

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Meeting #1605
January 24, 2012**

*******Draft Document – Subject to Commission Review*******

The Meeting was called to order in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. at 7:00 P. M. by Chairman Ouellette.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:

A quorum was established as four Regular Members (Devaney, Gowdy, Ouellette, and Sullivan) were present. Regular Member Thurz and Alternate Member Zhigailo were absent. Chairman Ouellette congratulated Commissioner Sullivan on his appointment to a full/Regular Member of the Board. He noted all Regular Members would sit in, and vote, on all Items of Business this evening.

Also present was Town Planner Whitten.

GUESTS: Alan Baker, Board of Selectmen Liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission (arrived at 7:55 p.m.), and Dale Nelson, Selectmen.

LEGAL NOTICE: None

ADDED AGENDA ITEMS: None

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION: No one requested to speak.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES/January 10, 2012:

MOTION: To APPROVE the Minutes of Regular Meeting #1604 dated January 10, 2012 as written.

Gowdy moved/Devaney seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

PERFORMANCE BONDS – ACTIONS; PERMIT EXTENSIONS; ROAD ACCEPTANCE: Kings Court – Acceptance as Town Road:

MOTION: To RECOMMEND TO THE BOARD OF SELECTMEN to accept Kings Court as a Town Road based on Town Engineer Norton's memo dated December 21, 2011.

Devaney moved/Gowdy seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: BRD, LLC – Special Use Permit to allow a volume reduction center located at 297 North Road, owned by Kement Family Limited Partnership. [A-1.A-2 Zones; Map 117, Block 35, Lots 43B & 43C] (*Deadline to close hearing 2/14/2012*):

Chairman Ouellette read the Hearing description. Appearing to discuss this Application were Doug King, the Applicant, Mark Kement, the property owner, and Galen Semprebon, P. E. with Zuvic - Carr and Associates, Consulting Engineers.

Mr. Kement opened discussion by summarizing the concerns raised by the Commission at the last/previous Meeting. Those concerns include:

- **Access to the property:** They have agreed to reverse the proposed primary and secondary accesses to those preferred by the Commission. The primary access will be the existing construction yard entrance, while the secondary access will be the landfill entrance.
- **Plan revisions:** Plan revisions required based on Town Engineer Norton's recommendations have been made to the plans before the Commission this evening.
- **Traffic analysis:** Mr. Kement indicated Mr. Semprebon will present the traffic analysis.

Mr. Semprebon introduced himself, and gave his credentials. He is a professional engineer and senior project engineer with Zuvic – Carr of Rocky Hill, CT. Mr. Semprebon presented the following summary of his analysis:

- **Traffic analysis location:** intersection created at North Road at the location of the existing construction entrance. A private driveway (which will have no bearing on the proposed operation) creates the 4th component of this site intersection.
- **Site volumes:** Counts were taken at the peak AM hours and peak PM hours. Based on discussion with Mr. King it was determined that up to 60 trucks per day could utilize the site from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Mr. Semprebon suggested an even distribution of vehicles was assumed, based on that assumption it is anticipated that 6 trucks will enter and exit the facility during peak A.M. and peak P.M. hours.
- **Traffic distribution:** Based on discussion with Mr. King a distribution of 50% to the west and 50% to the east was used for the analysis.
- **Level of Service:** The left turn into the facility was taken into consideration for this analysis. Under existing conditions the Level of Service is A. It is anticipated that under the proposed operation the facility will continue to operate under a Level of Service A. It was noted there is a delay for vehicles exiting the site during the peak A.M. and P.M. hours due to existing traffic on North Road; that delay reduces the Level of Service to D during peak hours.
- **Sight lines:** To the west the sight line is over 1,000'; to the east the sight line is 550' to 600'. While the posted speed limit for North Road is 45 miles per hour both sight lines are adequate for a speed of 50 to 55 miles per hours. Mr.

Semprebon suggested the higher speed limit is actually more consistent with the actual conditions.

- **Accident history:** Based on a fax from the East Windsor Police Department there have been no significant accidents within 1000' of the site intersection in the past 3 – 5 year period.
- **Left Turn Treatment:** North Road is a State highway; the DOT has criteria which must be met by projects located on State roads. Based on the traffic volumes anticipated during the peak hours a left turn treatment should be considered for the proposed facility. Left turn treatments could include either a dedicated left turn lane, or a bypass lane. North Road is presently approximately 30' at the site location, and somewhat acts as a bypass area now.
- **Summary:** Under existing conditions a left turn into the site operates under a Level of Service A. There are enough breaks in the traffic on North Road to allow access to the site. The existing construction driveway is wide enough to handle trucks maneuvering into and out of the site currently. The addition of the proposed Volume Reduction Facility will have a negligible impact on the existing traffic operations. A left turn treatment should be investigated, with final consideration made by DOT with regard to its necessity.

Mr. King indicated they are operating now handling storm debris at 40 to 50 truck trips per day; he does not anticipate going over that number in the future but they are asking for a cushion in case there is another catastrophe.

Discussion followed on the following items:

- **Vehicles per day vs. vehicle trips per day:** Chairman Ouellette referenced Condition #19 of the proposed approval motion, noting there is a distinction between the number of truck trips and the number of trucks. He indicated a trip is considered a vehicle entering the site and then exiting the site. Mr. King reiterated they were operating at 40 to 50 trucks per day; they don't have a problem reducing their request to 50 trucks per day. Chairman Ouellette recalled that there are other operations going on at the facility currently; he suggested the numbers must reflect those trucks as well. Mr. King stated that Kement Construction is an on-going operation, and their numbers are in addition to the numbers for Kement Construction and have been accounted for. Mr. Semprebon clarified that his numbers took into consideration the number of trucks driving in and out of the site. He believed his count may be over-estimated because he is considering the 120 vehicle trips – 60 in and 60 out – as discussed with the Applicant.

Chairman Ouellette suggested he felt the number proposed in Condition #19 is low; he didn't believe it would serve the needs of the Applicant. He also referenced the last line of the traffic report, noting the language suggests that final determination should be made by DOT. Chairman Ouellette suggested that DOT has no jurisdiction on this Application, unless the Commission requests input from that agency. He suggested the report says it's a recommendation; is the

bypass lane needed or not? Mr. Semprebon suggested the determination isn't black or white as it would be if there were a capacity issue. It isn't a safety issue; traffic travels 1,000' down a straight roadway and there is a good sight line. It isn't a safety issue; it's really a convenience issue. Mr. Semprebon clarified that the DOT wording is "a left turn treatment should be considered." Chairman Ouellette indicated he just wanted people to understand the situation.

Commissioner Gowdy questioned if Chairman Ouellette thought further analysis was needed; should further study be done by DOT? Chairman Ouellette replied negatively, noting Mr. Semprebon has already studied it. With regard to a left turn treatment, there is "sliver widening" which is a bypass lane with just enough room to get by, and there is a full widening lane as was done with the road at the entrance to the Mansions. Mr. Kement suggested the bypass is really what exists there now; there is not an obstruction, everyone just passes by. Commissioner Gowdy questioned the width of the road? Mr. Semprebon suggested 30' currently. A bypass lane requires 20' from the center line, and maybe 14' on the other side, which is approximately 34'. At 30' feet the existing conditions are close to the width for a bypass lane now. Commissioner Gowdy clarified that they would only be widening the area 5'. Commissioner Devaney suggested it seems to be working well now.

Commissioner Gowdy questioned how the Applicant would widen North Road if the Commission required them to do so? Chairman Ouellette suggested if the Commission decides the road width is adequate as it is then case closed. If the Commission feels the road is not adequate there would be a condition added to the approval motion that North Road would be widened at the access drive and the Applicant would have to go to DOT to request to widen the road. If DOT says no the Applicant would have to return to this Commission to get that condition removed. Chairman Ouellette cited his concern is the last sentence of the traffic report. Mr. Semprebon suggested the criteria are there for a reason. Commissioner Sullivan indicated he has spent a fair amount of his life on the road; he questioned the effect of an additional 12 trucks on North Road? He felt for safety's sake the bypass lane should be considered. He felt the Applicant is probably a very safe operation but other people aren't as safe; they are doing everything but driving.

Town Planner Whitten questioned what was Chairman Ouellette's professional opinion? Chairman Ouellette suggested the bypass lane. Town Planner Whitten suggested that would be within the right-of-way? Chairman Ouellette noted there is a utility pole next to the road so you wouldn't want to make a full turn lane; he felt a left turn lane would be excessive. Mr. Kement felt this recommendation was overkill. He recalled that back in the day they have had truck after truck coming from that site and they had no problems.

Chairman Ouellette queried the Applicant if they preferred the Commission extend the Public Hearing to allow them to go back and do more analysis? Mr. King requested clarification that if they had one additional truck going in there it triggers the criteria? Mr. Semprebon suggested they are at the point of considering volume guidelines. Mr. King questioned if Chairman Ouellette would be more comfortable downgrading the number of trucks using the facility? Chairman Ouellette responded affirmatively, noting it's about the volume threshold. He reiterated he understood there is an existing operation at the facility already, and this proposal is in addition to that operation. Mr. King suggested they were presently at the busiest peak they will ever be; that number won't go up. Chairman Ouellette referenced proposed condition #19 again, noting the request is for 50 trips per day, which is approximately 30 vehicles for the entire operation. Mr. King suggested they could probably live with 45 trucks; that's the level at which they are operating now – 45 loads per day which is 90 trips - and they are functioning well. The amount of traffic will never be more than the amount on which this study is based; that is the maximum. Chairman Ouellette suggested this discussion would probably not be occurring if the operation was located on another road. *(See additional discussion below)*

- **Hours and days of operation:** Town Planner Whitten indicated the request is for 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday, which is comparable to other operations in town. Mr. King clarified they could be working on site handling the material after 5 o'clock. Town Planner Whitten clarified the tub grinder can't be operated after 5 o'clock. Mr. King questioned pushing the piles around? Town Planner Whitten suggested that gets into the existing operation which is grandfathered.

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for comments. No one requested to speak.

Additional discussion on:

- **Vehicles per day vs. vehicle trips per day:** Commissioner Gowdy noted the difference between the 45 trucks of the current operation and the requested 60 trucks is 15; if they are not having a problem with 45 why would 60 trigger a problem? Chairman Ouellette suggested he wasn't saying there is a problem, but the final sentence of the traffic report creates a grey area. If this were a totally new operation there would be no question in his mind. If you drive this road you kind of know there may be a vehicle turning, but how far do you take that? Commissioner Gowdy suggested he is as concerned with 45 trucks as he is with 60. Commissioner Devaney noted they have been operating at the 45 trucks for years and if you go to 60 there is more potential for accidents. She would rather stay with 45 trucks. Chairman Ouellette suggested if the applicant found the 45 trucks wasn't working they could come back and request a modification, but if we go to 60 trucks and there is a horrific accident..... Commissioner Gowdy reiterated he as concerned with 45 trucks as he is with 60 but nothing has happened in the past 45 to 60 years. Commissioner Sullivan suggested he is comfortable with 45 trucks and 90 trips, and is comfortable with 120 trips if there

is a bypass lane; he felt the Applicant should consider the bypass lane. Chairman Ouellette suggested the Applicant can work out the higher number with the State.

Mr. King indicated he would rather get the approval with 45 trucks; he felt the volume will only go down. He suggested they will not see this type of volume again in a long time, and when that does happen they can return for a modification. They are operating now at the highest level it probably has been. If they need to come back they will work that out with the State.

Chairman Ouellette suggested he is just trying to be reasonable but at the same time he is trying to be safe. He noted the Commission didn't have a recommendation from Town Engineer Norton regarding the bypass lane. He asked Town Planner Whitten if she had any comments or input regarding the current discussion? Town Planner Whitten indicated she would defer to Chairman Ouellette's comments/suggestions regarding the traffic study as he is a traffic engineer. Chairman Ouellette suggested if there is ever a need to update this traffic study there is a reference in the study to the 1985 Highway Capacity Manual. Town Planner Whitten noted she passes this area 4 to 6 times a day and she has never seen any problems at this location; she indicated she didn't feel this is going to be a big problem.

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for comments again; no one requested to speak.

MOTION: To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING on the Application of BRD, LLC for a Special Use Permit to allow a volume reduction center located at 297 North Road, owned by Kement Family Limited Partnership. [A-1.A-2 Zones; Map 117, Block 35, Lots 43B & 43C].

DISCUSSION: None.

Devanney moved/Gowdy seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

MOTION TO APPROVE the Application of BRD, LLC , and owner Kement Family Limited Partnership, requesting a Site Plan/Special Use Permit per Chapter 807 of the Zoning Regulations to allow a volume reduction facility for the processing, storage and retail of wood /brush products into mulch at 297 North Road, A-1 Zone (Map 117, Block 36, Lots 43B & 43C)

This approval is granted subject to conformance with the referenced plans (as may be modified by the Conditions) and the following conditions:

Referenced Plans:

-Conditions which must be met prior to signing of mylars:

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Meeting #1605 – January 24, 2012**

7

1. All final plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for preparation of the plans. (PE and LS)
2. The conditions of this approval shall be binding upon the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns. A copy of this approval motion shall be filed in the land records prior to the signing of the final plans.

Conditions which must be met prior to the issuance of any permits:

3. Two final full sets of mylars, with any required revisions incorporated on the sheets shall be submitted for signature of the Commission. One shall be filed on the Town Land Records, and one filed with the Planning and Zoning Department
4. Special Use Permit shall be filed on the land records in the Town Clerks Office.

Conditions which must be met prior to certificates of compliance:

5. All public health and safety components of the project must be satisfactorily completed prior to occupancy. In cases where all public health and safety components have been completed, the Zoning Officer may issue a Certificate of Zoning Compliance provided a suitable bond is retained for any remaining site work.
6. The Fire Marshall must review application and sign annual zoning permit application. Concerns such as height of wood chip piles, and adequate management of saw dust should be considered and addressed.
7. This application specifically allows the storage and processing of wood brush debris on the subject site. This includes wood mulch/chips, sawdust and other similar wood by-products.

General Conditions:

8. Conditions as set forth in Chapter 807 of the East Windsor Zoning Regulations shall be adhered to.
9. In accordance with Chapter 900.3.h of the Zoning Regulations, site plan approval shall become null and void in TWOYEARS from date of approval if the activities have not commenced and the site plan shall be considered disapproved, and Special Use Permit shall be voided, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
10. A Zoning Permit shall be obtained prior to the commencement of any site work.

11. A Zoning permit is required annually should the site be utilized, with documentation that the site and activities are in conformance with the original permit. Documentation shall be in the form of an “As Built” plan showing location of all stockpiles, impervious surfaces (inclusive of asphalt millings and gravel surfaces), and spot grades.
12. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the filed plans. Minor modifications to the approved plans that result in lesser impacts may be allowed subject to staff review and approval.
13. Any modifications to the proposed drainage or grading for the site plan is subject to the approval of the town engineer.
14. Additional erosion control measures are to be installed as directed by town staff if field conditions necessitate.
15. By acceptance of this approval and conditions, the applicant, owner and/or their successors and assigns acknowledge the right of Town Staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

Additional Conditions:

16. Hours of operation are 7:00 am – 5:00 pm Monday –Saturday. These hours will include utilization of on site equipment such as tub grinders, and truck traffic.
17. All wood chip stockpiles processed or otherwise, shall be located a minimum of 100 feet from any property line, unless otherwise approved by the Commission. This shall include the storage and use of all grinding machinery and loading activity. The maximum height of stockpiles shall be 15 feet.
18. Conditions as set forth in #16 and 17 above shall be shown on the plans. Final plans are to be approved by the Town Planner before signing or filing.
19. A bond shall be posted and maintained by the applicant to ensure compliance with all conditions of the approval, including, but not limited to, provisions for protecting the Town of East Windsor in the event a facility terminates operations with a large amount of material on the site. **Truck trips shall not exceed shall not exceed 90 per day, which is 45 loads.**
20. It is the applicant’s responsibility to pursue any required State permits, such as from CT DEEP for volume reduction facilities and CT DOT for change of use.

DISCUSSION: None.

Devanney moved/Gowdy seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

BUSINESS MEETING/(1) Preliminary Discussion on Multi-family Regulations with Atty. Dory Famiglietti:

Appearing to present this discussion were Attorney Dory Famiglietti, Gardner Chapman, and Jay Ussery, of J. R. Russo and Associates, LLC.

Attorney Famiglietti reported they are following up on the previous discussion regarding amending the regulations to allow apartments. She noted that in response to the Commission's request Mr. Ussery has prepared a map which would show the location of parcels which may have the potential for this type of development if the regulations were changed.

Mr. Ussery presented a copy of the Sewer Service Map, which shows the areas designated for sewer avoidance in grey, and the areas which are served by sewers presently, or could be sewerred at some time, in white. Mr. Ussery referenced East Windsor's Plan of Conservation and Development which differentiates between village district areas and areas designated as rural. He has reviewed parcels within the town based on the following criteria: 1) they must be located on a State highway, and 2) they must contain 25 acres or greater. Mr. Ussery indicated there are some parcels located within the grey areas which meet the 25 acre and State highway requirement but they are currently zoned industrial, i.e. the land to the rear of the W. B. Mason Company and the 26 acre parcel next to that on Route 140, as well as the 31 acre parcel on Bridge Street. Due to the industrial zoning designation those parcels would be eliminated. Mr. Ussery identified the following parcels as fitting the current criteria: Main Street, Broad Brook (current site of fire department carnival), parcel at intersection of Wells Road and Scantic Road, and three additional parcels on Phelps Road. Mr. Ussery suggested that if the requirement for being located on a State road were eliminated there may be other parcels which would have sufficient acreage to be considered. He clarified that the parcel on Scantic Road previously owned by Victory Outreach is presently zoned for multi-family development.

The Commission reiterated their preference that multi-family dwellings would NOT be included in the development mix for the Route 140 corridor. Discussion followed regarding regulation language, and developing specifics of criteria.

Attorney Famiglietti noted the proposed text amendment currently includes:

- Design requirements, including laundries in each unit, and individual entrances.
- Increased square footage for units
- Elimination of 3 bedroom units

- Defined percentage mix for 1 and 2 bedroom units

The Commission raised the following questions:

Chairman Ouellette

- **WPCA input** – he believes the sewer facility is operating at 40% capacity presently; is there reserve capacity for large residential projects? Discussion followed regarding current capacity vs. future availability.
- **Increase in unit square footage** – how does the percentage mix relate to the Mansions at Canyon Ridge? Attorney Famiglietti suggested the conceptual plan is based on the Mansions plan under which a 1 bedroom unit contains 740 square feet, while the 2 bedroom unit contains 1100 square feet.
- **Density bonus** – is the private garage the trend? Gardner Chapmen replied affirmatively, noting single women feel it's a security feature as they can drive their vehicles into the garage before exiting into the unit. He cited that at the Mansions 80% of the units have 2 car garages; all units have at least a one car garage. He noted that in the Vernon complex all the garages are heated.
- **What's the rationale for leaving some areas pasture?** Mr. Ussery noted there are wetlands located throughout the pastures, which raises environmental concerns. They could also achieve the number of units they wanted without encroaching on wetlands. Mr. Ussery also noted there are 15 acres of Conservation land on Tromley Road, as well as the Flaherty Field Trial area, and another area of Conservation Easement created by Southern Auto Auction; continuation of the pasture land on Phelps Road would give a nice corridor of contiguous Conservation land. They have had discussions with parties for keeping the cows within the pastures on Phelps Road so it would be continuing the rural look that everyone is used to seeing.
- **Building set-back at the Mansions vs. set-back on Route 5:** Mr. Ussery suggested the first buildings at the Mansions at Canyon Ridge are about 150' back, which is about what they are proposing for Phelps Road. They would keep the first units on Route 5 a little further back.
- **What consideration has been contemplated regarding the anticipated opposition from neighbors?** Mr. Ussery indicated they were cognizant of potential opposition. The proposal for the Conservation area, which would be kept in its natural state, was one consideration. Development is anticipated to start approximately 500' up the road from the hollow. They would also provide vegetative screening for the housing area previously associated with the army base.

Commissioner Gowdy:

- **Why not develop condos:** Attorney Famiglietti suggested taxes are higher on condominiums for the developer, and financing is more difficult to achieve presently. Mr. Gardner also suggested management/development of condominiums is a whole different business. Attorney Famiglietti suggested these conceptual apartments would look like condominiums rather than apartments.

- **How do you plan to sell the concept of apartments?** Attorney Famiglietti indicated this will be a similar product to the Mansions at Canyon Ridge, which has experienced zero police calls, zero kids in the present school year, and the complex is a huge tax generator – a figure which will only get higher as the complex is occupied.

Commissioner Sullivan:

- **Tax allocation** – would the developer propose that a portion of the tax revenue be allocated to the Open Space Fund? Attorney Famiglietti suggested she didn't feel an applicant could dictate how the Town uses its taxes; Town Planner Whitten felt that suggestion was NOT statutorily possible.
- **Number of apartments vs. single family homes** – Commissioner Sullivan thought he saw a figure of 55% in a recent CREC document. Chairman Ouellette questioned if active adult dwellings, like Newberry Village, would be included as single family dwellings? Mr. Ussery clarified Newberry Village would be considered a condominium. Town Planner Whitten felt then those units would be counted as multi-family dwellings.

General discussion continued for a short time. Attorney Famiglietti thanked the Commission for their input and consideration of the discussion.

MOTION: To TAKE A TEN MINUTE BREAK.

Gowdy moved/Devaney seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

The Commission RECESSED at 8:50 p.m. and RECONVENED at 9:00 p.m.

BUSINESS MEETING/(2) Route 140 – Discussion on Design Guidelines and Draft Regulations:

Town Planner Whitten referenced a map contained within the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) entitled "Proposed East Windsor Business Corridor Zoning" which identified various business districts. The proposed boundaries for the Route 140 Business Corridor as considered during previous discussions are presently shown as a dotted red line, while the POCD map extends the Route 140 Business Corridor approximately 1500' further to the east. Town Planner Whitten is looking for a consensus from the Commission as confirmation of the identified (red dotted line) boundaries, or should it be expanded to include the additional 1500'? The consensus of the Commission was to include the boundaries so they match the POCD with regard to the eastern boundary.

Discussion followed regarding the southern boundary and the effect of rezoning on current property owners as some large parcels will then contain multiple zones.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Meeting #1605 – January 24, 2012**

12

It was agreed that the boundaries of the Route 140 area as presently shown on the “Residential Growth Guide Map” contained within the POCD should be changed to match/conform to boundary revisions made to the “Proposed East Windsor Business Corridor Zoning Map”.

BUSINESS MEETING/(3) Discussion on Plan of Conservation and Development:

The Commission reviewed the proposed amendments to the POCD and made minor language changes. Subsequent discussion involved the statutory timeframe for referral to CRCOG (Capital Region Council of Governments) in relation to timing for local public hearings. It is anticipated that the Public Hearing can be scheduled for April 10, 2012.

MOTION: To RECOMMEND the referral of the proposed changes to the Plan of Conservation and Development to the Board of Selectmen and subsequently to CRCOG (the Capital Region Council of Governments).

DISCUSSION: None.

Devanney moved/Gowdy seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

BUSINESS MEETING/(4) Review of Bylaws: Tabled.

BUSINESS MEETING/(5) Election of Officers: Tabled.

BUSINESS MEETING/(6) Correspondence:

- CFPZA annual conference 3/15/2012
- EWEDC Meet and Greet 1/26/2012

BUSINESS MEETING/(7) Staff Reports:

No additional comments other than previous discussions.

SIGNING OF MYLARS/PLANS, MOTIONS:

- 50 Newberry Road – Mylars

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN this Meeting at 10:15 p.m.

Gowdy moved/Sullivan seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted, _____
Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, E. Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission (4770)