

• August 22, 2005

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Martin, Mr. Owen, Ms. Page

ALTERNATE PRESENT: Mr. Abella

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Fitzherbert

ALTERNATES ABSENT: Mr. Brinton, Mr. Shapiro

STAFF PRESENT: Mr. Ajello, Mrs. Hill

ALSO PRESENT: Mr. Sears, Mr. Solley, Mr. Werkhoven, Mr. W. Smith, Mr./Mrs. Condon, Atty. Strub, Atty. Andrews, Mr. C. Smith, Mr. Ullram, Mr. Powell, Ms. Anson, Ms. Adams, Mr. Swain, Ms. Roberts, Mr./Mrs. Graham, Mr. Auchincloss, Mr./Mrs. Houldin, Mrs. Middlebrook, Ms. Raithel, Mrs. Raithel, Ms. Habib, Mr. Brigham, Mr. Farmen, Mr. Washington, Mr./Mrs. Piscuskus, Mr./Mrs. Stern, Mr./Mrs. Crumrine, Mr. Kallluri, Atty. Kelly, Atty. Fisher, Mrs. Peckerman, Mr. Kinsolving, Mr. Miller, Mr. Ringel, Mrs. Andersen, Mrs. Dyer, Residents, Press

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Revision to the Washington Zoning Regulations/Section 12.1/ Wetlands and Watercourse Setbacks

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 7:37 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in **Voices** on 8/10 and 8/17/05.

Mr. Martin reviewed the documents in the file. (See attached list.) He then briefly reviewed the proposed revisions, which listed the structures such as boathouses, docks, one municipal boat ramp, and structures for erosion control that would be exempt from the 50 foot setback from the shoreline of Lake Waramaug. He noted the proposed revision would facilitate the implementation of the Lake Waramaug Agreement, which had previously been approved at a Town Meeting. He read the 8/2/05 Planning Commission minutes, which stated that Commission had no objections to the proposed revisions, the 7/11/05 memo from Mr. McGuinness of the NW Ct. Council of Govt's, which found the proposed amendments did not conflict with any plan of policy of the NW Ct. COG, and a portion of the 5/6/05 letter from Mr. Sears on behalf of the Board of Selectmen, which stated the Board thought the proposed revisions would achieve the intended ends regarding the Lake Waramaug boat launch and related parking and storage. He noted previous input from both Mr. McGuinness and Mr. McGowan of the Lake Waramaug Task Force had been incorporated in the proposed language and thanked them for their efforts.

Mrs. Anderson, resident, stated Lake Waramaug is a heritage lake and asked whether the implementation of the revisions would result in a change in the lake's status. Mr. Martin responded the Lake Waramaug Agreement supported the heritage lake by taking into account the maintenance of its health and added it made sense to recognize the existing boat launch in the Regulations. Mrs. Anderson asked if some of

the lake would be filled with gravel to accomplish the boat launch improvements. Mr. Martin said he had not yet seen the final plans, but noted before the new boat launch could be built, an application for a Special Permit would have to be considered by the Zoning Commission. He explained the proposed revisions did not approve the boat launch; they would only allow a future application to be submitted.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commissioners or the public.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider

revisions to the Washington Zoning

Regulations: Section 12.1/Wetlands

and Watercourse Setbacks. By Mr. Owen,

seconded by Mrs. Friedman, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin closed the public hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Milstein/36 Hinkle Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11/Detached Accessory Apartment

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 7:48 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in **Voices** on 8/10 and 8/17/05.

Mr. Martin reviewed the list of documents in the file and read the 8/22/05 ZEO report.

Mr. Washington, agent, presented the map, "Site Plan," by Mr. Bertaccini, dated April 2005. He explained the proposed accessory apartment would be an addition to the existing garage. The garage was within the side yard setback, but the addition would comply with the setback requirements. Mr. Ajello confirmed the addition would not increase the nonconformity of the building. The elevations and floor plans by Natale and Stoutenberg dated 6/28/05 were reviewed. Mr. Washington noted the apartment would not be visible from Hinkle Road.

No one from the public spoke for or against the application.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider

the Special Permit application: Section

13.11 submitted by Ms. Milstein for a

detached accessory apartment at 36 Hinkle

Road. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Ms. Page,

and passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin closed the public hearing at 7:56 p.m.

At this point due to the large number of people in attendance, the meeting was moved to the Main Hall.

The Gunnery, Inc./22 South Street/Special Permit: Section 4.4.10/School Use, Driveway, Classroom Building

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 8:04 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in **Voices** on 8/10 and 8/17/05.

Mr. Martin reviewed the application and the documents in the file. He then explained the public hearing procedure, stressing that only the actual application that was submitted would be considered in the public hearing. If The Gunnery wished to apply for further development in the future, he said, that future application would be decided on its own merits and would require another public hearing.

The Gunnery made its presentation.

- Mrs. Graham, Head of School, noted the project was essential to the school as it would enhance the environmental education program and keep it competitive with other private schools.
- Mr. Graham, Associate Director of Development, gave a brief history of the property purchased by the school in 1958, which currently provides the school's water supply.
- Atty. Andrews noted the application had all the prerequisite approvals; Health, Inland Wetlands Commission, and Board of Selectmen for the driveway.
- Mr. Smith, environmental engineer and surveyor, reviewed the map, "Phase One Plan with Topography," by Smith and Company, revised to 8/17/05. He noted the natural features of the property. Wetlands had been delineated mainly on the west side near the well fields, but also along the north boundary where the old hockey ponds are located, and the land slopes approximately 10% in the center, but up to 35% at the north end. He pointed out the location of the proposed 1100 ft. long, 18 ft. wide driveway with 2.5 shoulders on each side and the 816 sq. ft. classroom building. He noted 1) the driveway did not exceed the maximum 10% grade permitted, 2) the 18 ft. width was necessary to accommodate both auto and van access to the classroom building, 3) the Washington Fire Chief had recommended this width for fire and emergency access, 4) the traffic engineer also thought an 18 ft. wide travel way was needed, and 5) due to the wetlands and steep slopes that would require significant cuts and fills elsewhere on site, this was the only feasible and prudent location for the driveway.
- Mr. Kaluri, traffic engineer, reported the proposed entrance would meet the sight line requirements when a mound near the entrance was regraded. He also stated 18 ft. with 2 ft. shoulders was the minimum width driveway recommended. He noted a traffic study had been conducted in February and it had been determined there was no traffic congestion and the traffic flow through the area had been given a

good rating.

- Mr. Smith submitted the 8/2/05 letter from Mr. Riefenhauser, engineer, regarding drainage and impact on down grade property owners. He noted the property is mainly Class A soils with some wetlands and Class C to the east so it was relatively well drained. He explained the driveway would be constructed so the surface flow would continue to flow to the north and with curtain drains on the uphill side so the driveway would not be undermined by groundwater. He reviewed the map, "Site Plan, Grading, Drainage, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan," dated 7/12/05, which included curtain drain details and cross sections. Drainage calculations were submitted. Mr. Smith concluded that no water would be impounded and there would be no impact on downgrade properties from the proposed development.
- Mr. Powell, architect, reviewed the plans for the 16.5 ft. tall, 34 ft. X 24 ft., 816 sq. ft., classroom building including porch. He said a total of 9.5 c. yds. of material would be displaced with the nine 12 in. sonotubes required for the foundation. The structure would have a metal roof and cedar shingles.
- Atty. Andrews stated the proposed classroom building would involve using the property for environmental education, which is a core part of the school's curriculum. She estimated there would be one van with two teachers and sixteen students once a week during the school day. She said late afternoon and evening use would be infrequent, and said the building would not be rented out or used commercially. She reviewed Section 13.1.B of the Zoning Regulations and explained how the proposed use would comply with each of the eight requirements. #1) She stated the small scale, low intensity use set deep inside the property was consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development's goal to preserve the rural character. #2) She stated the Inland Wetlands Commission had found the natural resources on site would be protected and had approved the application. The proposed low intensity use would not hinder the use of adjoining properties, and that a school was an appropriate use for a residential neighborhood. She stated the architectural design was in keeping with its rural surroundings. She had contacted Mr. Bellentoni, the state archeologist, who reported there were no archeological sites on the property. Finally, she noted the proposal would comply with all requirements of the Zoning Regulations and that no variances would be required. #3) She read the 8/18/05 letter from the Fire Chief, which stated the 18 ft. wide driveway would provide adequate access for emergency vehicles. #4) She stated the classroom building would generate very little traffic. Mr. Smith reviewed the parking plans, which he said, required minimum regrading and would result in a minimum loss of natural features. #5) Atty. Andrews stated the property was 70 acres and the proposed structure would be 700 feet away from the nearest home and could not be seen from the nearest home. Also, it would not be lit when it was not in use. #6) Given the nature of the property, no additional landscaping was proposed, but she said the school would consider it if the Commission thought it was necessary. #7) She stated the driveway had been designed with respect to the preservation of natural features and that the IWC had approved it's location. The driveway would not require much maintenance and the school's staff would do all maintenance work. She submitted the 11/28/05 letter from the state DEP, which stated there were no known endangered, threatened, or species of special concern on the property. #8) Due to the small number of students who will use the classroom at any one time and the fact there will be faculty supervision, the proposed use will not create noise. Also there will be no fumes. The building will have lights per the state Building Code, but they will be turned off when it is not in use. There will be a locked gate at the entrance so the driveway will not create a nuisance. In addition, Atty. Andrews stated the Zoning Regulations listed no requirement that a school use must be within a specified distance of its main campus.

Mrs. Friedman asked if it would be possible to construct a narrower driveway considering the modest use proposed. Mr. Kaluri reiterated that 18 ft. is the minimum width required for two vehicles to safely pass, noting the paved portion is critical. Mr. Smith said the Fire Chief

had stated a paved 18 ft. wide driveway was the minimum width for safe access by emergency vehicles, particularly because of the curves the driveway has.

Mr. Martin asked about hours of operation. Atty. Andrews stated the building would be used primarily in the spring and fall an average of once a week, usually during regular school hours, and rarely on weekends or during the evening.

The following public comments were received.

- Mr. Swain, South Street, asked Mr. Martin to state for the record who had written letters for and against the application. Mr. Martin listed those names for the record.
- Mr. Piscuskus, 15 Painter Ridge Road, thought the public should be able to address The Gunnery's future master plans since it had been discussed in an informational brochure circulated by the school. Mr. Martin responded the Commission could deal only with the current application, and again stated if additional activities were applied for in the future, the Commission would go through the entire process again and any future decision would be made on the merits, independently of the Commission's decision on the current application.
- Mrs. Andersen, Blackville Road, asked 1) can you have a classroom without a bathroom and well and 2) why wasn't the engineering study done during morning hours? Atty. Andrews stated the classroom would have a bathroom using new "green" technology. It was noted the revised plans showed the classroom would have two bathrooms. It was also noted the project had received Health Dept. approval. Mr. Kaluri stated the traffic study had been conducted during peak traffic hours according to the state DOT and that the 125% figures used took into account seasonal adjustments.
- Mr. Altschul, South Street, noted the applicant said the building would have a minimal use, but asked if there was anything to prevent it from being used all the time once built. Mr. Martin said that would depend on whether the motion of approval put any specific conditions on the use of the building.
- Mr. Ringel, 33 South Street, noted the applicant had stated there would be minimal environmental impacts from the proposed development and asked if use of the remaining acreage would be restricted. Mr. Martin stated if a Special Permit for this application was granted, there could be no additional development on the site without Zoning Commission approval.
- Mr. Kinsolving, 59 South Street, stated he had purchased his property because it was located in a residential district and he thought it was unfair that phase II and phase III of the master plan could not be considered on at this time. He complained the value of his property would decrease, that there was already too much traffic in the area, and that the Wetlands Commission had originally considered the driveway application and recently amended it without a public hearing. Mr. Martin noted the Inland Wetlands Commission operates under a different section of the state statutes and assured Mr. Kinsolving that Special Permit uses under the Zoning Regulations require public hearings. Mr. Owen noted schools are a use permitted by Special Permit in the R-1 District.
- Mrs. Peckerman, Sabbaday Lane, voiced her support for The Gunnery's plans. Mr. Martin noted the Plan of Conservation and Development encouraged the Town to support its schools, which are a key resource. He also noted nearly every school in Town is located in

the R-1 District.

- Mr. Farmer, 191 Popple Swamp Road, said while he was sympathetic with the neighbors, The Gunnery had owned this property for 50 years and should be allowed to use it. He asked how many houses would be allowed if it were developed residentially. Mr. Martin said the Commission would not consider hypothetical scenarios and would only evaluate future applications when they were actually submitted.
- Mr. Swain, 8 South Street, opposed The Gunnery's application. His points included; 1) All the other schools in the R-1 District have consolidated campuses; the proposed secondary campus was different. 2) The traffic study should have been done in the morning as everyone arrives at Shepaug at the same time, but departure is staggered. 3) The traffic study by The Gunnery was biased and the present traffic on South Street is not safe due to speeding. 4) The Commission should consider the additional impact to South Street if a consolidated elementary school is built on the high school property. 5) Zoning minutes from 2002 stated that the Commission was concerned about the number, intensity, and nature of non residential uses in the R-1 District because these uses might threaten the residential character of neighborhoods. 6) Schools are large commercial enterprises with different objectives than the rest of the Town. 7) The Town does not need more school campuses.
- Mr. Auchincloss, Bell Hill Road, spoke in favor of the application and testified the property was part of the school's heritage and had been used for hiking in the past.
- Atty. Strub spoke on behalf of the Sterns who reside on South Street. While he said it was up to the Commission to interpret its Regulations, he thought the Regs permitted a centralized school campus on contiguous property and not a single school building on a separate, non contiguous parcel, which would be an accessory use to the main school. He asked the Commission to consult with its counsel on this matter and to continue the hearing to provide the public the opportunity to review all the information submitted tonight. He also noted that later on in the agenda, The Gunnery was scheduled to discuss its master plan, but suggested a better time for the presentation would be when there was no pending application. Mr. Martin responded that the Commission did not consider the South Street campus to be accessory to another campus a mile away and pointed out there were no specific standards for school use in the Regulations.
- Mrs. Crumrine, 14 South Street, said the South Street neighborhood had no objection to The Gunnery's use of the property as long as that use complied with the Zoning Regulations, noted she was concerned about how the proposed use would change the neighborhood, and asked if the Special Permit would apply to the entire 70 acre parcel. She also stated that local customs had not been considered; that traffic counts taken in February were not applicable. She also thought it was unreasonable not to consider the master plan for the property at this time. Mr. Owen said, if approved, there would be a school use on a 70 acre parcel.
- Mr. Miller, 9 Wykeham Road, said he understood how the neighborhood residents felt because he had been a South Street resident when Shepaug High School had been built. He noted, however, that if the Zoning Commission's charge was to preserve rural character, rural character was more than just the arrangement of homes in a rural setting. He urged the Commission to include community awareness and the responsibility we all have to one another when considering the application.
- Mr. Kiiffner, 23 South Street, spoke against the application, was suspicious that the Zoning Commission had a hidden agreement with The Gunnery to approve soccer fields, and stated the current application before Zoning was not identical to the one approved by the Inland

Wetlands Commission. He also thought that variance and Special Permit approvals diminish the value of Zoning throughout Washington.

- Ms. Yurchak, Shinar Mountain Road, supported the small classroom building which would not be visible from the road. However, she questioned the need for an 18 ft. wide driveway to access it. She urged the community to work together to accomplish educational goals that are important to society.
- Mr. D. Werkhoven, Old Litchfield Road, supported The Gunnery's plans. He thought approval of the application would be a positive and constructive effort to educate the children in Town and to improve the quality of life for all.
- Mr. Ringel, South Street, said he was concerned that approval of this application would open the door to the development of the entire property and asked for a pledge from The Gunnery that it would not develop more of the 70 acres in the future. He argued The Gunnery could not use the 70 acres as an assurance there would be minimal impacts now and then propose to develop it in the future. Mr. Martin noted the Commission would not require any applicant to restrict itself regarding future activities. As an example, he said due to budget restrictions, many residential property owners begin with a modest project with plans to expand later.
- Mrs. Dyer, Buffum Road, asked the Commission to approve the application.

There were no further questions or comments from the public.

The majority of the Zoning Commissioners thought the public hearing should be continued to the September meeting to allow the Commissioners and the public the opportunity to review the information submitted this evening.

MOTION: To continue the public hearing to consider

the Special Permit application: Section

4.4.10 submitted by The Gunnery, Inc. for

school use, driveway, and classroom building

at 22 South Street to 9/26/05 at 7:30 p.m.

in the Main Hall, Bryan Memorial Town Hall.

By Mrs. Friedman, seconded by Ms. Page, and passed 5-0.

At 10:28 p.m. Mr. Martin continued the hearing to 7:30 p.m. on Monday, September 26, 2005 in the Main Hall, Bryan Memorial Town Hall.

The Gunnery announced it would not make a presentation on its master plan tonight.

Rumsey Hall School/184-201 Romford Road/Section 4.4.10/ Gymnasium-Auditorium Addition

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 10:34 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in **Voices** on 8/10 and 8/17/05.

Mr. Martin reviewed the documents in the file. (See the attached list.) He then read the 8/18/05 DEP letter of approval.

Mr. Farnen, headmaster, presented the May 15, 2005 master plan map. He explained the application was for a gymnasium and performing arts center addition to the existing "Big Top" building. Currently, the campus has only one small gym so the proposed addition, which also includes locker rooms and bathrooms, would double the gym facilities for the students. He pointed out the location was chosen due to the restrictions that the Bantam River and the location of the existing septic system, wetlands, and Romford Road place on the campus and because the school wanted the new facility to be centrally located.

Mr. Weaver, architect, reviewed the plans in detail. He explained the location of the addition on the hillside would enable the gym to have its own entrance on the lower floor with the auditorium on the upper level. The total square footage of the two story addition was 15,000 sq. ft. Mr. Weaver stated the building would have a low scale residential look, would have a clapboard exterior with columns to be compatible with the rest of the campus, the "Big Top" would be resided, and the two story portion of the structure would be hidden from view from the road due to the topography of the site. Pole fixtures for lights were proposed in front of the building and along the walkway. Mr. Weaver said the fixtures would direct the light downward and would be on a timer with manual over ride so they would not be on all night, but could be left on later when there are performances. Ms. Habib noted the existing lights along the driveway are turned off at approximately 10:30 - 11:00 p.m. It was also noted the lights along the walkway would be one foot candle. The addition would have a loading and receiving area and four handicapped parking spaces, but the parking area would be located across the road on the main campus. Those attending events would be busses up the hill as is done now. Mr. Farnen stated the school did not want to add a lot of pavement for parking because the facility would not be frequently used.

Mrs. Friedman asked how much the coverage would increase. Mr. Weaver said the coverage would be 6.2%.

There would no comments or questions from the public.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider

the Special Permit application: Section

4.4.10 submitted by Rumsey Hall School

to construct a gymnasium-auditorium

addition at 184-201 Romford Road. By

Ms. Page, seconded by Mr. Abella, and

passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin closed the public hearing at 10:51 p.m.

These public hearings were recorded on tape. The tape is on file in the Land Use Office, Bryan Memorial Town Hall, Washington Depot, Ct.

REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Martin called the meeting to order at 10:51 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella.

Consideration of the Minutes

MOTION: To accept the 7/25/05 Public Hearing/

Regular Meeting minutes as written. By

Mrs. Friedman, seconded by Ms. Page,

and passed 5-0.

MOTION: To add Seymour/79 Whittlesey Road/First

Cut to the agenda. By Mr. Owen, seconded

by Mr. Abella, and passed 5-0.

Pending Applications

Milstein/36 Hinkle Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11/Detached Accessory Apartment: Mr. Martin noted there had been no issues raised at the public hearing.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application:

Section 13.11 submitted by Ms. Milstein

for a detached accessory apartment at 36

Hinkle Road. By Mr. Owen, seconded by

Ms. Page, and passed 5-0.

The Gunnery, Inc./22 South Street/Special Permit: Section 4.4.10/School Use, Driveway, Classroom Building: It was noted the public hearing was continued to 7:30 p.m. on Monday, September 26, 2005 in the Main Hall.

Rumsey Hall School/184-201 Romford Road/Special Permit: Section 4.4.10/Gymnasium-Auditorium Addition: It was noted there were no outstanding issues to be addressed. Mrs. Friedman stated a condition to govern the proposed lighting would not be necessary because the plans as proposed appropriately placed restrictions on the lighting.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application:

Section 4.4.10 submitted by Rumsey Hall

School for a gymnasium-auditorium

addition at 184-201 Romford Road. By

Mr. Owen, seconded by Ms. Page, and

passed 5-0.

Revision of the Zoning Regulations/Section 12.1/Wetlands and Watercourse Setbacks: Mr. Martin noted no issues of consequence had been raised at the public hearing and that approval of the revisions would enable the implementation of the Lake Waramaug Agreement.

MOTION: To approve revisions to Section 12.1,

Wetlands and Watercourse Setbacks, of

the Washington Zoning Regulations. By

Mr. Owen, seconded by Mrs. Friedman, and

passed 5-0.

It was noted an effective date had not been specified.

MOTION: To amend the previous motion to state the

revisions to Section 12.1 of the Zoning

Regulations will be effective as soon as allowable by law once the legal notice has been published. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mrs. Friedman, and passed 5-0.

New Application

Seymour/79 Whittlesey Road/First Cut: Atty. Fisher represented the applicant. He presented Map #204A filed on the Town Land Records and "Property/Boundary Survey," by Mr. Alex, revised to 7/26/05, which showed the proposed 4.73 acre first cut parcel. He represented that the 335.90 acre parcel was made up of four separate parcels, which had never been joined or merged. The proposed first cut, he said, was from one of those separate parcels consisting of approximately 130 acres, which had not incurred a prior first cut. Mr. Fisher reviewed Mr. Alex's residential density calculations that showed the proposed 4.73 parcel met the soil based zoning requirements. He then asked that the residential density form requirement for the remaining 126+/-acre parcel be waived because there was nothing proposed on it and it had a conservation easement restricting its use. Mr. Martin asked Atty. Fisher if he was certain this was a first cut. Atty. Fisher submitted a letter dated 8/22/05, which, he said, was based on a title search that showed this was a first cut for the lot in question, which had never been merged with the other lots that are part of the Seymour property. An error in this letter was corrected and initialed by Atty. Fisher and he added a signed handwritten statement that confirmed that based on his research of the land records, the 130 acre parcel had never been divided after it had been created. Mr. Martin read the 8/22/05 ZEO Report, which stated all aspects of the application complied with the Zoning Regulations.

MOTION: To approve the application submitted by Mr.

Seymour for a first cut at 79 Whittlesey

Road. By Ms. Page, seconded by Mr. Abella.

and passed 5-0.

Other Business

Multi Family Housing: Due to the late hour a comprehensive discussion was postponed to the next meeting. Mr. Martin noted at the last meeting the Commission had been deadlocked about whether the maximum project size should be 25 units per site or per project. (To allow 25 units per project would mean that the total number of units would be 25 whether the affordable units were located on site or off.) Mr. Martin stated that after giving the matter more thought he had decided that setting the maximum at 25 per project would keep the projects smaller and more controlled.

Viewshed Protection Regulations: Mr. Martin noted the subcommittee to work on draft language would soon meet. He asked Mrs. Hill to

contact the Roxbury Zoning Commission to obtain a copy of viewshed protection regulations being considered in Roxbury. The 8/17/05 **Voices** article about the ongoing work in Roxbury was reviewed.

Revision of the Zoning Regulations/Section 16/Signs: Mr. Martin asked the ZEO and Land Use Coordinator to review the proposed revisions to Section 16 so they could be finalized at the next meeting. Mrs. Friedman reported she was working with Mrs. Hill on a new application form for signs as was discussed at the last meeting. It was agreed the sign permit fee would be \$25 and would be waived for non profit organizations.

Eminent Domain Ordinance: Mr. Martin noted a Town Meeting had been scheduled for August 25 to consider the proposed ordinance. He urged the Commissioners to attend to voice their support.

Enforcement

Mrs. Friedman asked if the Klemm sign at the corner of East Shore Road and New Preston Hill Road had been turned off or taken down. Mr. Ajello said he thought it had, but noted the building had showcase windows that are very bright.

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

Mr. Martin adjourned the meeting at 11:28 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill, Land Use Coordinator