

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



TOWN HALL ANNEX  
238 Danbury Road  
Wilton, Connecticut 06897

**DRAFT**  
**WILTON PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES**  
**JUNE 28, 2010 REGULAR MEETING**

**PRESENT:** Chairwoman Sally Poundstone, Secretary Doug Bayer, Commissioners Alice Ayers, Marilyn Gould, Bas Nabulsi, Eric Osterberg, and Michael Rudolph

**ABSENT:** Commissioners Pratt and Wilton (notified intended absences)

**ALSO**

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

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- 1. SP#332A, Polito, 490 Danbury Road, To allow professional offices for non-resident occupants and residential apartments**

Ms. Poundstone called the Public Hearing to order at 7:15 P.M., seated members Ayers, Bayer, Gould, Nabulsi, Osterberg, Poundstone, and Rudolph, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest. She noted that the hearing had been continued from a previous date.

Present were Clarissa Cannavino, attorney; and Dominick Polito, applicant.

Ms. Cannavino distributed a letter dated June 28, 2010 from Clarissa Cannavino to Planning and Zoning Commission. She reviewed a modified site plan, noting that 10 parking spaces previously located in front were relocated to the lower driveway area, and four parallel spaces along the existing wall near Route 7 were pulled in closer to the row of existing white pines uphill from the existing wall to improve screening.

Regarding the question of occupancy of building #1, Ms. Cannavino referred to two letters from Carol McMorris of the Higgins Group indicating that the property was listed for rent beginning May 1, 2007 and was leased from July, 2007 until March, 2008. She

stated that the property is now being rented on a month-to-month basis. Mr. Polito noted that half of the downstairs area is occupied and he stated that there is only one kitchen area, per zoning regulations.

Ms. Cannavino noted for the record that the porch repair work was permitted due to its pre-existing nature, not as a result of any relief granted by the Commission. She also explained that the historical/architecturally significant zoning regulations allow for setback relief for an accessory apartment.

Mr. Nabulsi raised the question of driveway grade. Ms. Cannavino explained that the grade would be greater than the maximum 10% permitted by regulation (Section 29-8.B.8.c). However, she explained that she had met with P&Z staff and it was their opinion that the purpose of the aforementioned regulation was to assure adequate emergency access, which staff felt would not be compromised on the subject site, and it was also noted that the regulation specifically referenced new driveways (which also did not apply for the subject site).

Mr. Nerney felt that the intent of the regulation is to assure emergency vehicle access to the front door of the building in the quickest fashion possible, and he noted that the excessively graded area is located behind the building. He felt that the applicant's revised parking/driveway plan represented an aesthetically better and safer design overall.

Ms. Gould noted that the subject driveway configuration is analogous to many private homes in Wilton where garages are located in the back of properties off of fairly steeply graded driveways. She suggested that any approval could be contingent upon receiving confirmation from Town emergency personnel that the driveway grade would not represent an obstacle/risk for emergency vehicle access.

Ms. Cannavino noted that the applicant is willing to implement either parking/driveway plan.

Mr. Nabulsi expressed concern that a driveway approval for the subject application might have implications for other similar applications coming before the Commission in the future. He did not feel that comparisons to private home driveways in Town had any relevance to the subject application.

Ms. Throckmorton briefly reviewed landscaping and lighting modifications on the site, noting that the revised plan lessens the commercial feel of the property, which she felt was more pronounced in the previously submitted plan. She noted that there would be one street sign and one wall sign on the parcel.

Ms. Ayers noted that zoning regulations permit apartments in a principal structure on a site, but she asked the applicant to cite the section(s) in the regulations that permit

apartments in two separate buildings on a site. Mr. Bayer noted further that just because a structure is pre-existing and nonconforming does not mean its use cannot be regulated.

Ms. Cannavino requested that the application be continued until July 12, 2010 so that the applicant could research this issue in more detail and provide a response to the Commission at its next meeting. She stated that the applicant would grant an extension of the time to close the public hearing until July 12, 2010.

Regarding the aforementioned issue, Mr. Nerney referred for the record to Section 29-5.C.6.d of zoning regulations, noting in particular the use of the word “principal”, as follows: “In conjunction with uses eligible for professional offices, residence apartments may be permitted within the principal building subject to the requirements of Section 29-5.C.5.c.(3).”

Ms. Poundstone 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 7:43 P.M. the Public Hearing was continued until July 12, 2010.

**2. SP#258D, Wilton Retirement Housing, 435 Danbury Road, 16 additional congregate housing units**

Ms. Poundstone called the Public Hearing to order at 7:43 P.M., seated members Ayers, Bayer, Gould, Nabulsi, Osterberg, Poundstone, and Rudolph, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest. She noted that the hearing was continued from a previous date. Mr. Bayer referred for the record to a 10-page response letter dated June 24, 2010 from J. Casey Healy to Planning and Zoning Commission; and a faxed letter dated June 28, 2010 from Ronald Hitter (Wilton Volunteer Ambulance Corps) to Robert Nerney.

Mr. Bayer recused himself from the hearing and left the meeting room.

Present were Clarissa Cannavino, attorney; Eric Rains, landscape architect; and Larry Apple, principal.

Ms. Cannavino submitted a photometrics lighting plan; Wilton Retirement Housing Parking Calculations dated June 25, 2010; First, Second and Third Half-Story Floor Plans of the entire improved facility; and a Luminaire Schedule and Statistics for the proposed addition. She reviewed in detail all responses to the Planning and Zoning Staff Report dated June 24, 2010.

In response to comment #3 of the Staff Report, Ms. Cannavino submitted an email confirmation from Aquarion Water Company attesting to the availability and adequacy of public water for the facility as proposed. She also reviewed circulation plans for the site, referencing an added sidewalk per staff request.

Ms. Cannavino explained that the architectural setbacks of two sides of the proposed attic/third floor were adjusted to equal one-fourth the parallel dimension of the story below, in compliance with Section 29-4.C.2.9 of the regulations.

Mr. Rains reviewed circulation on the site in greater detail. In response to additional concerns raised by Commissioners regarding pedestrian safety, modifications were proposed by the Commission and staff to extend a portion of the southern sidewalk and to relocate five parking spaces to minimize potential pedestrian/vehicle traffic interaction.

Commissioners Gould and Ayers questioned the purpose and size of the two apartments proposed for the half-story level above the second floor, in particular questioning whether the applicant was considering an eventual conversion of each of the proposed units into two separate units. Mr. Apple noted that the apartments are well below the maximum size criteria established by regulation. He explained further that these larger apartments were designed to be flexible, noting that sometimes there is a need to accommodate a married couple or two sisters or friends within one unit.

Ms. Ayers asked whether the site would be over its maximum number of units if the two large units were divided into two separate apartments each. Mr. Apple did not believe they would be over. Ms. Gould stated that the Commission should count up all the units to be certain.

The question of density was raised. The applicant indicated that the facility would be in compliance with the average size of units permitted as well as the average number of bedrooms per unit permitted.

Ms. Gould asked whether parking located within 10 feet of the property lines is permissible. Mr. Apple stated that the parking in question has been there since 1986. Ms. Cannavino noted that all parking is either conforming or pre-existing. Mr. Nerney also noted that there are zoning provisions for shared parking in connected lots.

Mr. Rains presented elevations of all existing and proposed buildings. He stated that the height of the new addition would be the same as the most recent addition known as The Residences, although he noted that the proposed addition will actually sit about 2 feet lower than The Residences, taking into account ground elevations.

In response to questions from Ms. Gould regarding the possibility of lowering the roof line on the proposed addition, Mr. Apple stated that the roof elevation would not appear

much lower even if the half story were removed due to installation of mechanical equipment on the roof. He explained further that an elevator is proposed for the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor/attic space, providing easier access to storage as compared with the existing building, and he noted that the Ambulance Corps felt that the elevator would be an important addition to the space. Ms. Cannavino also noted that if the two third floor apartments were removed, there would be one less affordable housing unit on the site.

Referencing the submitted parking calculations for The Greens and Wilton Meadows, Ms. Cannavino stated that both facilities comply with required parking regulations. In response to a question raised at the last hearing, she stated that The Residences facility is located approximately 51 feet from the property line and the new addition, as proposed, would be located approximately 51.5 feet from the property line. Referencing the aforementioned letter from the Wilton Volunteer Ambulance Corps (WVAC), she indicated that the applicant would comply with the Corps' request for an 81-inch elevator depth to accommodate WVAC stretchers.

Ms. Poundstone asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak for or against the application.

Sylvia Littleton, Cherry Lane, expressed her gratitude to Mr. Apple and The Greens. She explained that she has had four relatives who have lived at The Greens over the past 12 years and she felt that the accommodations and services are spectacular.

There being no further comments from the Commission or the public, at approximately 8:35 P.M. the Public Hearing was continued until July 12, 2010.

**3. SP#223E, Zackiewicz, 39 Danbury Road (Unit #11), Operation of package store**

Ms. Poundstone called the Public Hearing to order at approximately 8:35 P.M., seated members Ayers, Bayer, Gould, Nabulsi, Osterberg, Poundstone, and Rudolph, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest. She noted that the hearing was continued from a previous date.

Present was Clarissa Cannavino, attorney for the applicant.

Ms. Cannavino submitted a 2-page response letter dated June 28, 2010 from Clarissa H. Cannavino to Planning and Zoning Commission, with an attachment from Tighe & Bond dated June 20, 2006 and a Google Map of the vicinity.

Ms. Cannavino reviewed submitted responses. Referencing the applicant's request for a waiver of an additional 8 parking spaces (bringing the total parking waiver for the site to

12), she explained that an error was inadvertently made at the time of the Moore Rehabilitation Center application several years ago when the applicant listed tenants' square footage erroneously. As a result, a waiver of 11 spaces should have been requested at that time as opposed to the 4 which were requested. The additional parking space was lost when the site was repaved and a non-conforming handicapped space was made conforming.

Mr. Nabulsi expressed concern that Tighe & Bond was not asked to provide a current opinion as to whether the site, as modified by the proposed package store tenant, could support the full parking waiver request.

Ms. Cannavino noted that the proposed package store (a retail use) would be replacing a previous retail use (a hardware store). She also explained that the package store is principally a late afternoon to evening and weekend use, which is countercyclical to the other uses located on the site.

Mr. Bayer felt that parking on the site is difficult, expressing concern that most of the site's parking is located behind the building. Ms. Cannavino stated that there is adequate parking on the site that is not being utilized.

Ms. Gould stated that there was always sufficient parking on the site when the subject premises was a hardware store and given the different peak hours of operation for the proposed package store as compared with the other tenants on the site, parking should be sufficient as proposed.

Mr. Nabulsi stated that the requested waiver is substantial, noting that he felt uncomfortable granting such a waiver based on a report that was prepared in 2006 before the existing Moore Rehabilitation Center moved to the site.

Ms. Cannavino stated that traffic studies are expensive, noting that the applicant chose not to request another study since the use was remaining as retail, in addition to the fact that peak usage hours for the package store, as compared to the previous hardware store use, would have a favorable impact on parking availability for the site.

Ms. Poundstone asked if anyone wished to speak for or against the application.

There being no further comments from the Commission or the public, at 8:49 P.M. the Public Hearing was closed.

**4. SP#45P, The Lake Club, Inc., 175 and 195 Thayer Pond Road, Add lighting to tennis courts 7 & 8**

Ms. Poundstone called the Public Hearing to order at 8:49 P.M., seated members Ayers, Bayer, Gould, Nabulsi, Osterberg, Poundstone, and Rudolph, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest. Mr. Bayer read the legal notice dated June 15, 2010. He referred for the record to a 3-page Planning and Zoning Staff Report dated June 23, 2010; a letter dated June 22, 2010 from Albert and Pamela Miller to Planning and Zoning Commission; and a letter dated June 21, 2010 from Ray and Leena Wangneo to Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission.

Present was Richard Erario, Lake Club member, representing the applicant.

Mr. Erario referred to a posted site plan, noting the elevation differences between courts 4/5/6 and courts 7/8, which he noted are lower and are the subject of this application. He also noted that a retaining wall surrounds the northern and western perimeters of courts 7 and 8.

Mr. Erario submitted a lighting study into the record. He noted that the applicant's engineer redesigned the configuration of the proposed lighting for courts 7 and 8 to provide an average illumination of approximately 100 foot candles.

Mr. Nerney explained that zoning regulations restrict illumination levels at property lines but do not actually regulate illumination within a site. He stated that the submitted Lumen Study indicates 0-1 foot candle averages at a distance of approximately 55-65 feet from the perimeter of the courts, but he noted that these numbers do not take into consideration the impacts of retaining walls or elevation levels.

In response to a question from Ms. Poundstone regarding potential impacts of the application on other aspects of the Club, Mr. Erario stated that there would not be any impact on membership levels, which are at maximum capacity at present. He noted that league play has often been canceled/rescheduled due to lighting insufficiencies and, as a result of the proposed lighting, there would now be tennis play later into the evenings.

Ms. Gould requested that the applicant submit a map showing the topography of the site, and locations of neighbors' houses that are immediately adjacent to the club, with distances from the courts to the respective houses noted. She expressed particular concern for the residence located on the northern boundary of the site. She also questioned whether use of the lighting could be limited based upon the amount of tree foliage present during different times of the year.

Mr. Erario noted that submitted lighting information did not take into account lighting deflectors, which would significantly reduce the illumination levels shown, and he

indicated that the applicant would be willing to provide additional screening if necessary.

In response to questions from Mr. Rudolph, Mr. Erario explained that only courts 2 and 3 presently have provisions for night-time play out of a total of 12 existing courts. He confirmed that courts 7 and 8, which are the subject of the application, are the farthest away from nearby residences and are the lowest in elevation and therefore the most protected from view. Mr. Rudolph asked that the applicant submit a map indicating the other two lit courts and the respective distances from those courts to surrounding homes in the area.

In response to additional questions from the Commission regarding hours/days of play, Mr. Erario stated that league play occurs four times per week. He noted that games generally finish between 9:00 – 9:45 P.M., although he noted that lights are required to be turned off by 10 P.M. anyway. He stated that the majority of players are club members.

Mr. Osterberg noted that the club's paddle court lighting seems to have worked well and he asked the applicant to compare that lighting to the lighting proposed for the tennis courts. Mr. Erario stated that the proposed tennis court lighting represents the next generation of lighting technology, noting that it is a direct, concentrated beam with very little spill-over, although he acknowledged that the tennis court light poles would be taller.

Mr. Nerney noted that although the paddle court light poles are shorter as compared to the tennis court poles, it appeared to him that the elevations of the paddle courts are higher. He asked what the exact differences in elevation are. Mr. Erario stated that he did not have that information but would provide it to the Commission.

Ms. Poundstone asked if anyone wished to speak for or against the application.

Bill Mahoney, 45 Woods End Drive, stated that he lives on the lake directly across and to the east of where the proposed lighting will be, and he indicated that he was also representing the interests of two other neighbors in the area. He expressed concern with the brightness of the current lighting and he felt that the proposed 27-foot lighting towers would be very visible, particularly in the fall and winter months. He stated that the quality of life in the area has been depressed due to the noise generated by the club, particularly in connection with frequent parties and loud blasting music at the club. He noted that it has been an ever worsening situation for the surrounding neighborhood as the club has gradually expanded its membership over the years and improved/modified the site (e.g. club house, extra courts, lighting, etc.).

Albert Miller, 196 Thayer Pond Road, stated that the current lighting is too bright during the winter months and gives an industrial feel to the surrounding area. He expressed concern with the overall effect on the neighborhood of the ongoing incremental upgrades



to the site. He asked that the Commission continue its good efforts in scrutinizing the subject application.

Mr. Erario distributed lighting cut sheets to the Commission, noting that there would be very little light leakage upward.

Mr. Rudolph asked that the applicant prepare the same sketch as previously requested but without the topographical lines.

Ms. White referred to the submitted “Light Control Shields” sheet and asked if the applicant would be willing to utilize such shields to better control light spillage. Mr. Erario stated that the applicant would be agreeable to the suggestion.

Mr. Osterberg requested that staff research the data previously provided by the applicant to the Commission in connection with the paddle tennis court lighting for comparison purposes.

Mr. Bayer stated that he would like to understand the cumulative effect of all lighting on the site if the subject application were to be approved (e.g. all illuminated tennis courts and paddle courts, pool lighting, etc.). He felt it would be difficult to properly evaluate the subject application without understanding the overall lighting impacts on the site, particularly in the later fall months when the foliage comes down.

Mr. Erario noted for the record that tennis courts are disassembled in October, generally around the third week of the month, and lights are turned off, at which time there is no more tennis play.

Mr. Bayer asked that the applicant provide a lumen study indicating the cumulative effects of lighting from tennis courts 2 and 3, the proposed lighting on courts 7 and 8, as well as the swimming pool lighting.

There being no further comments from the Commission or the public, at 9:30 P.M. the Public Hearing was continued until July 12, 2010.

## **REGULAR MEETING**

- A.** Ms. Poundstone called the Regular Meeting to order at 9:30 P.M., seated members Ayers, Bayer, Gould, Nabulsi, Osterberg, Poundstone, and Rudolph, and referred to Connecticut General Statutes Section 8-11, Conflict of Interest.

**B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**1. June 14, 2010 – Regular Meeting**

MOTION was made by Ms. Ayers, seconded by Ms. Gould, and carried (7-0) to approve the minutes of June 14, 2010 as drafted.

**C. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW**

**D. ACCEPTANCE OF NEW APPLICATIONS**

**1. SP#324A, Wilton Commons, 21 Station Road, Modifications to previously approved plans for senior housing**

MOTION was made by Ms. Poundstone, seconded by Ms. Ayers, and carried unanimously (7-0) to accept the application and set a public hearing date for July 12, 2010.

**2. SP#190I, Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, 10 Westport Road, To allow for the construction of 197 surface parking spaces**

MOTION was made by Ms. Poundstone, seconded by Ms. Ayers, and carried unanimously (7-0) to accept the application and set a public hearing date for July 26, 2010.

**E. PENDING APPLICATIONS**

**1. SP#350, Wilton Wine Search, 28 Center Street, Operation of Package Store**

The Commission briefly reviewed draft Resolution #0610-10P.

MOTION was made by Ms. Gould, seconded by Ms. Ayers, and carried (6-0-1) to adopt as drafted Resolution #0610-10P for SP#350, effective July 1, 2010. Mr. Nabulsi abstained.

**WHEREAS**, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has received a Special Permit application **SP#350** from Enver Selmani d/b/a Wilton Wine Search for approval to allow the establishment of a 1,238 square foot retail package store, for property located at 28 Center Street; in the Wilton Center “WC” District, Assessors Map#73, Lot#13, consisting of 1.16 acres owned by Old Post Office Square, LLC and shown on the plans entitled:

**P&Z Minutes – 06/28/10 – Page 11**

Map of Property- Prepared for Old Post Office Square, LLC, Prepared by Roland H. Gardner, Jr., surveyor, dated September 8, 2006, scale 1"=20', no sheet #.

Easement Survey- Prepared for Old Post Office Square, LLC, Prepared by Roland H. Gardner, Jr., surveyor, dated June 2, 2009, scale 1"=20', no sheet #.

Overall Site Plan- Prepared for 12 Center Street, Prepared by Melanie R. Voelker, landscape architect, dated January 6, 2009, last revised May 7, 2009, scale 1/16"=1'-0", no sheet #.

Liquor Store Layout- Prepared for Wilton Wine Search & Liquors, Prepared by Arch-Design Services, architects, dated April 4, 2010, scale 1/4"=1'-0", sheet #A-101.

**WHEREAS**, the Wilton Planning and Zoning Commission has conducted a public hearing on May 24, 2010 to receive comment from the public and has fully considered all evidence submitted at said hearing; 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 #350 to allow the establishment of a 1,238 square foot retail package store, effective July 1, 2010 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 Site Plan shall be completed within five years of the effective date of this resolution. This five-year period shall expire on June 17, 2015.
3. The approval for this special permit shall be filed with the Town Clerk's office using the Land Record Information Form prior to receiving a zoning permit.
4. No shopping carts shall be allowed on the premises.
5. The applicant shall ensure that all hand held shopping baskets are collected and stored inside the retail package store.
6. No additional dumpsters shall be allowed on the premises without the approval of either the

Planning and Zoning Commission or the Commission's staff.

7. No parking of delivery vehicles shall be allowed in the parking spaces fronting on Old Ridgefield Road.
8. Deliveries shall be limited between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 11:00 a.m. during allowable days of operation.
9. The existing lighting and building façade shall not be modified unless otherwise authorized by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
10. All signage shall be maintained in strict accordance with zoning regulations and prior to installation, signage shall be subject to review by the Planning and Zoning staff and to the issuance of a sign permit from the Zoning Enforcement Officer.
11. The hours of operation shall be conducted in accordance with the Connecticut General Statutes and all applicable ordinances of the Town of Wilton, specifically between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. In instances where any conflict may exist; the more restrictive provision shall apply.
12. The installation of rooftop mechanical equipment shall be prohibited unless otherwise authorized by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
13. There shall be no outdoor storage of any products, including the storage of recyclable containers. Any indoor storage of recyclable containers shall be conducted in accordance with all applicable State and local health code requirements.

**Submittal of revised plans and application:**

14. Three (3) 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 July 1, 2015."

b. "For conditions of approval for Special Permit #350, see **Resolution #0610-10P.**"

2. **SP#332A, Polito, 490 Danbury Road, To allow professional offices for non-resident occupants and residential apartments**

Tabled.

3. **SP#258D, Wilton Retirement Housing, 435 Danbury Road, 16 additional congregate housing units**

Tabled.

4. **SP#223E, Zackiewicz, 39 Danbury Road (Unit #11), Operation of package store**

Tabled.

5. **SP#45P, The Lake Club, Inc., 175 and 195 Thayer Pond Road, Add lighting to tennis courts 7 & 8**

Tabled.

#### **F. COMMUNICATIONS**

1. **AvalonBay Communities, Inc./Avalon Springs II, 116 Danbury Road, Proposed use of letter of credit from Bank of America**

Mr. Nerney indicated that the matter had been resolved and therefore further discussion was tabled.

#### **G. REPORT FROM CHAIRMAN**

1. **Reports from Committee Chairmen**

Mr. Rudolph briefly reviewed recent Regulations Committee activities. He noted that a draft of temporary commercial sign modifications has been completed and general agreement on modifications for not-for-profit signs has been reached, although the Committee was unable to agree this evening on the permitted size of such signage. It was the general consensus of the Commission to discuss this matter as a group on July 26, 2010.

**H. REPORT FROM PLANNER**

**I. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

- 1. SP#351, Kim & Song Properties, LLC and Song Wilton Properties, LLC, 151 Old Ridgefield Road, Take-out restaurant [P.H. July 12, 2010]**
- 2. REG#10322, O'Brien Design, 118 Old Ridgefield Road, Amendment to Zoning Regulations Section 29-6.B.3.i to allow more residential units in GB zoning district within 1000 feet from a train station [P.H. July 12, 2010]**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION was made by Ms. Gould, seconded by Ms. Ayers, and carried unanimously (7-0) to adjourn at 9:43 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorraine Russo  
Recording Secretary