

# November 10, 2008

## Special Meeting

7:30 p.m. Land Use Meeting Room

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Mr. Abella, Mr. Averill, Mr. Fitzherbert, Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Owen

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Mr. DuBois, Mr. Shapiro, Mr. Wyant

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mr. Ajello, Mrs. Hill

**ALSO PRESENT:** Mr. Adams, Mr./Mrs. Federer, Atty. Hill, Atty. McTaggart, Atty. Fisher, Mr. Szymanski, Mr. Klauer, Mr. Carey, Mrs. Clark, Mr. Papsin, Mrs. Hardee, Mrs. Addicks, Mr. Charles, Mr. Doherty, Mr./Mrs. Rickart, Mr. Miller, Mr./Mrs. Solomon, Ms. Giampietro, Residents, Mrs. Peacocke, Press

## Wykeham Rise, LLC./101 Wykeham Road/Special Permit: Section 13.9 and 4.4.1/Inn

Mr. Owen called the Meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and seated Members Abella, Averill, Fitzherbert, Friedman, and Owen.

Mr. Owen said that after consulting with Atty. Zizka, he would suggest that the Commission not vote tonight on this application, even if after discussion there was a clear consensus. He said this would give Atty. Zizka the opportunity to review either the reasons for denial or conditions of approval for whichever decision the Commission would make.

Mr. Owen explained how he would proceed with the deliberation of this application. He thought the issues most important to the Commission should be identified and prioritized so that time was not spent on those that were not important.

## Legal Issues

Mr. Owen noted there had been three legal issues raised; 1) the conservation easement, 2) CGS 8-2h, and 3) interpretation of Section 13.9 of the Zoning Regulations. He said that Atty. Zizka had advised him that the first two issues were beyond the Commission's ability to resolve and so should be excluded from the deliberations. Mr. Shapiro said he had understood that the Commission should not base a decision solely on any one of these matters, but could reference them in its motion. He thought it was within the Commission's rights to consider them since the Special Permit criteria in Section 13.1.B would not necessarily touch on these issues. Mr. Owen said this was correct, but he preferred to discuss these legal issues later.

Mrs. Hill encouraged the commissioners to use the Special Permit process to focus and organize their consideration of the application. She stated that inns are permitted in the R-1 district only by Special Permit and that Special Permits are site specific. She stated that since only uses that are suitable and appropriate for the location and property where they are proposed may be approved by Special Permit, the Commission should examine each of the criteria in Section 13.B.1 and determine whether the proposed inn complies with each.

#### Definition of Inn

Mr. Owen noted the definition of “inn” was an issue. He asked, is this an application for an inn?

Mr. Averill noted the Commission had an open ended definition of inn. He was bothered that the proposed inn would include a retail outlet in the main building because retail sales are not permitted in the R-1 district. While it was not known exactly what would be sold there, Mr. Owen thought it would be a retail space like those typically found in hotels and inns.

Mrs. Friedman asked why he thought the retail outlet was a concern, but not the proposed spa, restaurant, or fitness center, none of which are uses permitted in the R-1 district. Mr. Averill said he was concerned about all of these uses because the applicant had stated they would be open to the public, not just to guests of the inn. Mr. Fitzherbert noted the Mayflower Inn has a retail area.

Mr. Shapiro referred to the 11/10/08 letter from Atty. Zizka, which, he said, helped him to put in context the question of whether the proposed establishment is an inn. He said many comparisons had been made to the Mayflower and in light of those, it would be difficult to say this application is not for an inn. However, according to Atty. Zizka’s letter, because this is a Special Permit application, whatever the Commission may have allowed at one site sets no precedent for any other site. He said the Mayflower Inn was a different case with different circumstances than the current application. Mr. Owen pointed out that if it was determined that the two sites were similar, he would worry if the Mayflower was treated as an inn, but the proposed inn was found to be something beyond the definition of inn. He noted the Commission had accepted a spa, tennis court, restaurant, and bar at the Mayflower, although this did not mean that the Mayflower would be permitted anywhere in the R-1 district. Mr. Shapiro said the two sites were not substantially similar and that was an important consideration. Mr. Owen agreed that an inn could be acceptable in one location in the R-1, but not another and that inns had to be judged in the context of the site for which they were proposed. He said he believed the current application was for an inn as the Commission has interpreted its Regulations since the early 1990’s and that a retail use was included at the Mayflower.

Mrs. Friedman noted that however “inn” was defined, it had been considered in the same category as tourist home and it had not been deleted from the regs along with hotel and motel. She thought since hotels and motels had been deleted from even the commercial districts, it made no sense to think a use more intense than a hotel or motel would now be permitted in a residential district. She read the definition of tourist home, which last appeared in the Regs in 1978 and she referred to Mrs. Peacocke’s 10/27/08 letter in which she addressed the definition of inn. Mr. Owen said it could be argued that the definition of tourist home had been removed because no inns met that definition. Mr. Shapiro noted that the uses left in the business districts, room and board and bed and breakfast establishments were relatively less in scope and scale than the inn now proposed in the residential district. He did not think it probable that the Commission would allow a more intense use in the R-1 district than in a business district. Mr. Fitzherbert noted that Washington’s inns are country inns and they could not be expected to be located in a business district. Mr. Owen agreed that throughout the Town’s history, inns had not been located in the business

districts.

Mr. Fitzherbert thought the proposed establishment was an inn under the Regulations. He said he had researched resorts and had found they offer more amenities and have many more rooms than the proposed inn. Mr. Owen noted that if the Commission did not consider this to be an inn, there was no need for further discussion.

#### Lot Coverage

Mr. Owen asked if the commissioners were satisfied that the plans received are within the 10% maximum lot coverage allowed under the Regulations.

Mr. Owen said he viewed the access with grass pavers going down to the detention pond as an extension of the driveway and said it should be counted as lot coverage. Otherwise, he noted there had been an independent evaluation of the plan and lot coverage under 10% had been confirmed.

Mr. Shapiro said a more significant issue was the final plan, "Overflow Parking," which showed an additional 55 parking spaces. He read from the definition of "Lot Coverage" in Section 21 and said it did not differentiate between parking on pavement or on grass or how often it would be used; that it all counted as lot coverage. He asked why these spaces had not been included in the coverage calculations.

Mr. Fitzherbert asked if the Commission required overflow parking. Mrs. Friedman said the applicant had chosen to apply for it. Mr. Shapiro said it was the applicant's final plan. Mr. Wyant thought an overflow parking area was better than overflow parking along Wykeham Road.

Mr. Owen did not think the Commission treated overflow parking as lot coverage anywhere else in Town. He gave The Gunnery School and private homes that have parties as examples.

Mr. Shapiro thought the overflow parking was a welcome addition because the 103 parking spaces originally proposed had not been a realistic number and their inclusion had been an acknowledgment that there was, indeed, a need for additional parking. He guessed it would be used more often than not. Mr. Owen noted the applicant did not expect to use all of the spaces. Mr. Shapiro thought the applicant's expectations were not credible given the proposed scope of the project. Mrs. Friedman noted that parking considerations should be site specific and she questioned why the applicant proposed to put limits on some of the proposed uses such as the function room, if he thought he had provided adequate parking spaces. Mr. Owen asked if there was evidence the maximum number of parking spaces should be provided, noting the fire and health codes would control the number of patrons. Mrs. Friedman asked, since the applicant said the function room would be limited to a capacity of 50, why the room wasn't decreased to a size that would be limited to 50 per the Fire Marshal. Mr. Fitzherbert noted there could be many uses for the function room that might require the larger size. Mr. Owen said he would consult with Atty. Zizka regarding how the Commission should treat the capacity of this facility.

Relating to parking demand, Mrs. Friedman listed the number of non handicapped parking spaces near the main building: 56, and the capacities of the uses which they were to serve: 24 guest rooms, 92 seat bar-restaurant, 38 person capacity spa, 50 person capacity function

room, and fitness center. She noted these figures did not include staff and thought that even assuming there was some overlap of patrons, the 56 spaces provided were not adequate to handle the 204 person occupancy. Mr. Fitzherbert pointed out that not all of the uses would be at full capacity at the same time of day. He thought it was unreasonable not to take the applicant at his word regarding occupancy. Mrs. Friedman noted the number of self imposed limitations by the applicant in order to justify the number of proposed parking spaces. Mr. Fitzherbert and Mr. Owen said those were examples of the applicant's responsiveness to the Commission's concerns. Mrs. Friedman noted that when the Commission had decided not to hire a consultant to review the application, the commissioners had been told they could use their good judgment and common sense to do so.

Mr. Shapiro stated that the Zoning Commission has a range of discretion in its parking regulations and noted that the applicant had originally chosen to base the number of parking spaces on the minimum requirement per square footage, which was 103. He noted that what is now proposed exceeds the maximum per the Regulations, which is 146. He thought 146 seemed like a more realistic number based on occupancy rates, public use of the spa and restaurant, employee shifts, etc. and so was glad to see the number of spaces had been increased.

Mr. Fitzherbert asked if anyone in Town had ever been told he could not park on grass. It was agreed the answer was, no. Mr. Owen noted the intent of the parking regulations was to urge applicants to pave as little as possible rather than to create impervious surfaces to accommodate infrequent maximum uses. Mr. Averill said he had understood the overflow parking plan was to alleviate fears that there would be parking along Wykeham Road. Mrs. Friedman stated that the current definition of lot coverage has nothing to do with whether or not there is pavement, but only whether or not there is parking there. She said it was parking no matter how often it was used, that it was necessary overflow parking, and that it should be counted as lot coverage.

Mrs. Friedman noted there was no driveway to get to the overflow parking and asked how it would be accessed considering the east entrance was supposed to be for emergency vehicles only. Mr. Ajello said the area was a grassy meadow with a hard base.

Mr. Fitzherbert was satisfied there was adequate parking without the overflow and suggested the Commission condition approval on the removal of the overflow parking area.

The access to the detention pond was again briefly discussed. Mrs. Friedman noted that Mr. Goodin said the slope down to the pond was 17% and that pavers were necessary to stabilize it. Mr. Owen said this was a wetlands issue and that the applicant had told the Commission the pond could be serviced without the pavers. Mr. Ajello noted that pavers are shown on the plans for this access. Mr. Owen said if the access to the pond had definite edges and pavers it would be an extension of the driveway and count as coverage. Mr. Owen read a portion of Atty. Zizka's 10/20/08 letter, which stated a grass access to be used for annual maintenance would not count as lot coverage. Mrs. Friedman stated this did not change her view because to be consistent with the definition of lot coverage, it did not matter whether it was paved or not, it counts as coverage.

Mrs. Friedman discussed the walkways, which would be composed of porous pavement. She said she understood from reading the definition of lot coverage that only those walkways constructed of the porous materials listed would be exempt from lot coverage. Mr. Owen disagreed, saying the use of the phrase, "such as," meant there were porous materials other than those given as examples that would exempt walkways from coverage. The maintenance of permeable walkways was briefly discussed, although Mr. Owen noted that the Regulations did not address this matter. It was also noted that the Regs do not address the width of walkways, but Mr. Owen thought that 4 feet wide was

reasonable.

#### 13.1.B.1: Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD).

Mr. Shapiro noted that the POCD and the Zoning Regulations are consistent regarding the goal of the R-1 district and he read Section 4.1 of the Zoning Regulations, Purpose. R-1, Farming and Residential District. He thought it could be argued that the purpose stated in 4.1 was one of the three key goals of the POCD; to preserve the rural character of the district. While Atty. Zizka did not think the POCD was a controlling factor, Mrs. Friedman thought it should be an important consideration since Washington residents had put so much effort into it. She read the definition of rural character from the POCD.

Mr. Owen stated that inns were permitted by Special Permit in the R-1 district and the framers did not find that inconsistent. Mr. Shapiro said that revived the question in his mind of scope, scale, and size and what an inn is. Mr. Owen thought the POCD could be used to support anything and so recommended it would be a stronger case to cite the Zoning Regulations. Mrs. Friedman read Section 4.1 again and said it should take precedence.

Mr. Owen noted this section would be discussed again later.

#### 13.1.B.2: Location, Type, Character, Size, Scale, Proportion, Appearance, and Intensity

Mr. Shapiro noted the applicant claimed that the type and character of the proposal was institutional and so consistent with the POCD, but he thought it was decidedly commercial and not in keeping with the R-1 district. Mr. Owen thought this area of the POCD was vague because institutional uses were referenced on maps, but not defined. Mr. Shapiro thought the proposed use was so intensely commercial that it raised questions about its appropriateness for the orderly development of the neighborhood and the Town. Mr. Averill agreed, saying size, scale, and proportion were his main concerns. He did not give much weight to arguments that the Wykeham Rise School was grandfathered. He noted it was questionable whether it could have been built under the current Regulations because it is out of scale and proportion with everything else on Wykeham Road. Mrs. Friedman shared Mr. Averill's concern. She said the comparison made to Bryan Plaza put the size of the proposed main building in perspective and it was difficult for her to accept a 20,000 sq. ft. footprint and thirteen other buildings, many of which were larger than the moderate sized homes nearby, as fitting in with the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Owen noted that the Commission had approved other larger buildings, for example, at Rumsey Hall School. Mrs. Friedman asked why that was relevant and thought the question the Commission must consider was, is this location appropriate for all of the buildings proposed. Mr. Shapiro noted the Rumsey buildings were located in the context of a huge campus. Mrs. Friedman said in Rumsey's case, fewer neighbors were impacted.

Mr. Owen asked what the Commission thought about the argument that the large buildings would have little visual impact, and in fact, would be less visible from the road than the existing buildings on site. Mrs. Friedman stated it was not only the size, but the intensity of the use and the activity it would generate that were concerns.

Mr. Shapiro again compared the size of the proposed building to the Depot and then to the Montessori School. He noted that the Commission had required the Montessori building to be lowered, that no one really knows what a building will look like until it is up, and that he is aware of its “hulking presence” over the moderate houses in the area whenever he drives by. He said he would not like to see that happen again. Mr. Owen asked if the proposed building would be visual in the same way. Mr. Shapiro was not sure, but noted the building should be harmonious and fit in with the context of the existing residential neighborhood of moderate houses. Mr. Owen noted that the Zoning Commission had no concern about the construction of the Mayflower spa, which, he said was equally close to a neighborhood of small residential houses. He asked how the current application was different and if it mattered. Mrs. Friedman said this was a different application and Mr. Owen responded that the Commission could not be arbitrary. Mr. Averill noted that it is not just the size of the building, but the intensity of the use that must be considered.

Mr. Fitzherbert agreed that it was difficult to judge beforehand what the impact of the proposed building would be, but said he had reviewed the plans and was impressed by the use of the land and how the building would be set into the hill. He also thought that the applicant had put a lot of effort into giving the main building a rural appearance. He said that the character and appearance of the building were OK in his opinion, but that the size was questionable. Mr. Shapiro agreed there was no particular problem with the appearance, but he thought the size and scale were key, especially in the context of what surrounds it.

Mrs. Friedman noted that Section 13.1.B.2 also addresses the impairment of property values. She said there was one report from Mr. Hunter, which stated there was no objective data upon which to base a conclusion about the potential impact to neighboring properties, but there were three reports from other appraisers who found that the surrounding property values would be substantially negatively impacted. She read excerpts of the reports from Mr. O’Hazo and Mr. Kloss. Mr. Fitzherbert noted that this argument comes up all of the time, but asked if there were any actual examples in Town where approval of a project actually resulted in decreased property values. Mrs. Friedman thought this issue went beyond this particular property and neighborhood. She thought it was “crucial” because the people who move to Washington for tranquility believe the Commission will protect their residential neighborhoods from adverse impacts. Mr. Fitzherbert pointed out that tastes differ, and not everyone is attracted to Washington for peace and quiet. Mr. Owen thought the neighbors would endure more noise from a school than from the proposed inn and noted any use would be louder than the existing buildings. Mrs. Friedman stated the Regulations should be taken seriously. Mr. Owen said again that the Commission could not act arbitrarily. Mr. Shapiro stated that the file has three or four letters from appraisers who say the property values will decrease, and so thought the Commission could be skeptical of claims to the contrary.

Mr. Owen said the Commission would return to this subject.

#### Nature of Location, Fire and Emergency Services Protection

Mr. Owen noted that the Fire Marshal and Emergency Services had OK’d the application and said the Commission had no basis to disagree with them. Mr. Shapiro questioned whether Mr. Etherington had reviewed the final plans. Mr. Ajello and Mr. Owen both stated they had spoken with Mr. Etherington, who had based his evaluation on 16 ft. wide driveways. Mrs. Friedman said it was important to note that the plans he reviewed showed the 16 ft. wide driveway with adjacent 5 ft. wide walkways of the same material and at the same height as the driveway so they could have been used for emergency access. Mr. Ajello noted Mr. Etherington and the Fire Dept. had reviewed the plans

twice; once before and once after the east entrance had been eliminated. He said a turning template had been provided that showed the fire trucks can maneuver the turns and the bridge would not be taken out at the east entrance so that it could be used as an emergency access. Mr. Owen asked Mrs. Friedman if she had any issues with the Emergency Services report. She did not.

#### Adequacy of Existing Rural Road Network

Mr. Owen read Section 13.1.B.4.

Mr. Ajello stated that adequate off street parking and loading facilities had been provided. Mrs. Friedman disagreed, saying she had issues with the proposed loading facility.

Mr. Owen noted that it was clear from the testimony at the public hearing that traffic, adequacy of the proposed entrance-exit, and congestion were significant issues.

Mr. Shapiro suggested the east entrance had been eliminated due to lot coverage concerns. Mr. Owen said, no, this had been done to address sight line and safety issues raised at the public hearing. Mr. Shapiro questioned whether the proposed 17.5 ft. wide, two way west entrance with its stone balustrades on both sides was adequate. He thought that especially during peak hours it would create a bottleneck in the driveway and a backup on Wykeham Road for vehicles that would have to wait to turn in until cars in the driveway had exited. He thought the problem would be worse when two trucks attempted to use the entrance due to its narrowness, balustrades, and the entrance angle. Mr. Owen agreed the entrance was constricted and at a difficult angle. Mrs. Friedman noted it was true this entrance was existing, but said it had previously been for one way traffic only.

Regarding the capacity of the rural road network, Mr. Averill thought this would be one reason why a facility of this size should be on a state highway; a better road with better sight lines.

Mr. Owen noted the traffic consultant had found the inn would cause no change in the level of service rating for Wykeham Road. Mr. Shapiro did not think this was a relevant issue. Mr. Averill agreed.

Mr. Averill thought the capacity of Wykeham Road was a concern because the inn would generate an increase in traffic, including delivery trucks. Mr. Shapiro agreed, saying it had been estimated there would be 500 to 700 additional car trips per day and that increase in the volume of traffic would impact the capacity of the road as well as sight lines.

It was the consensus that congestion was a key issue, especially at the west entrance-exit. Mr. Owen questioned whether the road was adequate to accommodate the increase in traffic. He said, however, that issues raised such as dangerous intersections elsewhere on Wykeham Road have no bearing on this application, whereas whether the intensity of the proposed use would impact the rural road network was a relevant issue.

Mrs. Friedman said the existing rural road network includes the sight lines along Wykeham Road and that this concerned her because the

intersections with poor sight lines would become more dangerous as the volume of traffic increased. She also noted that Section 13.1.B.4 required that the application be evaluated in the context of the existing road and was not about changing the road to meet the needs of the application. Mr. Owen said the sight line problems on Wykeham Road were not due to the proposal.

Mr. Fitzherbert noted the Board of Selectmen preferred a lesser upgrade to Wykeham Road than the sight line work proposed by the applicant. Mrs. Friedman read a section of the Selectmen's undated letter, which stated it supports a more moderate plan that would be less destructive to the rural character of the road.

Mr. Owen said the Commission would return to this topic later.

#### Sufficiency of Lot

Mrs. Friedman thought it was difficult to separate this requirement from the others.

Mr. Ajello suggested that noise could be a problem. Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the amphitheater-like terrain could increase the impact of noise on the surrounding properties. Mr. Owen noted there were no expert opinions on the acoustic properties of the site.

Mr. Owen did not think the size of the property was an issue as the Regulations require 5 acres for inns and this site is well over that and has approximately the same lot coverage as the Mayflower.

#### Landscaping

Mr. Owen suggested that this requirement be discussed later.

#### Conservation of Natural Features

Mr. Owen noted there was no information in the file to support objections to the application based on this requirement.

#### Nuisances

Mr. Owen thought there were generally fewer nuisances associated with an inn than with any other use because so much of what the inn patrons seek depends on the absence of nuisances. He said it was self regulating in a way that schools were not. Mr. Shapiro said the exception was that inns have nighttime activities, which generate a significant volume of headlights. Mrs. Friedman noted the applicant proposed a "family friendly" inn, which might be noisier, and said the pool was an issue for some neighbors. She noted that the applicant's 10/17/08 letter dealt with the use of the pool, but said she could not understand what the applicant was promising. Mr. Owen said the applicant had offered a potential condition to address concerns that had been raised, but he did not think such a vague offer should be made a



condition of approval. Mr. Ajello noted there were residential pools in the neighborhood. Mrs. Friedman said the proposed pool was not residential. Mr. Owen stated he was not concerned about noise from the pool, which he did not think would be a threat to the neighborhood. Mrs. Friedman noted that in his 10/28 letter, the applicant proposed buffering to eliminate all sounds from the pool, but she saw no evidence to support that claim.

Mr. Fitzherbert asked if lighting had been addressed. Mr. Owen noted the lighting was governed by the outdoor residential lighting regulations and that the application proposed all dark sky lighting.

### Section 13.9

Mrs. Friedman thought it was time the Commission went on record about what this regulation meant before it was amended in June 2008. She said because that action had clarified that inns must be located on a state highway, a requirement that had always been the Commission's intent, the current application did not comply with 13.9.3 because it is proposed on a town road. She read a portion of Atty. Zizka's 7/28/08 letter regarding intent and Mr. Martin's 7/28/08 email, which she thought was instructive. Mr. Owen said that although Mr. Martin says the Commission consistently interpreted its Regulations to require that inns be located on state highways, there is nothing on record to support that. Mr. Owen noted that even if 13.9 is interpreted to require that inns be located on state highways, it does not say that inns can not be accessed from town roads.

Mr. Shapiro stated the purpose of allowing inns only on state highways would be since they are busy commercial enterprises, they would generate traffic, and larger state highways would be better able to accommodate them than would narrow, windy country roads. He said there would likely be less traffic congestion and fewer safety hazards because state highways have greater capacities and better sight lines. Mr. Owen thought there were other sections of the Regulations to address this issue and so recommended that any denial be based on the Special Permit criteria and not on this ambiguous language alone. Mrs. Friedman noted that some of the commissioners felt this matter should have been addressed first, but agreed that Atty. Zizka had advised that a decision should not be based entirely on this point.

Mr. Owen noted that Section 13.1.B applies whether or not an inn is located on a town road or state highway.

Mrs. Friedman pointed out that although Atty. Fisher claims the revision of this section was not a clarification, those on the Commission see it as a change to clarify the original intent and to make the language less ambiguous.

### CGS 8-2h

Mr. Shapiro noted the Commission had been presented with different legal views regarding this matter. He said he leaned to the view that the applicant was not in compliance at the time the application was submitted since the use he applied for was not grandfathered and a variance was required before approval could be granted. He thought according to the plain meaning of the statute, the applicant had not been in conformance with the Zoning Regulations. Mr. Owen referred to Atty. Zizka's letter dated 10/20/08, which disagreed with this view.

Mr. Owen then read Section 8-2h. He said he was drawn to Atty. Hill's interpretation, but could not disregard Atty. Fisher's points. Therefore, he recommended that the Commission not rely solely on this matter in any action that is taken. Mr. Shapiro said this was a serious statutory concern about how the application was handled, and he did not think it should be left out of any motion.

Mr. Owen asked the Commission how it wanted to proceed. Mrs. Friedman responded that conditions of approval had not yet been discussed. It was noted the Commission had 65 days from the close of the Public Hearing in which to refer a motion to Atty. Zizka for review and then make its decision.

At 10:30 p.m. the Commission took a 10 minute recess.

Mr. Owen noted that Mrs. Friedman had worked on two documents; reasons to deny the application and conditions of approval. He said he would refer these to Atty. Zizka, suggested they be used as the basis for discussion at the next meeting, and passed them out to the commissioners. He asked everyone to review them and the file, to consider the conversation held tonight, and to come to the 11/24 Meeting prepared to discuss a decision and the basis for it. He thought it would be helpful if the commissioners put their thoughts in writing. He hoped a motion would be drafted at the next meeting so it could be referred to Atty. Zizka for the possibility of a vote at the December meeting.

MOTION: To adjourn the Meeting. By Mr. Owen.

Mr. Owen adjourned the Meeting at 10:45 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill

Land Use Coordinator