

• August 25, 2003

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

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Fitzherbert

ALTERNATE PRESENT: Mr. Abella

ALTERNATES ABSENT: Mr. Brinton, Mr. Shapiro

STAFF PRESENT: Mrs. Hill, Mrs. Luckey

ALSO PRESENT: Mrs. Connolly, Mr. Miller, Ms. Zinick, Mr. Cable, Mr. Owens, Mr. Piskura, Mr. Boyer, Mr. and Mrs. Madoff, Mr. Thompson, Mr. and Mrs. Mnuchin, Mrs. Hedley, Mr. Trevenen, Residents

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Martin noted Mrs. Friedman would serve as hearing officer for the two continued public hearings.

Harris/18 Sabbaday Lane/Special Permit: Section 13.11.3/ Detached Accessory Apartment/Con't.

Mrs. Friedman reconvened the public hearing at 7:36 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella for Mr. Fitzherbert.

Ms. Zinick and Mr. Cable, contractor, represented the applicants.

Mrs. Friedman noted notifications of the hearing had been sent by certified mail and 8 of 11 receipts had been received.

The map, "Property Survey Showing a Portion of Property Owned by D. George and Charlene C. Harris," by Mr. Grossenbacher, dated 12/4/01 was reviewed.

Mrs. Friedman stated the main issue to be resolved was whether approval of the application would result in two detached accessory apartments on the property. She said the Commission had to be sure the existing cabana did not meet the standards for an accessory apartment. She reviewed the 8/25/03 ZEO Report, which stated someone is living in the cabana while waiting for approval of the apartment.

Mrs. Friedman read the 8/13/03 letter from Mr. Miller, adjoining property owner, in which he complained the applicants' piecemeal approach was being used to circumvent the Regulations. It was noted the Commissioners had been sent copies. Mr. Cable responded he had consulted with both the Health and Building Departments who had approved the cabana, which neither classified as a dwelling unit because it has no closets and no full kitchen. He asked what changes could be made so the Zoning Commission would not consider it a dwelling unit. Mr. Martin explained the Commission had to ensure approval of the new apartment would not undermine the soil based zoning requirements.

Measures that could be taken to guarantee there would not be two detached apartments on the property were discussed. Mr. Cable said the

property could be subdivided, but the owners did not want to do this. Other possibilities were removing the bar sink and associated plumbing and filing a notice on the land records that this is not a dwelling unit, decreasing the size of the cabana to under 400 sq. ft. (the minimum size allowed for an accessory apartment), and/or dividing the interior of the structure into two sections without changing the exterior.

Comments from the public were taken. Mr. Miller thought if the size of the cabana was to be reduced, the measurements would have to be taken from the outside of the building, meaning one of the outside walls would have to be moved in.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider the Special Permit application: Section 13.11.3 submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Harris for a detached accessory apartment at 18 Sabbaday Lane. By Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Owen, and passed 5-0.

Mrs. Friedman closed the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Piskura/258 Woodbury Road/Special Permit: Section 13.16/Shop and Storage Use by Contractors and Building Tradesmen/Con't.

Mrs. Friedman reconvened the hearing at 8:10 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella.

Mr. Piskura was present.

Mrs. Friedman read the written statement submitted by Mr. Piskura, which addressed how the proposed operation would comply with each requirement of the Regulations. She reminded the Commission of the issues raised at the last session of the hearing; 1) there is an unregistered septic pump truck on the property, 2) the barn has not been completed due to pending legal matters, 3) there is a complaint on file regarding the storage of business equipment on the property, and 4) Mr. Piskura had been asked to provide buffering to minimize the visibility of the equipment/vehicles from Rt. 47 and adjoining properties. Mr. Piskura's written statement said the only evidence of the commercial use of the property would be the vehicles, he did not envision there would be more than 6 vehicles parked on the property, and all vehicles would be parked by the barn.

The map, "Property/Boundary Survey," by Mr. Alex, dated April 1998 with the location of the driveways and parking sketched in by hand was reviewed. Mrs. Hill noted there was a steep drop between the house and the barn, which blocked the view from the road of the vehicles parked by the barn. She said when she had inspected the site there had been vehicles in a parking area near the front of the property and these had been clearly visible from both the road and the adjoining property. Mr. Piskura said he would now park all his commercial vehicles by the barn and the pump truck in the barn. He added he would have only one pump truck, but could not move the second from the property until a law suit had been resolved.

Buffering was discussed. Mr. Piskura pointed out where he would plant white pines to buffer the adjoining properties. Mrs. Hill recommended a diagonal line of plantings just above the drop off to screen the property to the south. Mr. Savage, neighbor to the south, agreed 5 ft. tall pines would completely block his view of the parked vehicles and said he had no other concerns. A second row of pines was proposed along the north side of the property, both rows to consist of 10 to 12 5 ft. tall trees. Mr. Piskura initialed the buffering details drawn in on the map.

Mr. Piskura said his personal vehicles would be parked by his house. He indicated he would be on call, but normal work hours would be 7:00 a.m. to 4 p.m. and that he would work only off site. He again agreed to park his commercial vehicles only in the rear near the barn. Mr. Piskura stated outside lighting would be directed downward, would not be on all night, and would be on only if he was working outside or if turned on by motion sensors. It was noted the Building Official had OK'd parking vehicles in the barn even though a C of O had not yet been issued.

Mr. Martin asked how soon he thought he could have the unregistered pump truck removed. Mr. Piskura hoped the matter would be resolved by 9/23.

There were no other questions or comments from the public.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider the Special Permit application: Section 13.16 submitted by Mr. Piskura for Shop and Storage Use by Contractors and Building Tradesmen at 258 Woodbury Road. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Ms. Page, and passed 5-0.

Mrs. Friedman closed the public hearing at 8:28 p.m.

Madoff/241 West Shore Road/Special Permit: Section 6.4.6/Fence on the Lake Waramaug Side of West Shore Road

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 8:29 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in **Voices** on 8/13 and 8/20/03. Mr. Martin noted the list of documents in the file, which consisted of the routine correspondence associated with a Special Permit application.

Mr. Thompson, contractor, and Mr. and Mrs. Madoff were present.

Mr. Martin asked why the proposed 6 ft. fence was so tall, noting if it was 2 ft. shorter it would not block the view of the lake. Mr. Thompson said it would be placed behind the existing 8 ft. tall hedge and Mrs. Madoff said the fence was needed to protect her children as well as for privacy. Mrs. Friedman asked how low the fence could be and still do the job it was intended for. Mrs. Madoff noted the fence has 1 ft. of lattice on the top so if 1 or 2 feet were taken off the bottom, it would look awkward. It was noted, however, the new proposed fence location on sloping ground behind the hedge would lower the height of the fence as seen from the road by 2 to 3 feet. Photos of the property were circulated and Mr. Thompson said the State DOT had approved the fence as long as it was installed behind the hedge.

There were no questions or comments from the public.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider the Special Permit application: Section 6.4.6 submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Madoff to install a fence on the Lake Waramaug side of West Shore Road. By Mrs. Friedman, seconded by Mr. Owen, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin closed the public hearing at 8:40 p.m.

Fairfield Land and Properties, LLC. and Mayflower Inn, Inc./35 Wykeham Road (116 Woodbury Road)/Special Permit: Section 13.9/ Spa and Inn

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 8:41 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in **Voices** on 8/13 and 8/20/03.

Mr. and Mrs. Mnuchin, owners, Mrs. Hedley, and Mr. Owens, architect, were present.

Mr. Martin noted the application listed the property owner as Mayfair Properties, LLC. Mr. Mnuchin said this was incorrect; the actual owners to be listed on the application were Fairfield Land and Properties, LLC. and Mayflower Inn, Inc. The correction was made and Mr. and Mrs. Mnuchin signed the corrected form for both owners.

Mr. Owens submitted revised maps and information sheets, "Mayflower Garden Spa and Rooms," by Halper Owens Architects, revised to 8/25/03, 8pp. to supplement the documents submitted at the last meeting and a memo dated 8/25/03, which summarized the changes and included information requested by the ZEO regarding buffering, proposed lighting, exterior equipment, commercial driveway, coverage calculations, and dust control during construction. He also presented scale models of the proposed buildings and connector and of the entire site.

Mr. Owens summarized the proposal for the 1589 sq. ft. garden spa with indoor pool and 7340 sq. ft. "rooms building." He said spa guests would use the existing entrance for the Mayflower Inn off Rt. 47 and would register at the Mayflower before proceeding to the spa. The footprints and height of the proposed buildings were reviewed. Coverage was discussed. Calculations by Mr. Owens showed the coverage at 35 Wykeham Road would be 7.58%, at 116 Woodbury Road 9.34%, and at the existing Mayflower Inn at 118 Woodbury Road 8.8%. Coverage of the Mayflower and spa properties combined would be 9%. It was noted these figures included the service drives.

The grade of the service driveway was discussed. The ZEO noted it was over the 10% maximum permitted for commercial driveways, but Mr. Owens countered that the 150 ft. section over 10% was an internal service drive to be used by staff only. He also questioned whether this met the official definition of driveway as it did not provide access to a street. It was noted the Inland Wetlands Commission had approved the service drive and the 10% grade had not been an issue.

Other matters addressed included:

- New inn building: This would have 8 rooms and the floor plan had been revised to include an egress stairway.
- Buffering and landscaping: Mr. Owens detailed the existing topography and vegetation, which would screen the proposed buildings. It was agreed a final landscaping plan would not be required at this time, but if approval were to be granted it could be conditioned upon receipt and approval by the Commission prior to the issuance of a certificate of zoning compliance, a prerequisite for the Certificate of Occupancy.
- External equipment: The location of the equipment had been added to the revised plans. Mr. Owens said generators would be tested only on Wednesdays between noon and 2:00 p.m. and reminded the Commission all equipment would be kept as quiet as possible as the success of the project would depend on preserving the solitude of the area.

- **Lighting:** Information sheets regarding the proposed lighting were submitted with the 8/25/03 memo. Footlights like those installed at the Mayflower would be installed, a few more near the buildings. Tree lighting was proposed by the tennis courts and in three other places. The 50 watt lights would be installed above eye level on the back sides of the trees would be turned off at 11:00 p.m. Mr. Martin noted there was some concern about the cumulative effect of lights in the area and what was appropriate for the preservation of rural character. Mr. Mnuchin responded the lights would be subtle and minimal. Mr. Owens said porches and outside doors would be lighted in a residential manner.
- **Dust control:** Mr. Owens noted there was a well onsite and there would be a press tank and temporary power available to water the construction area if it gets dusty.
- **Improvements to existing driveways:** Areas where regrading was proposed were noted. Mr. Owens pointed out there would be incidental widening of the driveways to 16 feet.

Mr. Owen read the 8/21/03 letter from Mr. Hearn, adjoining property owner, who was present and indicated support of the application

Mr. Walzer, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of The Gunnery School, also an adjoining property owner, thought the new buildings would be adequately screened and spoke in favor of the application.

Mr. Martin noted the issues raised in the 8/25/03 ZEO Report had been addressed. He asked the Commissioners if they thought a bond should be required. It was thought this was not necessary in this case because the new buildings were to be integrated with the Mayflower operation and that would be an incentive to properly complete the project.

It was also noted approval would have to include a condition that the two parcels of land, 116 Woodbury Road and 118 Woodbury Road remain contiguous, used for the same purpose, and under the same ownership in perpetuity. Mr. Mnuchin said he understood a restrictive covenant would have to be drafted.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider the Special Permit application: Section 13.9 submitted by Mayflower Inn, Inc. and Fairfield Land and Properties, LLC. for a spa and inn at 35 Wykeham Road (to be 116 Woodbury Road) whose operation would be integrated with the inn at 118 Woodbury Road. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mrs. Friedman, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin closed the public hearing at 9:27 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 9:27 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Owen, and Page and Alternate Abella for Mr. Fitzherbert.

Consideration of the Minutes

MOTION: To accept the 7/28/03 Regular Meeting minutes and the 7/31/03 Special Meeting minutes as written. By Ms. Page, seconded by Mrs. Friedman, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin suggested altering the order of the agenda to consider the Mayfair and Mayflower-Fairfield applications first.

Mayfair Properties, LLC./35 Wykeham Road/First Cut

The map, "Zoning Compliance Plan," by Mr. Neff, revised to 7/24/03 and the 8/25/03 ZEO Report were reviewed. The report found the application to be substantially complete with only two questions remaining; 1) Would the coverage on Parcel B exceed the maximum of 10% permitted? and 2) Would the Commission require the existing driveway connecting Parcels A and B to be taken up to eliminate the possibility of through traffic? It was noted the coverage calculations presented by Mr. Owens during the last public hearing showed the coverage of Parcel B, 35 Wykeham Road, would be 7.58%. Mr. Owens noted while Parcels A and B were under the same ownership, the existing driveway provided convenient access between the two and provided an alternate route to the fire pond. He said he expected it would be removed if Mr. Mnuchin ever sold the property. It was agreed a condition of approval should be that a notice be filed on the Town Land Records that the property may not be resubdivided.

MOTION: To approve the application submitted by Mayfair Properties, LLC. for a first cut at 35 Wykeham Road per the map, "Property/Boundary Survey," by Mr. Alex, dated July 2003 subject to the following condition: that the applicant file a restrictive covenant on the Town Land Records for Parcel B (35 Wykeham Road) that it may not be resubdivided in the future. By Mr. Martin, seconded by Mr. Owen, and passed 5-0.

Mayflower Inn, Inc.-Fairfield Land and Properties, Inc./35 Wykeham Road (116 Woodbury Road) Special Permit Section 13.9/Spa and Inn

Mr. Martin noted for the record the Mayflower Inn, Inc. and Fairfield Land and Properties, LLC. were co-applicants per the revisions made to the application form at the public hearing.

Mr. Martin briefly reviewed the three conditions of approval that had been discussed previously: 1) that a restrictive covenant be filed on the Town Land Records that would require in perpetuity that the two parcels, 116 and 118 Woodbury Road, be operated on an integrated basis, remain contiguous, remain under the same ownership, and have the same use. Such a restrictive covenant would enable the Commission to consider the two properties as one, 2) that the Zoning Commission approve a landscaping plan prior to the issuance of a certificate of zoning compliance, and 3) that the existing driveway between Parcels A and B may not be used for access by construction vehicles during the development of Parcel A.

Mrs. Friedman suggested approval also be conditioned upon the lighting being directed downward, shielded, etc. Mrs. Hill thought this would be consistent with other recent approvals by the Commission. It was the consensus that there was no need for a lighting condition considering the overall context of the application and because the input at the public hearing was adequate. Mrs. Friedman said uplighting might be a problem. Mr. Martin noted the Commission's sensitivity about the appropriateness of the lighting, and asked the applicant to keep this in mind.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application: Section 13.9 submitted by Mayflower Inn, Inc. and Fairfield Land and Properties, LLC. for a spa and inn at 35 Wykeham Road (to be 116 Woodbury Road) whose operation will be integrated with the inn at 118 Woodbury Road per maps and plans entitled, "Mayflower Garden Spa and Rooms," by Halper Owens Architects, revised to 8/25/03, 8 pp., and "Mayflower Garden Spa and Rooms," by Halper Owens Architects, dated 7/23/03, pp. SCH-E8-11 subject to the following conditions: 1. upon approval of its language by the Zoning Commission's counsel, the applicant must file a restrictive covenant on the Town Land Records that requires in perpetuity the spa/inn at 35 Wykeham Road (to be 116 Woodbury Road) be operated on an integrated basis with the Mayflower Inn at 118 Woodbury Road with the same principal use, "inn" for both properties; the two properties remain under common ownership; and that there be a contiguous property line between 116 Woodbury Road and 118 Woodbury Road, 2. prior to issuance of zoning compliance for the Certificate of Occupancy the applicant must submit a landscaping plan for review and approval by the Commission, and 3. that use of the existing driveway between Parcels A and B for access to Parcel A is not permitted and that no access for Parcel A from Wykeham Road is allowed. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mr. Abella, and passed 5-0.

Harris/18 Sabbaday Lane/Special Permit: Section 13.11.3/ Detached Accessory Apartment

The Commissioners considered the various options discussed at the hearing to ensure the cabana would not be used as a second detached accessory apartment. Mr. Martin pointed out an additional option was to deny the application. Mr. Cable did not favor a suggestion to take out the heating as the nearby pond is used for skating in the winter and the cabana is used at that time. It was the consensus the cabana should be downsized by constructing an interior partition of uninhabitable space and there would be no need for changes to the exterior walls. By doing this work, the cabana would no longer meet the definition of an accessory apartment and would not be eligible for a dwelling unit. A revised floor plan must be approved by the ZEO. After further discussion it was also agreed the owner would be required to file a notice on the Town Land Records that as long as the cabana remains at 18 Sabbaday Lane (the property is not subdivided) it may not be a dwelling unit.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application: Section 13.11.3 submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Harris for a detached accessory apartment at 18 Sabbaday Lane subject to the following conditions: 1. that the interior of the existing cabana on the same property be modified to decrease the habitable area to less than 400 sq. ft. and that the plans for this work first be approved by the Zoning Enforcement Officer, and 2. that the applicant file a restrictive covenant on the Town Land Records acknowledging the cabana is not a dwelling and may not be used for habitation. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mr. Abella, and passed 5-0.

Madoff/241 West Shore Road/Special Permit: Section 6.4.6/Fence on the Lake Side of West Shore Road

Mr. Martin noted it was not so much the fence, but the height of the fence that was objectionable. It was agreed that if the fence was installed behind the hedge where the grade was 2 to 2.5 feet below the road level, the height measured from the road would not exceed four feet. Mrs. Madoff asked then why she could not have a 4 ft. tall fence installed in front of the hedge. Mrs. Hill responded the official she had contacted at the DOT had approved the fence as long as it was erected behind the hedge as he knew that land was not in the state right of way.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application: Section 6.4.6 submitted by Mr. and Mrs. Madoff to install a fence at 241 West Shore Road subject to the following condition: that the fence not exceed 4 feet in height measured from the surface of West Shore Road. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Ms. Page, and passed 5-0.

Other Business

Revision of the Zoning Regulations to Enhance Protection of the Water Quality of Lake Waramaug

Mr. Frank and Mr. McGowan were present.

Draft #7 of the proposed dock regulations was discussed. Mr. Martin said he had referred it to the Inland Wetlands Commission chairman who was supportive of the work done to date. When the proposed revisions are completed, they will be formally referred to the Inland Wetlands Commission.

- f. If any part of the dock or float extends further than 40 feet from the shoreline, the ZEO shall consult with the Lake Waramaug Authority prior to issuing a zoning permit. It was suggested this be expanded to include docks and floats that may potentially impair public safety. Mrs. Hill noted this would include all docks and floats and Mr. Martin said the ZEO was not qualified to make this determination. It was the consensus to change f to: The ZEO shall consult with the Lake Waramaug Authority for any dock or float prior to issuing any zoning permit.
- k. While the front yard setback shall be waived for docks, side yard setbacks must continue to be adhered to. Ms. Page and Mr. Frank thought people should have the right to install docks on lake front properties and that it was not fair to penalize people who own smaller waterfront frontage. Ms. Page suggested requiring smaller, centrally located docks on the smaller waterfront properties. Mr. Martin questioned whether the Commission should differentiate between docks and other structures. Mr. McGowan asked whether docks were a primary or an accessory use. It was the consensus that docks are accessory to single family dwellings and that this should be clarified by including an accessory use section in Section 6 of the Regs as has already been done for the Woodville and Marbledale sections. The Commission agreed to retain the proposed wording.
- replacement of nonconforming docks. Mr. Martin noted property owners have the right to rebuild grandfathered docks on the same footprint, but said the Commission had the right to regulate what materials were used and how they would be attached to the shoreline. Mrs. Friedman voiced her concern that the Commission has no records on the existing docks and would not know whether they were being rebuilt to the same footprint. She also asked how property owners who do not need a zoning permit to replace in kind would know there were new regulations to follow regarding construction materials and attachment to the shore. Mr. Frank said the Lake Waramaug Association could educate its members.
- i. Floats was added to the heading.
- j. Canvas canopy was changed to fabric canopy.
- a. There was debate about whether more than one dock should be permitted per property, especially in cases where an owner has extensive lake frontage. It was the consensus that one dock per property was fair, especially since the size of docks is not regulated.

Revision of the Zoning Regulations/Addition of Section 6.5 Re: Spec. Permit Required for Construction Within 50-75 Ft. of Lake Waramaug

The 8/21/03 draft was reviewed.

Mrs. Friedman asked where the Lake Waramaug Residential District would be redefined. Mrs. Hill responded Planimetrics had recommended this be done in simple language rather than by hiring a surveyor to mark the metes and bounds. Mr. Martin noted the Commission has a map of the proposed boundaries available to present at the public hearing.

It was noted the proposed wording would be amended to state new construction could in no case be closer than 50 feet to the lake and that all new construction, whether it results in an increase in lot coverage or not, will be included. It was also noted driveways are structures and so would fall under this section.

Ms. Page left the meeting at 10:55 p.m.

Piskura/258 Woodbury Road/Special Permit: Section 13.16/Shop and Storage Use by Contractors and Building Tradesmen

The following conditions of approval were agreed upon: 1) The buffering would be as shown on the site plan discussed at the hearing, all planting must be completed by 12/1/03, and any trees that do not survive the first year must be replaced. 2) Only one septic tank truck is allowed on the property. The unregistered pump truck must be removed from the premises by 12/1/03. 3) The septic pump truck must be parked inside the barn when it is on the premises. 4) With the exception of personal vehicles, all vehicles and equipment must be parked in the barn and any vehicles that do not fit inside must be parked adjacent to the barn. 5) Lighting must be directed downward and on only when work is in progress or turned on by a motion sensor.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application: Section 13.16 submitted by Mr. Piskura for Shop and Storage Use by Contractors and Building Tradesmen at 258 Woodbury Road subject to the following conditions: 1. buffering be planted by December 1, 2003 as shown on the site plan reviewed at the public hearing, and any trees that die during the first year must be replaced, 2. only one septic pump truck is allowed on the property and the unregistered septic pump truck must be removed from the premises by December 1, 2003, 3. with the exception of personal vehicles, business vehicles must be parked in the barn or outside adjacent to the barn if they do not all fit inside, and the septic pump truck must be parked inside the barn, and 4. all lighting associated with the business must be directed downward and on only when work is in process or connected to motion sensors. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mr. Martin, and passed 4-0.

Kopp/137 Litchfield Turnpike/Renewal of Special Permit: Section 13.14/Bed and Breakfast

Mrs. Hill reported there had been no changes made to the operation since it was originally approved, the Health Department had approved the renewal, and there were no complaints on file.

MOTION: To approve a three year extension of the Special Permit: Section 13.14 granted to Mrs. Kopp for a Bed and Breakfast at 137 Litchfield Turnpike. By Mr. Owen, seconded by Mr. Martin, and passed 4-0.

Revision of the Zoning Regulations/Definition of Setback and Lot Coverage, Addition of Section 17.5 Re: Special Exceptions, and Section 14 Re: Site Plan Requirements

- definitions: The latest drafts of the definitions were reviewed. Mr. Owen said he would work on improving the language and fax the rewritten definitions to Mrs. Hill. Mr. Martin said he hoped to hold public hearings on these proposed revisions in October.
- Section 17.5: Mrs. Hill said she had passed the latest draft out at the last ZBA meeting for that board's review.
- Section 14: Mr. Martin noted he had just received Mr. Oley's redraft of this section. It will be reviewed and discussed at the next meeting.

Plan of Conservation and Development

Mrs. Hill noted the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing on adoption of the Plan on Wednesday, October 29, 2003 at 7:30 p.m. in the Main Hall.

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

Mr. Martin adjourned the meeting at 11:15 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill
Zoning Enforcement Officer