

WETHERSFIELD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
PUBLIC HEARING
January 22, 2007

The Wethersfield Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing on January 22, 2007 at 7:00 PM in the Police Department Community Room, 250 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

PRESENT: Thomas J. Vaughan, Jr., Vice Chairman
Bruce T. Bockstael, Clerk
Gina P. DeAngelo
George McKee
Mike Wrona, Alternate
Frank Dellaripa, Alternate
Matt Cholewa, Alternate

ABSENT: Morris R. Borea, Chairman

Also Present: Brian O'Connor, Chief Building Inspector

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. opened the meeting at 7:00PM. Before the meeting started, the public was welcomed to speak regarding anything except specific cases in the past or on the night's agenda. There was no one present who wished to speak.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. explained that once the hearing portion is closed no more comments will be accepted.

APPLICATION NO. 5967-07 Mark & Lisa DiMattia seeking a variance to construct a garage addition not having the required side yard at 456 Hartford Avenue, east side, B Residence Zone (§3.7).

Mark DiMattia, 456 Hartford Avenue, Wethersfield, CT appeared before the Board requesting a side yard set back variance. He stated that the variance would be approximately a 3'- 4' variance on the northwest corner of the garage. He stated that the existing garage is 17' off the corner of the property line; and they are trying to add a 22' bay garage and match the exiting depth of the garage which is 22'.

He stated that he feels that they have a two part hardship. He stated that the property is narrow in the front with a 60' wide front yard and the grade of the property falls away to the left and in the back from behind the garage. So if you are at the front of the home you are at zero and if you are at the back basement door you are at minus 6' and it keeps dropping another 3'- 4' feet as you go further back. He stated that they did try and look at other options however because of the grade no other options were really feasible.

He stated that as far as adjacent land, it is open land. He is not sure if it is Town owned land or nature reserve property but it is open land along with adjacent gas line that runs to the bottom of the hill on the property. So as far as a future home being built next to his property it is not possible.

He stated that he spoke to his neighbor at 450 Hartford Avenue and the neighbor in back of him and they do not have any problem with this variance.

He entered into the record pictures of the home a few years ago with upgrades that he has done on the home; adding that he is trying to keep the home consistent with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bockstael questioned if the addition will have the same line as the garage and will the peak be perpendicular to the house. Mr. DiMattia stated that yes and that they will actually be changing the pitch to 12 symmetrical.

Commissioner Bockstael confirmed that the only property that would be impacted is the Conn. Light & Power property. Mr. DiMattia stated that he is not sure if this is Town property or C L & P property.

Commissioner DeAngelo questioned if C L & P is across the street also. Mr. DiMattia stated that this was correct.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. questioned the amount of the variance. Mr. O'Connor confirmed that this would be a 3'- 4' variance.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to this application.

APPLICATION NO. 5968-07 John Anagnos seeking a variance to erect 2 (two) signs which will exceed the maximum allowed square footage at 887 Silas Deane Highway, east side, Regional Commercial Zone (§6.3).

Brian Gondek, Gondek Construction appeared before the Board on behalf of John Anagnos, City Fish Market seeking a variance to erect two signs. Mr. Gondek stated that he is the foreman on the construction job.

Mr. Gondek showed the sign that they are requesting to put up. He stated that it is a styrofoam base sign with a stucco base over it. He stated that there will be individual letters that will be attached to the building; adding that this will go over 34.11 square feet. He stated that Mr. Anagnos is requesting that 2 signs be put up; one 32 square feet in the rear of the building, which means that we are 2.11 square feet over in the front of the building. He stated that there is a sign on the side of the building that Mr. Anagnos is willing to get rid of which is 17.955 square feet; he stated that he really does not want to lose it but will if it means getting these two new signs.

Commissioner Bockstael confirmed that the issue before this Board is the interpretation of the allowable square footage. Mr. O'Connor stated that this applicant has three existing signs on the building that total 95 square feet, and they want to add two additional signs on the addition that is being constructed. One will be in the back and one will be in the front and the total will be 64 square feet added to the 95 square feet already there; which brings them to about 159 square feet. He stated that the maximum square footage of signage on a building cannot exceed 125 square feet, so he is roughly 34 square feet over.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. confirmed that he would be over that no matter the size of the signage. Mr. O'Connor stated that this was correct; the maximum signage is only 125 square feet.

Commissioner Bockstael stated that he is confused as he reads Mr. Peter Gillespie's letter. Mr. O'Connor stated that the way it is written in the zoning regulations was not the intent of the Planning and Zoning Commission back in 2004 when they went over the sign regulations and they said that their conclusion or their intent was to have 125 square feet maximum sign on a building or signage total on a building.

Commissioner Cholewa questioned how it is written in the zoning regulations. Mr. O'Connor stated that the zoning regulations basically say maximum per sign; almost like one sign can be 125 square feet. So if you have a huge building, you can have, if you follow the 2 square foot per linear foot, a lot more than 125 square feet, and that was not how the Planning and Zoning Commission read it or how they wanted it to be, so maximum is 125 square feet.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. questioned why he needs any additional signage, adding that the signage that is there now is very visible from the street. Mr. Gondek stated that it is more like a piece of art than a sign. He stated that it probably will not help his business any more. He stated that it is just something that he wanted to add to the new addition; adding that it is the same logo that is on the side of all his trucks.

Commissioner DeAngelo questioned why the sign on the back of the building. Mr. Gondek stated that he really cannot answer that; it cannot be seen from Route 3, it cannot be seen from anyway, the condo's in the back block it from any street. He stated that it is just something that Mr. Anagnos asked for so he is here requesting the variance.

Commissioner Cholewa stated that he is looking at the definition of a sign in the zoning regulations, and it states at the end "in which it's situated so that it can be seen from a public street." So, he questioned if this is really even a sign if it cannot be seen from a public street. Mr. O'Connor stated that he considers it a sign. Commissioner Cholewa stated that it really does not meet the definition of a sign in the zoning regulations. Mr. O'Connor stated again, that he considers this a sign.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. questioned what they would be over with one sign. Commissioner Bockstael stated that they would be over 2.11 square feet with the one sign.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak in favor of or opposition to this application.

APPLICATION NO. 5969-07 Barbara Fabian seeking a variance to erect (two) signs which will exceed the maximum allowed square footage at 263 Main Street, west side, Village Business Zone (§6.3).

Richard and Barbara Fabian, 16 Lakeview Drive, West Hartford, CT appeared before the Board seeking to erect two signs. Mr. Fabian stated that he would like to erect two signs; one small sign which is approximately 30" x 33" on an existing post. He stated that they would like to simply replicate the existing sign. He stated that the second sign would go on the face of the building and would be to the right of the sash window; in the blank space.

Commissioner Bockstael questioned the size of the second sign. Mr. Fabian stated that at a meeting with the Historic Commission they made a suggestion that his original size of the sign would be too small. He stated that since that meeting he brought in a letter to change the size of the second sign to be approximately 4.5' x 5'. He stated that the construction of the sign would replicate the existing signage on the building.

Commissioner Vaughan, Jr. questioned if this is the same situation as the previous application. Mr. O'Connor stated that it was. He stated that the signage on the face of the building already exceeds the maximum allowed signage. He stated that 30 square feet is all the signage that they can have as a detached sign. He stated that they are well over that now. Mrs. Fabian stated for the record that Comstock Ferre is over that. Mr. O'Connor stated that this was correct.

Mr. Fabian stated that they just want to make people aware that they are occupying the second floor of the Comstock Ferre building.

Commissioner Cholewa questioned how old the existing signs are. Mr. Fabian stated that he is not sure but the Company has been in business for over 195 years. Commissioner Cholewa stated that these are historic signs then that you would not want to have to take down and put different signs back up. Mr. and Mrs. Fabian stated that this was correct, and that is why they plan on making their sign replicate the signs that are already up. Commissioner Cholewa questioned approximately how far the building is set back from the street. Mr. Fabian stated that it is probably a good 250 feet. Commissioner Cholewa questioned if any of the other buildings are set back from the street that far. Mr. Fabian stated that this is the only building that is set back that far from the street.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. questioned how they are affiliated with Comstock Ferre. Mr. Fabian stated that there is no legal affiliation with Comstock Ferre.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. confirmed that they are looking for a variance for two signs; however, one is attached to the building. Mr. Fabian stated that this was correct; adding that they think that the sign that is going to be on the building is the sign that they need approval for. Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. asked Mr. O'Connor to confirm this. Mr. O'Connor stated that any sign that is added to the building, because the building is already legal non conforming signage wise, needs to get a variance, but because of the 1square foot per linear foot even the detach sign needs to come before the Board for approval.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. questioned if there were any other alternatives that can be done. Mr. O'Connor stated there really are no other alternatives.

Commissioner Bockstael confirmed that the variance they are looking for is approximately 6 square feet for the detached sign and approximately 20 square feet for the building sign. Mr. O'Connor stated that the detached sign is almost 7 square feet and the building sign is approximately 22.5 - 25 square feet.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

There was no one in the audience who wished to speak in favor of or in opposition to this application.

APPLICATION NO. 5970-07 Access America - Wethersfield, Inc. seeking to appeal the decision of the Building Official's order requiring an application to the Planning & Zoning Commission for approval of the electronic message center portion of the detached sign as per §6.3.I.2 of the Zoning Regulations at 449 Silas Deane Highway, west side, Office Zone (§6.3).

Attorney Randy McCue, 160 Farmington Avenue, Farmington, CT, Mr. Dan Thibodeau and Mr. John Zubretsky, 449 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, CT appeared before the Board appealing the Building Official's order. Atty. McCue stated that this is a case involving a sign which is located at 449 Silas Deane Highway. He stated that they applied for this sign with the Design Review Advisory Committee and they approved this sign. He submitted for the record minutes of the April 19, 2006 meeting which approved this sign. He stated that they are appealing the cease and desist order under which it is ordered that the electronic message portion of the sign be turned off until either they go before the Planning and Zoning Commission to have it approved or until they get an appeal of the order sustained.

Attorney McCue and Mr. Thibodeau stated that when they first wanted to put the sign on the property Mr. Thibodeau went to the Zoning Office and spoke with Mr. Gillespie and Ms. Bradley, adding that this was back in March. Mr. Thibodeau stated that he asked a lot of questions about what was required for the sign and what needed to be done with regards to zoning regulations. They thought, at the time, that no P & Z was required, that it would go before the Design Review Advisory Board. He stated that they gave him a schedule of the meeting.

Attorney McCue stated that Mr. Thibodeau went to the April 19 meeting with the Design Review Advisory Board with pictures of the proposed sign and the existing sign. Mr. Thibodeau stated that he has his notes from that meeting.

Attorney McCue showed for the record two colored pictures, one of the proposed sign and the other of the sign as it existing at the time of that April 19 meeting. He stated that this was presented at that meeting. He stated that, as you can see, this picture does show the electronic messaging that is now in question.

Attorney McCue stated from the minutes of that meeting that Ms. Denise Bradley stated "in accordance with Section 6.3I.2 that flashing lights and intensity variance lights are not permitted unless specifically approved by the Commission" He stated that the minutes then go on to say that you would need to work with the Town to make proper light adjustments if necessary after installment. A motion was made to approve the application with the stipulation that Century 21 would need to work with the Town to make proper light adjustments if necessary after the installation of the sign. The motion was seconded and all members voted in favor. He stated that their understanding after this meeting was that this sign was approved subject to modifications of the lighting if necessary. He stated that they also subsequently received a letter dated April 24, 2006 signed by Mr. Gillespie stating that the sign was approved with that stipulation. He stated that after receiving this letter the Sign Company from New Hampshire then applied for the application for the permit, once the permit was received the sign was installed.

Attorney McCue stated that the sign was paid for after receiving the permit. Mr. Zubretsky stated that the sign was, hard cost \$43,000 but with the incidentals, etc the total cost came close to \$50,000. Attorney McCue questioned Mr. Zubretsky that if this sign cannot be used would he be harmed economically in any way. Mr. Zubretsky stated absolutely; adding that if they just put in a free standing sign it would have only cost approximately \$5,000. Attorney McCue questioned Mr. Zubretsky if he is willing to work with the Town to adjust the lights as Mr. Gillespie's letter states. Mr. Zubretsky stated that he indicated to the Town that he would be, however, no one has asked to meet with him.

Attorney McCue stated that his case is that they were already approved for the sign, a permit was issued and now they are being asked to go before the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that his client has spent a lot of money on this sign; and now they are being asked to go before the Planning and Zoning Commission in the hope that it will **BE approved**. He stated that they are looking for relief from the cease and desist order that is imposed on them.

Commissioner Bockstael stated that his understanding of the Design and Review Committee; is just that, a Review Committee and they have no authority to make decisions on behalf of the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that as the minutes show the Chairman of that Committee was absent at that meeting. He stated that as he looks at the minutes he is shocked that the Committee made a stipulation with regards to the adjustments, because this Committee has not authorization to make such decisions.

Mr. Thibodeau stated that in defense of Ms. Bradley and the Committee, he feels that everyone was looking at something that they have never seen before and asked and answered questions to the best of their ability. He stated that when he walked out of the meeting he remembers calling Mr. Zubretsky and telling him that the meeting went well they then received the letter a few days later.

Commissioner Cholewa questioned what type of application was made and who the application was made to that resulted in this meeting with Design Review Committee. Mr. O'Connor stated that the application was made to the Design Review Committee. Commissioner Cholewa stated that it was his understanding that there were never applications made to the Design Review Committee because they were only advisory to Planning and Zoning and that there would have to be a Planning and Zoning application that was sent to them with a referral. He stated that there had to be a piece of paper, an application that was made to the Town. Mr. O'Connor stated that in the Planning Department there is a form that needs to be filled out that goes before the Design Review Committee. Mr. Thibodeau stated that he can honestly say that he does not remember filling out an actual formal application. Mr. O'Connor stated that, in this case with a sign, anything that goes on the exterior before it goes to Planning and Zoning it goes to Design Review and Design Review will look at it and maybe make adjustments.

Commissioner Cholewa questioned if Design Review can look at things that do not go to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. O'Connor stated that this was correct. Commissioner Cholewa confirmed that a building permit was issued. Mr. O'Connor stated that this was correct. Commissioner Cholewa questioned how a cease and desist order can be issued if the Town issued a building permit. Mr. O'Connor stated that the Town Attorney is here to discuss this. However, he stated that a building permit was issued based on how the application was written, he stated that a plan was issued, however, when it came across his desk, unfortunately for whatever reason, he did not see the plan. He stated that he issued the permit based on the verbiage of the application.

Commissioner Wrona questioned Mr. Thibodeau who he spoke with at the Zoning Office. Mr. Thibodeau stated that he went on March 10 and spoke with Mr. Gillespie and Ms. Bradley. Commissioner Wrona stated that he was aware then that he needed to submit an application of some sort in order to have approval to put up the sign. Mr. Thibodeau stated that that was why he was there, to find out how to go about getting approval for the sign. He was told at that point to go to the Design Review Committee and then if there are any questions or problems then he would have to go to the next step and go before the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that when they went to the Design Review Committee they received approval for the sign.

Commissioner DeAngelo stated that the building permit application states that the purpose was "to install a new sign, ground sign using existing base", however, it did not say anything at all about illuminating. Attorney McCue stated that that application was filled out by the Sign Company in New Hampshire and he has the letter stating that the sign was approved with the lighting.

Commissioner DeAngelo questioned if permits are issued based on the application. Mr. O'Connor stated that in most cases yes, however, in all fairness to the applicant, a plan was submitted; however, in this case, for whatever reason, I did not see the plan. Had I seen the plan, I would have denied it right away because we have not allowed this type of sign in the last eight years that I have been here. We have never permitted neon, blinking signs. Therefore if the verbiage was on the application then it would have been denied, however, it was unfortunate that I did not see the plans.

Commissioner Wrona confirmed that the plan did specify that it was an illuminated sign. Mr. O'Connor stated that it did.

Commissioner Wrona questioned how often the sign changes. Mr. Zubretsky stated that it changes approximately every 6 minutes which is the maximum allowed by the software. Commissioner Wrona stated that the minutes of the Design Review Committee states that the sign would not change.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. stated that the Board needs to remember that we are here to see if the Building Official has the authority to do a cease and desist order; not to approve or deny the sign.

Attorney McCue stated that what they applied for is what they purchased and now with the cease and desist they are being told to undo or stop doing what they thought and what it looks like they received approval for. Now, at this point, after having spent considerable sums of money there is a cease and desist order. Now we are being told to go before the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval when it was just said tonight that there has never been an approval for an illuminated sign. Mr. O'Connor stated for the record that he stated that his department has never issued a building permit for neon, flashing signs; this would have been sent to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval.

Attorney McCue stated that his client never would have spent that kind of money on something that was not pre approved. He stated that his client did everything right and everything that they thought they had to do.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

Attorney Ben Gettinger, Rome, McGuigan, 100 State Street, Hartford, CT appeared before the Board on behalf of Chief Building Official Brian O'Connor. Attorney Gettinger started by reading Regulation 6.3-A. He stated that ordinarily two requirements need to be met in order for a sign permit to be issued. The first is that all permanent signs shall be reviewed by the Design Review Advisory Committee for conformance of the design guidelines of these regulations prior to the issuance of the sign permit. The second is all permanent signs shall obtain a sign permit from the zoning enforcement official before the sign is erected. He stated that the regulations have a third requirement for certain signs and that requirement, as recently discussed, is there shall be no flashing, intermittent, intensity variance of lights or exposed neon lights permitted unless specifically approved by the Commission. He stated that without a doubt this sign is either flashing intermittent or intensity bearing. He stated that usually you do not have the ability to see the sign before it is erected, but I think that everyone here has driven by the sign, and to have someone come up here and say that the Commission's approval is not required because it is not flashing, intermittent, intensity bearing is quite frankly disingenuous. He stated that he understands that there is some interpretation allowed, however, this is clearly the type of sign that requires the Commission's approval.

Attorney Gettinger stated that he agrees that the permit was issued, however, the issue is whether it was issued in violation of the regulation. He stated that it is without dispute that it was issued in violation of the regulation because the Commission did not approve it. He stated that regarding the Design Review Advisory Committee, that is what it is, an Advisory Committee, it does not have the authority to issue these types of permits. He stated that that is what is at the heart of this issue.

Attorney Gettinger stated that with regard to the economic hardship, he feels that that argument is a bit premature because you do not know what the Planning and Zoning Commission will decide. He stated the cease and desist order is not saying that the sign is in violation of the regulations; he stated that it is saying that the sign was issued in violation of the regulations. It is saying that the Planning and Zoning Commission should have the opportunity to review the application because they have that specific requirement to insure the public health and safety for certain signs.

Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. questioned whose responsibility is it to see that the regulations have been followed; is it the Town's responsibility or the Applicant's responsibility. Attorney Gettinger stated that it is up to the Town, however, with a Town of this size; errors will be made, and things will fall through the cracks. That is why there is a system in place and that system is that the Building Official can place a cease and desist order; the applicant can go to you and argue the case. He stated that the question here is if Brian O'Connor has the authority to issue a cease and desist order

and the answer is of course he has the authority. He issued the cease and desist order because a permit was issued in violation of the regulations.

Commissioner Cholewa questioned that if the town issues a building permit and what is built is in accordance with the permit; you can pull the permit. Attorney Gettinger stated absolutely, if someone without authority approves that application. Commissioner Cholewa questioned what if the Building Official approved the permit. Attorney Gettinger stated if something was issued in error then the Building Official has the right to do a cease and desist.

There were no further questions.

Mr. Joseph Hammer, Planning and Zoning Commission, Wethersfield, CT appeared before the Board urging the Board to deny this application and vote in favor of the zoning regulations; adding that the regulations do not permit the flashing lights without the Planning and Zoning Commissions approval. He stated that yes it is unfortunate that this fell through the cracks but it still needs to go through the process. He stated that the statement by Denise Bradley in the minutes "needs Commission approval" applies to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He stated that this applicant, like everyone else needs to go through the process. He stated that Mr. O'Connor's order was very reasonable; in the next 15 days submit an application - they did not want to do that.

Attorney McCue asked if he can speak again. He stated for the record that the permit was issued. The problem is if it gets approved or not approved. If it is not approved then there will be real economic damages. He stated that they were told that all they needed was approval from the Design Review Committee; they received that approval. He stated that the applicant has done everything they should do; they went to the Building Department and asked what was needed. He stated that his client would not have built the sign had he known that they had to go another step.

There were no further questions or comments from the Board.

WETHERSFIELD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VICE CHAIRMAN VAUGHAN, JR.

Commissioner Bockstael, Clerk

**WETHERSFIELD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
PUBLIC MEETING
January 22, 2007**

The Wethersfield Zoning Board of Appeals held a public hearing on January 22, 2007 at 7:00 PM in the Police Department Community Room, 250 Silas Deane Highway, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

PRESENT: Thomas J. Vaughan, Jr., Vice Chairman
Bruce T. Bockstael, Clerk
Gina P. DeAngelo
George McKee
Mike Wrona, Alternate
Frank Dellaripa, Alternate
Matt Cholewa, Alternate

ABSENT: Morris R. Borea, Chairman

Also Present: Brian O'Connor, Chief Building Inspector

DECISIONS FROM PUBLIC HEARING

Voting Members: Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr., Commissioner Bockstael, Commissioner DeAngelo, Commissioner

McKee, and Commissioner Cholewa.

APPLICATION NO. 5967-07 Mark & Lisa DiMattia seeking a variance to construct a garage addition not having the required side yard at 456 Hartford Avenue, east side, B Residence Zone (§3.7).

Upon motion made by Commissioner Bockstael, seconded by Commissioner DeAngelo and a poll of the Board it was unanimously voted that the above application **BE APPROVED** as submitted.

Voting Members: Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr., Commissioner Bockstael, Commissioner DeAngelo, Commissioner McKee, and Commissioner Cholewa.

APPLICATION NO. 5968-07 John Anagnos seeking a variance to erect 2 (two) signs which will exceed the maximum allowed square footage at 887 Silas Deane Highway, east side, Regional Commercial Zone (§6.3).

Upon motion made by Commissioner Bockstael, seconded by Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. and a poll of the Board it was unanimously voted that the above application **BE APPROVED** with the following stipulations:

1. To allow the front sign as presented being 2.11 square feet over the allowable maximum.
2. The rear wall sign cannot be seen from a public street, therefore it is not considered a sign.

Voting Members: Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr., Commissioner Bockstael, Commissioner DeAngelo, Commissioner McKee, and Commissioner Cholewa.

APPLICATION NO. 5969-07 Barbara Fabian seeking a variance to erect (two) signs which will exceed the maximum allowed square footage at 263 Main Street, west side, Village Business Zone (§6.3).

Upon motion made by Commissioner Bockstael seconded by Commissioner Cholewa and a poll of the Board it was unanimously voted that the above application **BE APPROVED** with the following stipulation:

1. Pending the Historic District Commission approval of the sign.

Voting Members: Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr., Commissioner DeAngelo, Commissioner McKee, Commissioner Cholewa, and Commissioner Dellaripa

APPLICATION NO. 5970-07 Access America - Wethersfield, Inc. seeking to appeal the decision of the Building Official's order requiring an application to the Planning & Zoning Commission for approval of the electronic message center portion of the detached sign as per for §6.3.I.2 of the Zoning Regulations at 449 Silas Deane Highway, west side, Office Zone (§6.3).

Upon motion made by Commissioner DeAngelo seconded by Commissioner McKee and a poll of the Board it was unanimously voted that the above application **BE DENIED**.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Upon motion made by Vice Chairman Vaughan, Jr. seconded by Commissioner DeAngelo and a poll of the Board it was unanimously voted that [the minutes of December 18, 2006](#) **BE APPROVED**.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 PM.

**WETHERSFIELD ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
VICE CHAIRMAN VAUGHAN, JR.**

Commissioner Bockstael, Clerk