

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING  
SEPTEMBER 21, 2004**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, September 21, 2004, at 7:00 p.m. in the Town Hall Council Chambers, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Joseph L. Hammer, Chairman  
Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman  
Philip Knecht, Clerk  
George Oickle  
Peter Leombruni  
Earle R. Munroe  
John Hallisey

Members absent:

David R. Edwards  
John Adamian  
Richard Roberts  
Robert P. Jurasin  
Scott Murphy

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner

Chairman Hammer called the public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.

**APPLICATION NO. 1433-04-Z.** Town of Wethersfield Comprehensive Revisions to the Town of Wethersfield Zoning Regulations (Continued from September 8, 2004). Chairman Hammer asked Mr. Gillespie to brief the commission on the status of the revisions.

Mr. Gillespie indicated that he had given each of the commissioners a copy of the revisions for Chapter 1, 2, and 3 of the regulations. He suggested that he quickly walk through the revisions. Chairman Hammer asked him to go through the substantive revisions. Mr. Gillespie complied.

- Table of Contents

Mr. Gillespie said that he included the subheadings from the rest of the text to the table in order to make it easier for the public to find things in the regulations.

- Section 2.3 - Definitions - p.9

Mr. Gillespie said that he added a definition for active adult housing in order to deal with the hot market demand for that specific type of housing. Commissioner Oickle asked if anyone under 55 years of age was allowed to live in the housing. Mr. Gillespie said that the definition wouldn't specifically deal with that issue, but there may be a provision in a different section that deals with that issue and would allow for a younger spouse or dependent child. Chairman Hammer also asked if that provision would deal with any deed restriction. Mr. Gillespie indicated that the deed restriction issue could be discussed in a different section.

- Section 2.3 - Definitions - p.10

Mr. Gillespie added a definition for building frontage in order to clarify the process of calculating sign area.

- Section 2.3 - Definitions - p.12

Mr. Gillespie deleted the definition of covenant. This was a definition that dealt with deed restrictions for affordable housing. Mr. Gillespie indicated that this was a carryover from the previous regulations and is no longer needed because this issue is being dealt with in a different way.

- Section 2.3 - Definitions - p.20

Mr. Gillespie modified the definition of shopping center. He looked at a number of definitions from other towns as well as the existing development in town and came up with the revised definition which states:

A group of not less than five (5) structurally connected commercial establishments, which are primarily retail stores or personal service establishments functioning as a single unit, under single ownership and/or control having a total gross ground floor building area of at least fifty (50) thousand square feet, with immediate adjoining off-street parking facilities not less than prescribed by these Regulations.

Mr. Leombruni asked if the shopping center were not under one ownership, would it be considered a shopping center. He has seen shopping centers owned as condominiums and not under one owner. Mr. Gillespie said that the definition should get a second look to take that issue into account, perhaps by taking the ownership statement out of the definition. Chairman Hammer suggested that the condo issue be addressed so that a scattered five separate stores does not become a shopping center.

- Section 3.2 - Permitted Principal Uses

Mr. Gillespie added a subsection to include the ability to rent no more than two rooms to boarders. Commissioner Oickle said that it used to be three boarders were allowed, and that he agreed with the change to two boarders.

- Section 3.2.1 - Congregate Residential Development

Mr. Gillespie added criteria to the section pertaining to Congregate Residential Development. He also organized the information better to make that section clearer because there were a lot of questions the last time. Commissioner Leombruni asked for clarification on the "55 year old" rule. Mr. Gillespie said that he would develop some language for that specifically and come back to the commission with that at a later date. Mr. Gillespie also altered the definition for side yard and landscaping in order to allow for driveways to come up to the building. He also took out the term parking spaces in order to accommodate the driveway. The side yard requirements are still substantial for these types of developments. The minimum lot area was increased to two acres, which is not unreasonable based upon other towns that were surveyed. Mr. Gillespie also allowed for flexibility by special permit in the case where an existing building might be converted for this use. He also deleted the minimum buildable square requirement. He could not find justification or support for both the minimum buildable square and the larger lot size, so the larger lot size will stand. Finally the density was increased to 25 units per acre in order to identify the density in this section.

Commissioner Oickle gave an example of why the two-acre minimum lot is important. He said that being able to accommodate the parking on site is important. Commissioner Leombruni agreed.

- Section 3.4 - Special Residential Development District (SRD)

A new section was added with new criteria: identify a need for this type of housing, look at supply of land, and to look at the specifics of the site.

- Section 3.4 - Special Residential Development District (SRD) -Subsection E

Mr. Gillespie borrowed the same language from the congregate residential development section regarding the 15-foot landscaping border around the buildings, except at points of entry. Mr. Gillespie said that he deleted all references to shared services in order to clarify that shared services should only take place under the congregate

housing section.

- Section 3.5.1-Permitted Accessory Uses

Storage of a boat, RV's as well as keeping of pets, like cats and dogs will now be permitted as of right with no permit required.

Mr. Gillespie concluded and said that he hopes to have all revised chapters by next week in order to review everything at the next meeting. Chairman Hammer asked if Glenn Chalder, the outside consultant from Planimetrics could be in attendance and Mr. Gillespie said that he was planning on being present at the next meeting.

Commissioner Leombruni asked about boats as accessory structures and specifically where they should be located. Mr. Gillespie directed him to Section 3.5.1.b.3 which specifies:

Outside storage of one recreational vehicle, one boat and it's trailer not more than eighteen (18) feet in length, by the resident when treated as an accessory structure in compliance with Section 3.6.

Commissioner Leombruni also asked how this regulation is enforced. Mr. Gillespie said that it is usually by complaint from a neighbor to the building official. Commissioner Leombruni said that it is confusing how a movable thing like a boat is dealt with as an accessory structure. He suggested that Mr. Gillespie take a look at dealing with it as a piece of equipment instead.

Commissioner Munroe asked if there would be a copy of the regulations with all of the revisions indicated. Mr. Gillespie indicated that there would be.

Chairman Hammer asked if there were any members of the public who wished to speak, seeing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Gillespie gave the commissioners a copy of a fax that he received late in the day from Bill Bellock at Bell Site development. Mr. Gillespie read the fax into the record. Mr. Bellock is asking for consideration in the proposed Special Residential Development revisions. He has a Right of Way (ROW) that is rather large and is asking for that to be considered as part of the lot.

Commissioner Oickle said that he would not be in favor of that because it would increase the density of that site. Chairman Hammer agreed and gave an example of the DOT needing the ROW to increase the width of the street, which would bring the development right up to the street. Mr. Gillespie suggested that the commissioners allow for some flexibility in the regulation in order to not exclude a specific development that they might want closer to the street, especially if the developer is willing to give something in return, like more open space. Commissioner Leombruni warned the commission to be wary of opening the door to allow for building closer to the ROW and gave the example of Franklin Avenue in Hartford. Mr. Gillespie advocated that the commission still allow for the flexibility in order to have the commission make the decision on a development so that it is not left up to the Zoning Board of Appeals to grant specific developments variances. Chairman Hammer said that the flexibility that Mr. Gillespie is proposing would in no way allow for this type of development as of right and asked Mr. Gillespie to draft language to allow for some flexibility.

Chairman Hammer again asked for any members of the public to speak. Seeing none, he asked for a motion to continue the hearing to the next meeting.

Vice-Chairman Forsdick made a motion to continue the hearing to October 5, 2004. Commissioner Oickle seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor. (7-0)

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 21, 2004**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public meeting immediately following the public hearing on Tuesday, September 21, 2004, in the Town Hall Council Chambers, 505 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Joseph L. Hammer, Chairman  
Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman  
Philip Knecht, Clerk  
George Oickle  
Peter Leombruni  
Earle R. Munroe  
John Hallisey

Members absent:

David R. Edwards  
John Adamian  
Richard Roberts  
Robert P. Jurasin  
Scott Murphy

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner

Chairman Hammer asked for a roll call.

Clerk Knecht read the roll call. Chairman Hammer indicated that at least five of the seven members present must vote in the affirmative in order to approve an application.

Clerk Knecht then read a description of the application into the record:

**APPLICATION NO. 1435-04-Z** James Duquette seeking approval under Article XXXI for a change that is not significant - change of use from personal services to restaurant located on the east side of the Silas Deane Highway in an Industrial Zone at 1030 Silas Deane Highway.

Clerk Knecht also read a memo to the Planning and Zoning Commission dated September 21, 2004 from Peter Gillespie into the record. The memo recommends that the Commission require satisfactory screening around the proposed dumpster.

Chairman Hammer asked the applicant to come forward and state his name for the record.

**James Duquette 12 Brookline Drive West Hartford, CT** Mr. Duquette explained that there is no other Filipino restaurant in Connecticut even though there is a large Filipino community. He said that his wife is Filipino and that they were looking for a location for a restaurant and came upon this location on the Silas Deane Highway which appealed to them because of the traffic at the site.

Chairman Hammer asked if they would be open seven days a week for lunch and dinner hours. Mr. Duquette said that seven days, perhaps a half-day on Sunday was planned for lunch and dinner. Chairman Hammer also asked if there were any changes proposed to the exterior of the building, how many seats were proposed, and how many employees they expected to have. Mr. Duquette answered that there were no exterior changes except for the signage and that they were proposing forty-eight (48) seats in the restaurant and six (6) employees.

Commissioner Munroe asked if the Health Inspector had made any comments on this proposal. Mr. Gillespie said that although his comments are usually in depth and specific as to the distance of the sink, etc, he had not yet made comments on the proposal. Mr. Gillespie said that Mr. Duquette had spoken with the Health Inspector and as far as he

knew there were no negative comments.

Commissioner Oickle said that he was glad to see that the concrete pad was being fixed and the enclosure would be improved for the dumpsters. He asked the applicant about the purpose of the dump trucks on site. Mr. Duquette said that he was not aware of the presence of the dump trucks. Mr. Gillespie said that those trucks belong to the paving contractor doing work across the street. Commissioner Oickle asked if the whole site was paved. Mr. Duquette and Mr. Gillespie answered that the whole lot is paved although the back area of the lot is rough pavement with very light striping. Commissioner Oickle said that he assumed that the overgrowth in the back would be taken down as the site is cleaned up. Overall, he is impressed with the condition of the lot.

Clerk Knecht asked when the applicant planned to open the restaurant. Mr. Duquette answered that he hoped to be open by December 1, 2004. Chairman Hammer asked whether or not the applicant was planning on serving alcohol. Mr. Duquette answered that he would like to, although he had not yet received his permit.

Commissioner Leombruni asked about the prior use of the property. Mr. Duquette said that it was a nail salon. The commissioners discussed the previous uses to the nail salon, including a restaurant, Olive Oils.

Commissioner Munroe asked about the proposed signage for the restaurant, specifically would it be freestanding or just on the façade. Mr. Duquette answered that he was proposing both. Chairman Hammer said that the applicant would come back to the staff with the specifics. Mr. Gillespie informed the applicant that he would have to start with the building department and then go to the staff.

Commissioner Oickle asked that the applicant stripe the driveway with arrows in and out. Clerk Knecht asked about the hours of operation. Mr. Duquette said that they were planning on 10 a.m. to 10 p.m. Commissioner Leombruni asked about the screening around the dumpsters. He asked if the existing dumpster had screening. Mr. Gillespie confirmed that it does, but he is recommended that the commission recommend that an enlarged dumpster area also have screening.

Chairman Hammer then asked for discussion on the application.

Commissioner Leombruni made a motion to accept the application with the following condition:

1. The whole dumpster area both existing and proposed become enclosed and upgraded.

Clerk Forsdick seconded the motion.

Mr. Gillespie also recommended that the twelve (12) parking spaces in the rear of the property be restriped to delineate the additional parking.

Commissioner Leombruni amended the motion to add the following condition:

2. The twelve (12) parking spaces in the rear of the parking lot be restriped.

Clerk Forsdick seconded the amended motion.

Chairman Hammer then asked for a vote on the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the proposed application with conditions (7-0).

(Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Oickle, Munroe, Leombruni, Hallisey)

Clerk Knecht then read a description of the next application into the record:

**APPLICATION NO. 1436-04-Z** Sprint Spectrum LP d/b/a Sprint PCS seeking approval under Article XXXI for a change that is not significant - revisions to telecommunications compound in order to accommodate equipment, located on the north side of Kelleher Court in an A-1 zone at 23 Kelleher Court.

Chairman Hammer asked for the applicant to make a presentation.

Tom Regan, Brown, Rudnick, Berlack, Isreal, LLP 1 City Place Hartford, CT 06103 Mr. Regan is the attorney representing the applicant and introduced the lead engineer on the project to explain the changes to the site plan.

Alitz Abadjian, Project Manager, URS Corporation 795 Brook Street Rocky Hill, CT 06067 The applicant, Sprint Spectrum, is proposing to add antennas on the existing tower and cabinets on a concrete pad within the existing compound. The pad would be located in the eastern portion of the existing compound. The proposed 9'-6" x 18' pad would eventually contain four cabinets but would start with just two cabinets. Also, the proposed full build out of antennas would be twelve, although only six are proposed at this time. All proposed construction is within the existing fence. The antennas will be located on elevated T-arms. The utilities (Electric and Telephone) are all located within the existing compound.

Commissioner Oickle asked if the existing fence was screened. Ms. Abadjian said that it was not, although that can be screened as part of this proposal. In fact, she said that proper screening of the proposed equipment was a comment made by the Town Engineer and they are planning on addressing that. Chairman Hammer asked if the existing trees at the site provide a good screen and Clerk Knecht asked if the neighbors would have a view of the proposed installation. Ms. Abadjian said that there are existing trees within the compound and the installation would not be visible as it would be located behind the other existing installations. Chairman Hammer asked if the proposed cabinets would be below the fence line and Ms. Abadjian assured him that they would be.

Clerk Knecht asked if there was any equipment that would generate noise. Ms. Abadjian said that none of the outdoor equipment would generate noise. All that is proposed are the two cabinets, a radio cabinet and a battery cabinet, about five feet tall and gray/beige in color. No generators are proposed at the site.

Commissioner Leombruni asked who owns the tower and if it is the town, has the town approved this. Mr. Regan said that the town does own the tower and that the applicant has entered into a lease agreement with the town.

Chairman Hammer recalled that the Town of Wethersfield had opposed this installation. Mr. Regan confirmed that the town had a moratorium on telecommunications installations and they had opposed it at the state level. However, the State siting council under its tower sharing provisions overruled the opposition and stated that Sprint should locate here instead of at another site in residential area. Chairman Hammer asked if the town had appealed this ruling to the Superior Court. Mr. Regan said that they did not appeal. Mr. Regan also said that the State was given a copy of the structural analysis and that a copy will also be given to the town as part of the building permit application.

Commissioner Oickle asked about the configuration of the antennas. Mr. Regan and Ms. Abadjian explained that the town and AT&T have T-arms and Verizon has a low-profile platform. The siting council recommended that the applicant change from their originally proposed low-profile platform to the now proposed T-arms. These would match the existing configuration at the site.

Commissioner Leombruni asked about the density at the site. Ms. Abadjian said that the area is getting dense, however they would be able to install the cabinets and antennas, and there still would be room to get around. Commissioner Leombruni voiced his concern about maintenance of the area and access. Ms. Abadjian assured him that there would be room for the maintenance workers and that they would be able to do their job.

Commissioner Oickle verified that the town would get money for the lease of their site. Mr. Regan confirmed that the town would be getting paid for the lease. Commissioner Leombruni asked about the remaining structural capacity after this installation was constructed. Ms. Abadjian explained that she could not verify exactly how much capacity was remaining, however, she expected that there would be remaining capacity after Sprint constructed the installation. Commissioner Leombruni said that he was concerned about the town needing future capacity at the site and not being able to handle town needs with all of the other carriers at the site. He also asked who would make the call as to the maximum number of carriers at the site. Mr. Gillespie said that it is up to the Town Council to make that decision and in this case, they have approved the installation.

Chairman Hammer asked for verification if they were ordered to do so. Mr. Regan said that they were required to

located at the site and repeated that the siting council had made a determination being aware of the structural analysis that the applicant provided to them.

Commissioner Oickle asked if any of the neighbors were upset about the proposal. Mr. Gillespie said that one of the neighbors, Mr. Flannery, was here and the Commission may wish to hear him speak. Chairman Hammer asked Mr. Flannery to come forward.

Paul Flannery 382 Ridge Road Wethersfield, CT Mr. Flannery's main concern had been that there would not be enough parking spaces at the firehouse. He feels that concern has been satisfied, as the town has not allowed any expansion of the fenced in area. His question now is with the cable run or bridge that is proposed. He is concerned that the proximity between Sprint's and Verizon's cable bridge would be too tight. Also, he claims that no one has talked about the vertical height of the proposed Sprint cable bridge. He said that there is a problem with static on the existing radio system in town, however he does not have a problem with the proposal if the clearances are ok. He has been surprised how many technicians have been through the site.

Commissioner Leombruni asked if any members of the public or just the technicians would be impeded by the height of the proposed cable bridge. Mr. Flannery said no members of the public go through there, just the technicians. Chairman Hammer asked the applicant to answer the question about height and proximity of the proposed cable bridge. Ms. Abadjian said that the cable bridge would be elevated to match the Verizon cable bridge and the clearances would be worked out so that there would not be a problem. Mr. Regan also stated that there is a provision in the lease that if there is a problem with interference of the public safety equipment, that they would have to resolve that problem. Also, he said that the telecommunications companies have actually been able to improve public safety equipment.

Commissioner Munroe asked about the role of the town council vs. the siting council in this matter. Mr. Regan answered that the siting council regulates the tower and the equipment that goes with it. However, Sprint did want to go before the town as well because Verizon had set a precedent. Commissioner Munroe reminded Mr. Regan that the town does have control over town owned property. Mr. Regan agreed. Commissioner Munroe also asked why there were no generators proposed as part of the installation. Mr. Regan said that no generator is proposed, instead, an eight-hour battery backup is used because it is cleaner and does not generate noise at the facility. Finally, Commissioner Munroe asked why the carriers do not get together to share a generator if one is needed. Mr. Regan could not speak to that because the other installations were already in place and there was no requirement for a shared generator. Also, Sprint does not need a generator.

Commissioner Munroe also stated that he was concerned about the parking at the site being compromised, which had been brought up by Mr. Flannery. Mr. Regan said that they were able to locate all of the proposed equipment within the existing fenced-in compound and therefore were not taking any more parking from the firehouse.

Commissioner Leombruni asked how many generators were currently located at the site. The applicant replied that they believed that there was only one generator. Mr. Flannery spoke again and confirmed this. Mr. Flannery said there was only one generator at the site and that it belonged to the town. There is no generator in the Verizon shed and that there is no back up for AT&T and Verizon to his knowledge.

Mr. Gillespie requested that the structural analysis be provided as per the request of the town engineer. He also suggested that additional concerns, specifically, those numbered 1, 5 and 6, of the town engineer, as stated in the memo from Town Engineer Michael Turner to Town Planner Peter Gillespie dated September 15, 2004, be referenced in the Commission's action.

Commissioner Oickle said that he did not see a need for additional screening at the site based upon what he saw at the site. He was wondering why the town engineer would call for that at the site. Mr. Gillespie suggested that the commission include this condition and leave the decision about type and quantity of screening to the Planning Staff and Town Engineer.

Chairman Hammer asked for a motion.

Commissioner Oickle made a motion to approve the proposal with the following conditions:

1. The applicant must provide a structural analysis of the tower to confirm ability to support their antenna and cabling.
2. Staging during construction must be coordinated so as not to interfere with Fire Department activities.
3. The applicant shall work with the Planning Staff to place additional plantings outside of the chain link fence north of the Town shelter. The applicant shall also place plastic slat inserts, which mimic evergreen shrubbery for all of the fenced area.

Vice Chairman Forsdick seconded the motion.

Chairman Hammer then asked for a vote on the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the proposed application with conditions (7-0).

(Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Oickle, Munroe, Leombruni, Hallisey)

**APPLICATION NO. 1433-04-Z.** Town of Wethersfield Comprehensive Revisions to the Town of Wethersfield Zoning Regulations (Continued from September 8, 2004).

Chairman Hammer then stated that the next item on the agenda, discussion of the proposed zoning regulations would be taken up at the next meeting after the public hearing.

### **MEETING MINUTES**

He then moved onto the next item on the agenda, approval of [minutes from the September 8, 2004 meeting](#). He asked for a motion.

Vice-Chairman Forsdick made a motion to approve the meeting minutes.

Commissioner Oickle seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioner Munroe and Commissioner Leombruni abstaining, as they were not present at that meeting.

(Aye: Hammer, Forsdick, Knecht, Oickle, Hallisey)

(Abst: Munroe, Leombruni)

### **OTHER MATTERS**

Chairman Hammer then called for a discussion on other matters.

- Microwaves in Lodging Facilities

Mr. Gillespie informed the commission that he had written a memo to the town council based upon the discussion last week. The town council has not yet voted on the matter. Commissioner Munroe said that his experience was that they were not approved generally because the police department had opposed specific requests based upon a fear of transient people residing at the motels. Mr. Gillespie said that they are still trying to figure out that issue, because it is a concern. However, now most modern motels and hotels, including something like a Residence Inn, would not be allowed under the current regulations, so it is something to consider.

Commissioner Oickle stated that upscale hotels commonly have kitchenettes and those should be allowed for business travelers. The regulations now will discourage good hotels from moving into town.

Vice-Chairman Forsdick added that if Hartford is built up as planned, then Wethersfield is only five minutes out of town and may be able to attract business travelers who don't want to stay in the center of the city, but rather in town.

Mr. Gillespie said that he will come up with something else to add to his original memo to express the commission's concerns as discussed.

Commissioner Hallisey asked what the specific language was that the council was hung up on. Mr. Gillespie replied that the regulations, specifically the zoning regulations do not allow for lodging facilities with cooking areas. The concern has been long term stays attracting transients.

Commissioner Oickle said that he thought that the town was concerned and hired Mr. Gillespie to encourage growth and development. He doesn't understand why they would be hung up on something like this. Commissioner Hallisey agreed saying that the microwave has been around for a long time and it is common to see them in hotels.

Commissioner Leombruni contributed that he does a lot of traveling and that usually hotels with kitchenettes are very modern with a lot of safety and they are very upscale. He does think that it is a problem to allow kitchens in older hotels with lousy wiring. He doesn't know how to sift through that matter. Commissioner Oickle said that he did not think that the town could regulate length of stay in a hotel. Mr. Gillespie agreed.

Vice-Chairman Forsdick said that there are a few places on the Berlin Turnpike that have been making an effort to restore their properties, and that even though length of stay cannot be regulated, things like safety and wiring can be.

Commissioner Oickle commented that there is new construction in Rocky Hill, a proposed Residence Inn, with kitchen facilities. Commissioner Leombruni suggested that a standard be put in place, perhaps even with the building department. Mr. Gillespie said that this would require thinking bigger, and the council is currently just dealing with the specific wording in the regulations.

- Workshop

Mr. Gillespie invited the commissioners to a forum/workshop sponsored by the Town Manager at 5 p.m. on Wednesday night at the Community Center. The forum will feature the Town Manager from South Windsor who is credited with some of the economic development initiatives in that town.

- Other properties

Commissioner Oickle asked about the Hughes Brothers site. Mr. Gillespie explained that they are waiting for their building permit. Also, Office Depot is still working on some of their detailed plans in order to receive their building permit. Foodways on the Silas Deane Highway has been looked at, but no one has come in with a plan to date. Mr. Gillespie informed the commission that the Stop and Shop site could change over in early October.

Chairman Hammer asked for additional correspondence. Mr. Gillespie said that he had emailed some information to the members about Wednesday's forum and if they did not get it, to let him know.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman Hammer asked if there was any other correspondence or other business. Seeing none, Chairman Hammer asked if there was motion to adjourn.

Vice-Chairman Forsdick made a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Leombruni seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously (7-0).

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Philip Knecht, Clerk