviewed, a favorable report generated and a conditional permit issued. He noted for the record that the IWC is the agency in charge of wetland issues of this nature.

Mr. Hanseman referenced neighbor letters submitted in support of the initial application. Mr. Nerney noted for the record that any documents/information submitted as part of the first application (which was subsequently withdrawn) cannot be considered under the subject application.

Mr. Hulse asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak for or against the application.

There being no further comments from the Commission or the public, at 7:25 P.M. the Public Hearing was closed.

REGULAR MEETING

- A. Mr. Hulse called the Regular Meeting to order at 7:25 P.M., seated members Bufano, Fiteni, Hulse, Knapp, Poundstone, Shiue, and Wong, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. July 28, 2014 – Regular Meeting

- MOTION was made by Ms. Knapp, seconded by Ms. Poundstone, and carried (3-0-4) to approve the minutes of July 28, 2014 as amended. Commissioners Bufano, Fiteni, Hulse, and Wong abstained.

C. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW

1. SDP, Troup, 84 Old Driftway, Filling of land

Present was Dean Pushlar, Studer Design Associates, Inc., landscape architect.

Ms. Knapp referenced a Health Department memorandum dated September 8, 2014 from Jennifer M. Zbell to Bob Nerney and Daphne White.

Mr. Pushlar explained that the homeowner hired a contractor to do restoration work on the subject property after Hurricane Sandy had knocked down trees on the site. He noted that over 100 yards of fill were brought in (which is the maximum allowed without site development plan approval) and a small retaining wall was built, which subsequently failed during construction. He stated that a stop work order was issued once the matter was discovered by the Town and the applicant, who was out of Town when the work was being performed, is now before the Commission to rectify the matter.

Mr. Pushlar stated that the applicant has also engaged the services of engineer John McCoy as a consultant. Referencing a posted site plan and based on both GIS and a topographical survey, Mr. Pushlar noted that 500-600 yards of fill are estimated to have been brought onto the site, burying the aforementioned retaining wall in the process. He noted that the applicant is proposing to remove the bulk of that fill, along with rocks and debris, leaving probably less than 200 yards of fill on the site; and to create a proper retaining wall varying from 0-6 feet in height. He noted further that the existing slope, also based on GIS, is greater than the Town's maximum allowable grade of 2:1. He explained that the proposal is to bring the slope back to its pre-existing grade which, in an area on the lower half of the site, will likely exceed the allowable 2:1 maximum, but he emphasized that everything will be properly stabilized on the property.

Mr. Nerney confirmed that the property is very challenging, with a steep drop-off and previous slopes that exceeded 2:1. He explained that attempts to bring the entire property into a 2:1 grade conformance would result in more tree-cutting as well as additional land fill, exacerbating the current situation and jeopardizing an existing cesspool on the property. He felt that the proposed site plan modifications make sense as long as the property is properly stabilized and slopes are brought back to pre-existing condition in areas as indicated on the plans, noting that the natural topography/configuration of the property makes complete conformance particularly difficult.

It was confirmed that both the Health Department and Environmental staff reviewed the application and no issues were raised by either department.

Mr. Nerney noted that a draft resolution of approval was prepared by staff if the

P&Z Minutes – 09/08/14 – Page 4

Commission felt inclined to approve the application. At the Commission's request, Mr. Nerney distributed copies of the draft resolution, which was reviewed and amended by the Commission.

MOTION was made by Ms. Knapp, seconded by Ms. Bufano, and carried unanimously (7-0) to adopt as amended Resolution **#0914-3Z** for **Site Development Plan** at 84 Old Driftway, effective September 11, 2014.

WHEREAS, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has received an application for a Site Development Plan from Craig A. Studer, Licensed Landscape Architect, Studer Design Associates to allow importation of earth fill material, removal certain earth fill material and grading of property for purposes of the modifying yard area, property located at 84 Old Driftway Lane; located in a Residential "R-2A" Zoning District, Assessor's Map #115, Lot #6 and 2.155 acres; owned by Bradley D. & Cassandra L. Troup and shown on the plans entitled:

Existing Conditions Survey, Prepared for Bradley D. & Cassandra L. Troup, prepared by Michael J. Riordan, Land Surveyor, Riordan Land Surveying, dated March 22, 2008, last revised October 21, 2013, drawn at a scale of 1"=20', no sheet # noted.

Site Plan, Prepared for Bradley D. & Cassandra L. Troup, prepared by Dean P. Pushlar, Licensed Landscape Architect, Studer Design Associates, dated June 12, 2014, last revised August 25, 2014, drawn at scales of 1"=20' and 1"=10', sheet #LA-1.

Rear Yard Retaining Wall Plan & Details, Prepared for Bradley D. & Cassandra L. Troup, prepared by John F. McCoy VII, Licensed Professional Engineer, J.F.M. Engineering, Inc., dated April 7, 2014, last revised July 28, 2014, drawn at a scale of 1"=20', sheet #SE-1.

B100a Septic System Design & Details, Prepared for Bradley D. & Cassandra L. Troup, prepared by John F. McCoy VII, Licensed Professional Engineer, J.F.M. Engineering, Inc., dated July 28, 2014, drawn at a scale as noted, sheet #SE-2.

WHEREAS, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the Site Development Plan on July 28, 2014 and September 8, 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has determined that the application is in substantial compliance with the Wilton Zoning Regulations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission **APPROVES** the Site Development Plan effective September 11, 2014 and subject to the following conditions:

1. This Resolution does not replace requirements for the applicant to obtain any other permits or licenses required by law or regulation by the Town of Wilton, such as, but not

P&Z Minutes – 09/08/14 – Page 5

limited to: Zoning Permit, Sign Permit, Building Permit, Certificate of Zoning Compliance; or from the State of Connecticut or the Government of the United States. Obtaining such permits or licenses is the responsibility of the applicant.

2. In accordance with Section 8-3.(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes, all work or physical improvements required and/or authorized by the approved Site Plan shall be completed within five years of the effective date of this resolution. This five-year period shall expire on September 11, 2019.

GENERAL CONDITIONS:

3. There shall be no filling or earthmoving activities on the site on Sundays or holidays. All on-site work shall be limited between hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on allowed working days. Truck deliveries shall be limited to the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. on allowed working days.
4. Public roads shall be swept and kept clean of any earth material resulting from truck spillage or earth material tracked onto public roadways from the site.
5. An itemized bond estimate and bond submittal for sedimentation and erosion controls shall be provided prior to the issuance of a zoning permit. Said bond shall furnish to the Town with proper surety, in the form and amount satisfactory to the Commission's staff. The bond shall remain in place until such time that all site restoration work has been completed to the full satisfaction of the Town.
6. The soil stockpiles and slopes, in areas as represented on the plan, shall not exceed a slope of 2:1 or two feet horizontal to one foot vertical, as defined in Section 29-9.I.5. of the Zoning Regulations.

SUBMITTAL OF REVISED PLANS AND APPLICATION:

7. Two (2) completed revised sets, (collated and bound) shall be submitted to the Commission's office for endorsement as "Final Approved Plan" by the Town Planner. Said plans shall include all revisions noted above and shall bear an ORIGINAL signature, seal and license number of the professional responsible for preparing each plan or portion of it. Said plans shall include the following notes:
 - a. "According to Section 8-3.(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes, all work in connection with this Site Development Plan shall be completed within five years after the approval of the plan. Said five-year period shall expire on September 11, 2019."

- b. "For conditions of approval for Site Development Plan, see **Resolution #0914-3Z.**"

PRIOR TO A ZONING COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATE:

8. If requested by the Zoning Enforcement Officer, prior to the issuance of a zoning certificate of compliance, the applicant shall submit a letter, stamped and signed by a Connecticut licensed surveyor, verifying that the grades have been established per approved plans.

-END RESOLUTION -

Mr. Nabulsi was seated at approximately 7:55 P.M.

- 2. **SDP, Wilton Historical Society, 140-150 Danbury Road, Signage Plan**
and
- 3. **SDP, Wilton Historical Society, 224 Danbury Road, Signage Plan**
and
- 4. **SDP, Wilton Historical Society, 414 Olmstead Hill Road, Signage Plan**

Present were Bob Faesy, architect; and Pamela Hovland, graphic designer; on behalf of the Wilton Historical Society.

It was determined that the three applications would be heard/discussed concurrently.

Mr. Faesy briefly reviewed the nature of the applications for the three sites, noting that consistent and appropriate signage for the sites has been in the works for a number of years.

He distributed updated plans and photos to the Commission.

Ms. Hovland addressed concerns raised at the previous meeting. She stated that the overall size of the proposed sign at the Cannon Corners property (414 Olmstead Hill Road) has been reduced to 18 square feet, which is the as-of-right size permitted for the four tenants which are currently on the premises, although only two currently require a sign.

She explained further that due to the unique topographical conditions of the Cannon Corners site and the existing guard rail that currently blocks the view, the applicant is proposing to elevate the grade an additional 2 feet through landscaping strategies so that the sign can be made visible to passing cars. She referenced existing large slabs of stone which could be used or, alternatively, a traditional fieldstone retaining wall that could be constructed, to elevate the sign for proper visibility.

P&Z Minutes – 09/08/14 – Page 7

Mr. Nerney confirmed the legitimacy of the site problems, citing a sharp grade in addition to an existing guard rail, and noting that the applicant's proposed design would seem to address all such issues.

Addressing a question from Mr. Nabulsi, Mr. Faesy stated that the proposed plan is to essentially feather the signage base into the hillside, noting that large stone slabs are already on the site and the applicant would design an appropriate stone base for proper stabilization.

Ms. Hovland stated that the applicant has documented all the secondary signage on the sites via the previously distributed photo package.

Ms. White stated that the Commission needs a comprehensive list of all signage (existing and proposed) as well as associated square footage of each for purposes of memorializing what will be permitted on the sites.

Mr. Fiteni questioned the status of two existing signs at the Cannon Corners site, shown in a photograph on page 4 of the submitted photos ("We Repair Furniture" and "Consignments & Antiques"). Mr. Nerney confirmed that they will not be permissible.

Addressing a question about two oval signs ("Lantern House" and "State Farm Insurance") at Lambert Corners, Ms. Hovland explained that the subject application is just dealing with road signage. She stated that those other signs are not part of the current proposal since funding is not available to address such signage right now. She also confirmed that the new signs would go roughly into the same locations as currently.

A question arose as to why the recently submitted plans did not include associated signage square footage for the 224 Danbury Road site. Although Ms. Hovland explained that no additional changes were made to that site since the last meeting, Ms. White noted that the Commission still needs signage square footage details as part of the subject application.

Mr. Nerney explained that many of the existing signs on the properties are very small and are important to people when they turn into the site. He noted that in terms of public visibility, the road signs are the most important, although he acknowledged that the applicant should still document all signage on the sites to memorialize everything that is there currently. He suggested that staff draft between now and the next meeting a resolution that is very specific with respect to documenting all existing and proposed signage.

Addressing a question about lighting from Ms. Poundstone, Ms. Hovland felt that existing lighting should be fine since most of it is adjustable.

Ms. Hovland also clarified that although two banner options were discussed at the last meeting, the applicant has decided it prefers façade-mounted, rather than armature-mounted, banners. She was of the opinion that the façade-mounted version would have the added advantage of feeling like less signage.

Ms. White asked whether the silhouette detail at the top of the Cannon Corners sign, specified as 10.5” in height, was included in the 17.8 square-foot number indicated on the submitted plans. Ms. Hovland stated that it was not included. Mr. Faesy explained that the silhouette detailing is essentially equivalent to a logo for the Historical Society. Ms. White asked that the silhouette square footage be clearly noted on the plan.

Referencing the two sites that qualify for the Alternative Signage program (224 Danbury Road and 140-150 Danbury Road), Ms. White noted that the applicant needs to be very clear as to which signs will be part of the Alternative Signage plan. Mr. Nerney agreed, noting that the applicant will need to identify which signs will remain and note them clearly as being included as part of the Alternative Signage plan for the sites.

Mr. Nabulsi stated that, per zoning regulation requirements for the Alternative Signage program, the totality of the signage must be embraced/included as part of the application although he recognized the applicant’s belief that only the road signage is included. He also referenced the proposed Cannon Corners sign, noting that the additional square footage associated with the silhouette portion causes the sign to exceed total square footage allowed by zoning regulations for as-of-right signage. He expressed concern with setting an undesirable precedent going forward if the Commission allows that portion to be excluded from total square footage.

Ms. Hovland stated that she preferred not to include the silhouette portion in the calculation, especially given the fact that the sign will have to eventually accommodate four potential tenants, and she felt the additional space was a nice trade-off for the structural elements that were removed.

Mr. Shiue noted that if each of the four tenant’s signage space were reduced by about 2.5” in height, then the 10.5”- high silhouette portion of the sign would be compensated for and the sign would comply with zoning regulations. Ms. Hovland felt that the sign would no longer function with such a reduction in space. Mr. Hulse felt that there must be ways to make the sign work and still comply with zoning regulations.

Ms. White advised the applicant that square footage information is required for the individual tenant panels in addition to the total square footage number provided for the full signage area.

At approximately 8:31 P.M., the application was continued until September 22, 2014.

D. ACCEPTANCE OF NEW APPLICATIONS

E. PENDING APPLICATIONS

1. SP#392, Jackson, 111 Highfield Road, Accessory Dwelling Unit

The Board briefly reviewed Draft resolution #0914-8P.

MOTION was made by Ms. Knapp, seconded by Mr. Shiue, and carried (5-2-1) to adopt as drafted Resolution **#0914-8P** for **SP#392**, effective September 11, 2014. Commissioners Wong and Fiteni opposed, citing a prior Inland Wetlands approval of the barn for an as-of-right farming use only, as noted during the hearing. Mr. Nabulsi abstained.

WHEREAS, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has received a Special Permit **SP#392** application from Michael Smith of Michael Smith Architects for approval of the establishment of an 859 square-foot accessory dwelling unit, within part of an existing barn, property located at 111 Highfield Road; in a Residential “R-2A” District, Assessor’s Map #111, Lot #21, consisting of 3.698 acres, owned by Hillary and Benjamin Jackson and shown on the plans entitled:

Zoning Location Survey, Proposed- Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Douglas R. Faulds, surveyor, dated March 10, 2014, revised June 9, 2014, drawn at a scale of 1” = 30’-0”.

Barn/Pool House Plan- Overall Site View- Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Michael E. Smith, architect, dated May 30, 2014, drawn at a scale of 1” = 20’-0”.

Barn/Pool House Plan- Alternates Considered- Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Michael E. Smith, architect, dated May 30, 2014, drawn at a scale of 1” = 60’-0”.

Barn/Pool House Plan- Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Michael E. Smith, architect, dated May 30, 2014, drawn at a scale of 3/16” = 1’-0”.

Barn Existing Conditions - Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Michael E. Smith, architect, dated May 30, 2014, drawn at a scale of 3/16” = 1’-0”.

Barn/Pool Proposed Elevations- Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Michael E. Smith, architect, dated May 30, 2014, drawn at a scale of 3/16” = 1’-0”.

Proposed Septic System, Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by D. Palladino & Son Septic Co. Inc., Received July 3, 2014, drawn at a scale of 1” = 30’-0”.

WHEREAS, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has conducted a public hearing on September 8, 2014 to receive comment from the public and has fully considered all evidence submitted at said hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Inland Wetlands Commission has rendered a favorable report to the Planning and Zoning Commission and has given due consideration to the consensus of the Inland Wetlands Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has determined that the application is in substantial compliance with the Wilton Zoning Regulations;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission **APPROVES** Special Permit #392 to allow for the establishment an 859 square-foot accessory dwelling unit within part of an existing barn, for property located at 111 Highfield Road, effective September 11, 2014 subject to the following conditions:

1. This Resolution does not replace requirements for the applicant to obtain any other permits or licenses required by law or regulation by the Town of Wilton, such as, but not limited to: Zoning Permit, Sign Permit, Building Permit, Certificate of Zoning Compliance; or from the State of Connecticut or the Government of the United States. Obtaining such permits or licenses is the responsibility of the applicant.
2. In accordance with Section 8-3.(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes, all work or physical improvements required and/or authorized by the approved plan shall be completed within five years of the effective date of this resolution. This five-year period shall expire on September 11, 2019.
3. The applicant shall file a Land Record Information Form with the Town Clerk (form to be provided by the Planning and Zoning Department) prior to the issuance of a zoning permit.
4. Prior to issuance of a Zoning Permit, the applicant shall submit documentation of approval from the Wilton Health Department regarding the adequacy of the existing septic system to accommodate both the principal residence and the proposed accessory dwelling unit.
5. The square footage of the proposed accessory dwelling unit shall not exceed the architects floor plan delineating 859 square feet of living space, as shown in the plan entitled Barn/Pool House Plan- Prepared for Benjamin and Hillary Jackson, Prepared by Michael E. Smith, architect, dated May 30, 2014, drawn at a scale of 3/16" = 1'-0".
6. The owners of the property have submitted to the Planning and Zoning staff in the form of an affidavit that the owners are in residence in one of the dwelling units on the property. Certification of owner occupancy shall subsequently be made to the Planning and Zoning

Department on an annual basis.

Submittal of revised plans and application:

7. Two (2) completed revised sets, (collated and bound) shall be submitted to the Commission's office for endorsement as "Final Approved Plan" by the Town Planner. Said plans shall include all revisions noted above and shall bear an ORIGINAL signature, seal and license number of the professional responsible for preparing each plan or portion of it.

Said plans shall include the following notes:

- a. "Pursuant to Section 8-3.(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes, all work in connection with this Special Permit shall be completed within five years after the approval of the plan. Said five-year period shall expire on September 11, 2019."
- b. "For conditions of approval for Special Permit #392, see **Resolution #0914-8P**."

- END RESOLUTION -

F. COMMUNICATIONS

- 1. The Calitri Revocable Trust, 46 Danbury Road, Review of correspondence pertaining to the pre-existing nonconforming status of property, and determination with respect to proposed site modifications**

Present was John Burke, on behalf of the Calitri Revocable Trust.

Mr. Nerney briefly reviewed details of the matter, noting that Mr. Burke inherited the property from his mother. He explained that a DEEP requirement to replace underground oil tanks in the next few years is one of the factors prompting the owner to consider additional modifications to the site, including razing the smaller building in the rear, expanding the retail component of the convenience store into the repair bays that exist today, and expanding parking in the rear. He noted that all of the aforementioned site modifications would of course be subject to required land use approvals once final plans are prepared/engineered.

Mr. Nerney explained further that the property is a 0.6-acre parcel located in the DE-5 zone which currently requires a minimum of 5 acres, so the question is whether the property owner can consider modifications as heretofore noted on the basis that such changes do not constitute a change or expansion of the property's current use. In

connection with the applicant's proposed concept plan for the site, he stated that at the previous meeting the Commission had requested comments/thoughts from Town Counsel, which comments were received via email today. He noted Assistant Town Counsel Pat Sullivan's opinion that because the gas station use was approved/established via a granted variance many years ago, and it was a use that was not permitted at the time, it gives such use a stronger position today in terms of a permissible versus a legally nonconforming use.

Thus, on the basis of Attorney Sullivan's opinion, Mr. Nerney felt that there is some latitude as long as the applicant is not physically growing the building or changing to another non-permitted use. Regarding the proposed changes in the nature of the convenience store sales (e.g. beverages, sandwiches, etc.), he suggested that the Commission might want to discuss this aspect further, although he felt that the proposed changes are fairly typical for a gas station use in today's environment.

Mr. Nabulsi asked for confirmation that the applicant is just seeking some acknowledgement as to whether the Commission is able to see a potential path forward for the applicant to accomplish what it wishes to accomplish, with the understanding that a full application with all required documentation/site plans would still have to be submitted and go before the Commission before any formal approvals could be granted. Mr. Nerney confirmed that this is the extent of what the applicant is seeking from the Commission at this time.

Mr. Burke responded to questions from the Commission, noting that he plans to implement all site modifications, including roof replacement and required tanks replacement, in one phase in 2018, which coincidentally also corresponds with the expiration of his tenant's lease.

A question arose as to when a gas station ceases to be a gas station and what parameters would be necessary to analyze in order to make such a determination (e.g. gross gas station sales, relative percentage of gas station area/use, etc.). Mr. Nerney noted for the record that courts have recognized some "elasticity" in that regard, i.e. acknowledgement of certain components that do not automatically lead to an expansion or change of use classification.

Mr. Nabulsi referenced Attorney Sullivan's email of September 8, 2014. Per her counsel, he felt that if the applicant were to come forward at some time in the future with a plan that maintains a gas station use, then such a proposal should receive a relatively open reception from the Commission, and thus he felt that there does appear to be a path forward for the applicant. Alternatively, he noted that if the applicant's proposed business use were to appear to be more on the order of a 7-Eleven store, then the Commission would deal with that issue at that time.

G. REPORT FROM CHAIRMAN

1. Reports from Committee Chairmen

H. REPORT FROM PLANNER

I. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

J. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION was made by Ms. Poundstone, seconded by Ms. Knapp, and carried unanimously (8-0) to adjourn at approximately 8:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Russo
Recording Secretary