

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING  
March 6, 2007**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing and meeting on Tuesday, March 6, 2007 at 7:00 p.m. in the Wethersfield Police Department Meeting Room, 250 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut

**CALL TO ORDER**

In the absence of Chairman Hammer, Vice Chair Margaret Wagner called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

**ROLL CALL & SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

Clerk Knecht called roll as follows:

Member Name	Present	Absent	Excused
Joseph Hammer, Chairman			X
Philip Knecht, Clerk	X		
Richard Roberts	X		
Thomas Harley	X		
Robert Jurasin	X		
Earle Munroe			X
Dorcas McHugh	X		
Margaret Wagner, Vice Chair	X		
Frederick Petrelli	X		
James Hughes			X
Anthony Homicki	X		
George Oickle	X		

Also present:

- Peter Gillespie, Director of Planning and Economic Development
- Denise Bradley, Assistant Planner

Vice Chair Wagner stated that there were 2 full members not in attendance at the time of roll call. She requested the services of alternate members Mr. George Oickle and Mr. Anthony Homicki to serve as full members.

Vice Chair Wagner requested that Item **4.1 C.G.S. § 8-24 REFERRAL** - Review of the five-year Capitol Improvement Program be moved up on the agenda.

Commissioner Anthony Homicki made a motion to move Item **4.1 C.G.S. § 8-24 REFERRAL** - Review of the five-year Capitol Improvement Program on the agenda.

Commissioner Dorcas McHugh seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Wagner stated that she would be excused from approving this referral since she is on the Capitol Improvement Commission and has already approved.

A presentation of the Capitol Improvement program was presented by Less Cole, Chairman of the Capitol Improvement Advisory Committee and Tony Martino, Analyst.

Mr. Cole stated that his part of the committee takes care of the petty cash part of the Capitol budget. Mr. Cole referred to a letter dated February 22, 2007 from the Town Manager to The Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Cole stated that people of the town come to them and ask for certain monies for budgets of things that they would like to do. The committee takes a look at the monies and tries to prioritize them. Mr. Cole stated that they prioritize three ways; safety issues, mandated issues or can it somehow leverage money for other things. Initial request from variance people in town was about 7.986 million dollars. Mr. Cole referenced the memo of February 22, 2007. He stated that certain things require immediate attention, ongoing projects and some have safety, mandated or have ways of unlocking other monies from the state to go on with other projects.

Commissioner Oickle asked what the \$50,000 for Redevelopment was for. Mr. Cole stated that the \$50,000 is startup money (Appraisals and pre-planning) for the redevelopment agency.

Commissioner Roberts asked about the list of things for this year that are classified as Town Hall, why they were not included in the bond. Mr. Cole stated that there were things that were in addition to what was originally in the scope of the work of the bond. Town Council chambers, work emergency control center (wiring) no money available for that, port for election machines in a climate controlled area, a/c system needs additional work as well. Commissioner Roberts asked about Fire Station 2 next year. Mr. Cole said that Fire Station 2 is looking to renovate and expand.

Commissioner Homicki asked about bond relationships for this forecast. Commissioner Homicki stated that at the last PZC meeting there were a lot of taxpayers concerned with the signs at the Little League fields. He asked if this would be the type of vehicle to earmark some of the funds at an earlier date rather than having to put the signs up. Mr. Cole stated that this would be something that would need to be brought to the department heads. He stated that his committee takes input from the various departments, anything with bonds is not their purview, and their purview is strictly general fund money.

Commissioner McHugh made a motion to approve **C.G.S. § 8-24 REFERRAL** - Review of the five-year Capitol Improvement Program-Positive Report

Commissioner George Oickle seconded the motion

The members voted as follows (6-1-1)

Aye: Knecht, Petrelli, McHugh, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle

Nay: Roberts

Abst: Wagner

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **Discussion of Sign Regulations**

- Advertising Signs on Athletic Fields
- Wall Sign Area
- Flashing Signs
- Special Events

Peter Gillespie stated that the sign regulations were presented with some detail at the last Planning and Zoning meeting. He stated that the proposed changes have been forwarded to the Commission not for approval, but for discussion on the possibility of moving them forward and setting a public hearing down the road. Mr. Gillespie stated that he made changes to the sign regulations based on comments made at the last meeting. Mr. Gillespie referred to a memo dated March 2, 2007 regarding Sign Regulations. He stated that he made changes to the specific language being proposed and on page 3 of the memo dated March 2, 2007. The proposal was to add language to the sign regulations, specifically Section 6.3.G Temporary Signs. Mr. Gillespie stated that Sponsorship Signs on Municipal Baseball and Softball fields. He said that specifically this would allow signs to be up for a period of not more than 8 months in any 12 month period non illuminated sponsor signs on outfield fences that face the playing field. Mr. Gillespie stated that the 3rd process would be staff approval, design review not required. He also stated that the maximum area per sign is 4' X 8'.

Commissioner Jurasin asked if the signs could be placed on any recreational field. Mr. Gillespie stated that the language has been changed to specify only softball and baseball fields. He also noted that they also limited it to the outfield fences. Commissioner Jurasin asked if there was any interpretation as to what an outfield fence was. Mr. Gillespie stated that the outfield fence is part of the playing field and that the zoning officer would be the one to interpret what was considered an outfield fence.

Mr. Gillespie stated that he has heard other concerns with the content on the signs. He said that Little League is going to solicit businesses that they would like to be sponsors. Mr. Gillespie stated that there are Little League guidelines that are established nationwide and are as follows "The name of the sponsoring business must not imply the sale or use of alcohol or tobacco, or any product or activity not in keeping with Little League's good name. The name and/or services provided by the business must not offend community standards." Mr. Gillespie stated that the town can not regulate the content on the signs, but this will be administered by the Little League Organization and they will control it. Vice Chair Wagner stated that the opinion is that the regulations should not be as specific as to name certain fields. Mr. Gillespie stated that if there was general consensus from the Commission a public hearing could be set up.

Vice Chair Wagner wanted clarification as to why the signs were temporary. Mr. Gillespie stated that the signs were made of a less than permanent material. He noted that the Little League also has a fall season, so rather than only having the signs up during the spring, they established the 8 month period. Vice Chair Wagner stated that in the proposed language there is no signage on the backstops. She stated that there are currently signs on some field's backstops that promote championships of certain teams. Vice Chair Wagner asked if those signs would be allowed. Mr. Gillespie stated that those signs are not sponsorship signs.

Vice Chair Wagner had question regarding Flashing Signs on page 4 of the memo dated March 2, 2007 from Peter Gillespie. She asked if bank signs that show the temperature and time would fall into that category. Mr. Gillespie stated that the banks could come to the Commission and ask for a special permit to do that.

Commissioner Roberts asked Mr. Gillespie about the definition of an animated sign. Mr. Gillespie stated that he has spent quite a bit of time gathering other community's regulations on animated signs and it seems to anticipate what state of the art is today. Commissioner Roberts asked Mr. Gillespie what #4 Special Events, on the memo dated March 2, 2007 does that they don't do already. Mr. Gillespie stated that the existing regulation does not give the zoning officer any discretion.

Commissioner Oickle asked Mr. Gillespie if he had met with the people on Griswold Road that were in attendance at the last meeting. Mr. Gillespie did not meet with them, but he did hear the concerns. The backs of the signs will be consistent and there will be no advertising on that side. Commissioner Jurasin asked if the backs of the signs will be the same color and if it should be written in the regulations. Mr. Gillespie stated that he could add that language in.

Commissioner Jurasin asked why the Commission should approve the Little League advertising signs if they are not going to make money from it. The point of doing this is to raise money. Ms. Kathy Bagley, Director of Parks and Recreation was in attendance, and she stated that the Little League is not going to be in the hole. She noted that they anticipate sign wear and tear and one of the reasons that they are taking the signs in over the winter is so they won't wear out. Ms. Bagley also said that the signs should last at least 3 years, if not longer. She noted that a 2 year

commitment for sponsoring a sign would be \$500 and they estimate the signs to cost \$90-\$100 per sign. Ms. Bagley also noted that there is a 1-year commitment that would cost \$350. She noted that the Little League will still make money on the signs. The Little League will volunteer to take the signs in and put the signs up.

Tim Verre, 300 Church Street, Little League representative, stated that the advertising signs are a new venture for Little League and they have never had this opportunity presented. He stated that they do not have expectations at this time and that they have discussed the possibility of 10 signs per field. Specific discussions were surrounded Mill Woods stadium, Greenfield and Highcrest. Mr. Verre stated that if 10 signs were to go on each field, with a 2 year commitment, they could make \$5000 per field. They would be looking at \$15,000 the first year minus \$100 per sign. He felt that this could bring a lot of money for Little League and that the fields need a lot of work that it is very expensive work to do. Commissioner Jurasin suggested that the money be added to the budget rather than have the signs.

Commissioner Homicki stated that the work that has been done so far has been good. He suggested that this be moved along. Commissioner Jurasin agreed. Mr. Gillespie said that the proposal will be expedited.

Vice Chair Wagner stated that the direction is to modify the sign recommendations and set up a public hearing.

Commissioner Anthony Homicki left the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

## **2.2 Discussion of Rules and Procedures**

Vice Chair Wagner Tabled 2.2 due to the hour.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**APPLICATION NO. 1553-07-Z. Percon, Inc./5th Avenue Motel** Seeking a Special Permit to construct an additional eleven (11) units in accordance with Section 5.2.E.7. of the Wethersfield Zoning Regulations at 1695 Berlin Turnpike.

Paul Randazzo, 467 Griswold Rd, Glastonbury, Percon, Inc., a representative for the 5th Avenue Motel, was in attendance. The 5th Avenue Motel is looking to construct an 11 Unit expansion 440 feet from the back of the carwash. Mr. Randazzo stated that this project does not approach building lines to any degree. There are currently 11 units at the motel and they want to add 11 more. Mr. Randazzo stated that the use is consistent with what is currently there. Vice Chair Wagner asked Mr. Randazzo if he received the memos from the Planning Department concerning his application.

Mr. Randazzo stated that he tried to comply with the memos that he received prior to the meeting as much as possible. Vice Chair Wagner asked Mr. Randazzo if he had a vertical view of the property. Mr. Randazzo stated that he supplied the plans to the Commission. Mr. Randazzo said that the building will be identical to the existing structure. The façade of the old building is currently stucco and will be changed to a new style foam texture. The roof will be a timberline style. The façade will also be changed on the old building.

Vice Chair Wagner stated that there were quite a few things listed in the memo dated February 26, 2007 from the Planning Department. She asked if he has complied with it. Denise Bradley stated that the Town Engineer has not commented on it at this time. Vice Chair Wagner stated that they can not move on the application on the revised plans. Commissioner Jurasin asked Mr. Gillespie why the application was accepted and put on the agenda. Mr. Gillespie stated that they anticipated all plans were to be modified along with the comments from the Town Engineer. Denise Bradley stated that the outstanding comments are due to not having been provided landscaping plans.

Commissioner Oickle said that he would like to see a color rendering of the building.

Mr. Randazzo stated that he received 15 comments from the Town Engineer in the Memo dated February 26, 2007. Mr. Randazzo referenced the comments. Vice Chair Wagner stated that the Commission would like to see a lighting

plan as well. She noted that the majority of what is missing from the application is a landscape and lighting plan.

Commissioner Jurasin felt that the Commission should not blindly accept that everything is complied with. He suggested that they wait until the next meeting to make a decision.

Vice Chair Wagner asked if there was anyone in attendance for public comment. There was no one in attendance for public comment.

Commissioner Fred Petrelli made a motion to keep the public hearing open for **APPLICATION NO. 1553-07-Z** until the next Planning and Zoning meeting on March 20, 2007.

Commissioner Richard Roberts seconded the motion

The members voted as follows (8-0-0)

Aye: Knecht, Roberts, Petrelli, McHugh, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle,

Nay: None

Abst: None

Commissioner Wagner stated that the Applicant needs to have the Landscaping Plan, Lighting Plan and deal with the Town Engineer and Planning Department on the items.

**APPLICATION NO. 1554-07-Z. Alkedi Saraci** Seeking Site Plan and Design Review for a change of use from residential to office/commercial of property located at 312 Silas Deane Highway.

Vice Chair Wagner stated that this was not a public hearing.

Alkedi Saraci, 240 South Street, Hartford, handed out a memo of the Summary of Proposed Activity for 312 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, CT. Mr. Saraci stated that the building will be used as an Insurance Agency. Mr. Saraci is an exclusive agent appointed by All State Insurance Co. He plans to start the business with 2 employees and hopes to have 4 employees by year end.

Mr. Saraci stated that the interior of the building is in need of extensive renovations. He will put new sheetrock, all new door openings and will conform to the ADA requirements and put a handicap accessible bathroom. He stated that the exterior will have a new roof and new windows.

Mr. Saraci stated that there will be a handicap accessible ramp that will be 40 inches wide. The plans call for a 48 inch ramp, but the Fire Marshall stated that the driveway needed to be widened a bit for the fire fighters to fight potential fires in the rear parking lot. Commissioner Oickle asked if the ramp was shortened from 48 inches to 40 inches to accommodate the Fire Marshall. Mr. Saraci said yes.

Mr. Saraci stated that the exterior of the building is currently vinyl siding and it will be power washed. He also noted that the sign will be the standard All State sign and that since the phone number can not be on the sign the business name will be on there instead.

Mr. Saraci stated that he opted out for curbside trash collection due to the low amount of trash produce expected.

Commissioner Oickle questioned parking spaces #6 and #7. He did not feel that they would be usable. Commissioner Jurasin suggested that parking spaces #6 and #7 be made into 1 parking space.

Commissioner Oickle asked if the tree on the property will be saved. It was noted on the plans that the tree will be saved.

Commissioner Richard Roberts motioned to approve **APPLICATION NO. 1554-07-Z** as submitted with the

stipulation that the plans be revised to show the elimination of parking space 6/7 and the widening of the driveway according to the Fire Marshall.

Commissioner Robert Jurasin seconded the motion with a comment that applicant complies with Michael Turner's comments from a memo dated January 26, 2007.

The members voted as follows (8-0-0)

Aye: Knecht, Roberts, Petrelli, McHugh, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle,

Nay: None

Abst: None

**APPLICATION NO. 1555-07-Z. 291 Ridge Road LLC** Seeking a Special Permit to modify Applications 1478-05-Z and 1519-06-Z for property located at 295 Ridge Road

Peter Barry, 1177 Silas Deane Highway, representing 291 Ridge Road LLC, is asking the Commission to consider removing the 55+ age restriction for the 12 apartment style condos at 291 Ridge Road that was originally approved on September 27, 2005.

Mr. Barry stated that there was a flaw in the marketing concept and that these condos do not appeal to the 55+ market. The units are on the smaller side, as they are less than 1300 square feet. People 55+ are not prepared to move into these units. Mr. Barry stated that they feel that these condos would appeal to singles and young married couples rather than the 55+ age bracket. Mr. Barry feels that the success of the front building will help with Phase II - the back building. Mr. Barry stated that they want the project to succeed.

Leslie Civitello, 26 Toll Gate Road, wrote a letter to Chairman Hammer, dated March 6, 2007, stating she wants the Commission to deny the application for a special permit and not to allow the removal of the 55+ age requirement.

Don Mondani, Mondani and Associates, stated that they have spent a lot of money marketing this property. They have had open houses and gone to senior centers to try and market this property. Mr. Mondani stated that he is an expert in the real estate field and that real estate is shaky right now. They would like to open the market to a bigger audience. Mr. Mondani stated that the focus is to sell the units at this time and that it is not cost effective to rent.

Mr. Barry stated that the building in the back has bigger units and the prices are higher.

Mr. Barry stated that this request is not a detriment to the town, no zoning changes. Commissioner Petrelli stated that if their request is not granted then it is a detriment. Mr. Barry stated that success it certainly more questionable. In order for Phase II to move on, Phase I needs to have more sales.

Commissioner Jurasin noted that he recalls there was a lack of amenities in the big building that led him to accept the age restriction in the first place. Mr. Barry noted that there was a community room. Mr. Barry also stated that a lot of seniors would rather go to assisted living or congregate living facilities where there is medical staff and food. This building does not have this.

Commissioner Harley stated that he would like the project to be successful, but when this zone change was originally proposed to the Commission, it was sold to them as 55+. He stated that it would probably have been looked at in a different light if it had not been 55+. Mr. Barry stated that he was not involved in the beginning. He said that it was an honest belief that the units could be sold as 55+. Mr. Barry stated that he sometimes wonders what the difference is between condos for 55+ and condos for under 55. He stated that 55+ was a marketing concept. Mr. Barry stated that removing the 55+ restriction is not doing any harm to the neighborhood. He stated that both are permitted in the zone. The building has sat for years and Mr. Barry feels that it is in the best interest of the town and the developer to see this project succeed.

Commissioner Knecht asked if a different price would suffice and sell the units. Mr. Barry stated that the price is determined by what has gone into the project. He noted that the square footage seems to be the problem.

Vice Chair Wagner asked if there were any public comments.

Donald Reilly, 37 Tollgate Road, stated that when this original application was proposed to the Commission the neighbors were supportive of it under certain stipulations. Mr. Reilly is questioning the price of the units. He noted that \$200 per square foot is an outrageous price. Mr. Reilly is requesting that the Commission think about the application before approving it.

Phillip Civitello, 26 Tollgate Road, brought to the meeting minutes from September 6, 2005 and September 20, 2005 regarding the original application for the 55+ age restriction. Mr. Civitello stated that the Commission's view in the meeting minutes was that there was concern that this would turn into an apartment building as opposed to a 55+ condominium. Mr. Civitello said that if the front building is open to any one who wants to rent and the back building will remain 55+ does not make sense.

Mr. Civitello stated that he does not feel that any one would want to pay the \$200 per square foot. He also noted that the developer chose to make 13 units. Mr. Civitello stated that they questioned the 13 units and the developer said that they would sell, and now they are saying that the units are not selling. Mr. Civitello stated that there are a lot of unanswered questions. Mr. Civitello stated that the application is incomplete and for them to say that this is not a detriment to the town is a statement and there is nothing behind it.

Mr. Civitello brought with him a copy of the Rare Reminder dated February 27, 2007, with an advertisement for the condos. The advertisement read as follows "OPEN HOUSE Friday 12-3pm. Saturday and Sunday 1-4pm, the Ridge at Wethersfield, 291 Ridge Road. 50 years + older adult condos for sale or rent. Rents from \$1200/mo. + utilities. Garages and storage available. Sales from low 200K's." Mr. Civitello stated that it is time to stand up and say no.

Vice Chair Wagner asked if there were any comments from the Commissioners.

Commissioner Petrelli stated that he sympathized with Mr. Reilly and Mr. Civitello that the price could be too high.

Vice Chair Wagner asked what keeps the developer from taking two 1,000 square foot condos and making them one 2,000 square foot condo, if that is what the 55+ community wants. She noted that she does not feel that it is the Commission's responsibility to help Mr. Tartaglia out of this fix. Vice Chair Wagner stated that Mr. Tartaglia told the Commission that he did his homework and that this building would be marketable to the 55+ group. He said that he was so confident that all of the units would be sold so quickly that he could do it in two phases. Vice Chair Wagner is not buying into bailing him out. She stated that he could try to bail himself out without the Commission changing what they have already approved. Vice Chair Wagner stated that in her opinion a different clientele would affect the neighborhood. She noted that they can not say for sure that this zoning change would not impact the neighborhood. Vice Chair Wagner stated that she was disappointed that Mr. Tartaglia was not in attendance. She stated that it is a complete reversal on how adamant he was on what a great thing this would be for the community.

Mr. Civitello presented Vice Chair Wagner with the September 6, 2005 and September 20, 2005 meeting minutes.

Mr. Barry stated that he feels most of the opposition is more of a personal thing rather than the use of the structure. Mr. Barry stated that the size has been dictated to what was there previously. Mr. Barry stated that judged on the structure itself, does 55+ have less impact than under 55. He feels that there is a lot of unhappiness about what the developer said the first time. Mr. Barry stated that ultimately they are dealing with what effect this change would have. Vice Chair Wagner asked what has changed. Mr. Barry stated that he has tried to layout what has changed to the Commission. Vice Chair Wagner noted that he said the market has changed. The realtor stated that the people that they are marketing this size apartment to do not want that size apartment. Vice Chair Wagner said that it was never viable. Mr. Barry asked if it was not viable, should the project not be permitted to go forward.

The Architect of the project was in attendance and stated that the building was very difficult to work with. There were code issues that caused the cost of construction to sky rocket.

Mr. Mondani stated that this was not done to trick anybody.

Commissioner Roberts asked Mr. Mondani what makes him believe that if the 55+ community does not want these units at this price, that other people would want the units at this price. Mr. Mondani stated that it is more of a size issue. Commissioner Jurasin asked who it would be marketable to, single people or couples. Mr. Mondani stated that he did not believe that the units are big enough for children. Commissioner Jurasin asked if Mr. Mondani was not prohibiting children. Mr. Mondani stated that it is not big enough for children. Commissioner Roberts stated that he was not on the Commission when this was approved. He asked if it would have been approved without the condition on it.

Vice Chair Wagner asked how critical this is to Mr. Tartaglia's financial situation. Mr. Barry stated that he does not have any contracts and he feels it is a critical situation.

Commissioner McHugh is questioning if they can rent the units if they do not sell them. Mr. Barry stated that yes they could, but does not think that it is Mr. Tartaglia's intention. Commissioner McHugh stated that she was reading the advertisement from the February 27, 2007 Rare Reminder. Mr. Barry stated that he is not familiar with the ad and it could be a misprint. Commissioner McHugh said that she would not like to see the units rented out.

Commissioner Jurasin asked for clarification on if the application was approved, could the units be rented out. Mr. Gillespie stated that they do not regulate the distinction between renting and ownership. It was always presented to the Planning Department that it would be a condominium ownership situation. Commissioner Jurasin asked of the age restriction approval that was given it is not mandated that it how to be purchased. Mr. Gillespie stated no, but that is the way it was presented. Commissioner Jurasin noted that one of Mr. Tartaglia's alternatives is to rent to 55 and older people. Commissioner Jurasin also stated that if the restriction was changed they would be able to rent to anyone if the units were not sold.

Commissioner Jurasin asked Mr. Reilly and Mr. Civitello if the property remained as it is today, how they would feel. Would they blame the Commission for denying the request? Mr. Reilly and Mr. Civitello stated that they would not blame the Commission one bit.

Commissioner Richard Roberts made a motion to close the Public Session.

Commissioner Thomas Harley seconded the motion.

The members voted as follows (8-0-0)

Aye: Knecht, Roberts, Petrelli, McHugh, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle,

Nay: None

Abst: None

Commissioner Jurasin stated that he would have voted a different way if it was not age restricted at the time.

Commissioner Jurasin believes that it is a substantial difference on the number of issues that affect the neighborhood without hearing evidence about the issues.

Commissioner Robert Jurasin made a motion to deny **APPLICATION NO. 1555-07-Z. 291 Ridge Road LLC**

Vice Chair Margaret Wagner seconded the motion

The members voted as follows (4-3-1)

Aye: Wagner, Oickle, Harley, Jurasin

Nay: Petrelli, Roberts, McHugh

Abst: Knecht

### **Motion Failed**

Commissioner Richard Roberts made a motion to deny **APPLICATION NO. 1555-07-Z. 291 Ridge Road LLC** without prejudice.

Commissioner Dorcas McHugh seconded the motion.

The members voted as follows (8-0-0)

Aye: Knecht, Roberts, Petrelli, McHugh, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle,

Nay: None

Abst: None

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **MINUTES of the February 20, 2007 Meeting**

Commissioner Knecht made a motion to approve the [minutes from the February 20, 2007 meeting](#).

Commissioner Richard Roberts seconded the motion

The members voted as follows (6-0-2)

Aye: Knecht, Roberts, Petrelli, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle,

Nay: None

Abst: Wagner, McHugh

### **STAFF REPORTS**

Peter Gillespie said that there were some applications pending

- Comstock Ferre Application, still going through HDC
- Century 21 Sign, just applied

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS ON GENERAL MATTERS OF PLANNING AND ZONING.**

No members of the public were present or offered any comment.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

**8.1** An invitation to the 59th Annual CFPZA Conference to be held on March 22, 2007 at the Southington Aqua Turf.

**8.2** Monthly Economic Development Report

### **UPCOMING BUSINESS**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner George Oickle motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Commissioner Robert Jurasin seconded the motion.

The members voted as follows (8-0-0)

Aye: Knecht, Roberts, Petrelli, McHugh, Wagner, Jurasin, Harley, Oickle,

Nay: None

Abst: None

The Meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

Philip Knecht, Clerk