

Town of Washington, CT
P.O. Box 383
Washington Depot, CT 06794
ZONING COMMISSION

Minutes
Public Hearing – Special/Regular Meeting
July 23, 2018

6:30 p.m.
Upper Level Meeting Room

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Mr. Solley, Mr. Reich, Mr. Werkhoven, Mr. Averill, Mr. Armstrong
ALTERNATES PRESENT:	Ms. Radosevich, Ms. Lodsia
ALTERNATES ABSENT:	Mr. Sivick
STAFF PRESENT:	Ms. Hill, Ms. Hodza, Ms. White
ALSO PRESENT:	Atty. Zizka, Atty. McTaggart, Atty. Fisher, Atty. Kelly, Ms. Purnell, Ms. Freidman, Mr. Hardy Mr. Szymanski, Ms. Branson Mr. & Mrs. Solomon, Mr. Parker, Mr. & Mrs. Barnet, Mr. & Mrs. Fredlund, Members of the Public

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Solley called the meeting to order at 6:40 pm. He noted that Louise van Tartwijk, representing Charter Communications CT-192 in Newtown, is making the video record of this town public hearing because the Town of Washington does not have a Washington reporter who covers these events. He explained that the videos will be used as a public information service and historical documentation.

He seated the five regular members.

Seated: Mr. Solley, Mr. Reich, Mr. Averill, Mr. Werkhoven, Mr. Armstrong

PUBLIC HEARING

101 Wykeham Road LLC. /101 Wykeham Road/Revision of Special Permit and Site Plan for Inn:

Mr. Solley stated that this was a continuation of the Special Meeting/Public Hearing that took place on July 19, 2018.

Mr. Szymanski, P.E. read a letter written by Ms. Klauer, dated July 23, 2018, as she could not attend tonight's meeting. Attached to her letter was an additional letter from Daniel Hostettler, President and Group Managing Director of Ocean House Management, LLC.

Mr. Szymanski commented on Atty. McTaggart's memorandum to the Zoning Commission dated July 19, 2018 in his letter dated July 23, 2018, addressed to Chairman Solley and the Zoning Commission. Atty. McTaggart claimed that the proposed parking is insufficient. Mr. Szymanski read his response citing Section 15.3.1 in the Zoning Regulations and compared the amount of parking spaces at the Mayflower Inn with the proposed 100 spaces for the Wykeham Inn. He noted that the "Mayflower has 25% greater restaurant seats, 25% greater employees

on the maximum shift and over 67% greater function room space, yet provides 5 fewer spaces.” (letter on file in the Land Use Office).

Atty. Fisher addressed Atty. McTaggart’s concerns that she has expressed in her letters dated April 17, 2018, January 7, 2013-Updated with April 17, 2018 date, and July 19, 2018 in his letter addressed to the Washington Zoning Commission dated July 23, 2018 (on file in the Land Use Office).

Atty. Fisher responded to Atty. McTaggart’s comments regarding the “Floor Area” of the main building and separate cottages are greater than what was approved in 2013. He stated that the footprint of the currently proposed main building is actually within the footprint of the originally approved site plan. Atty. Fisher noted that the “Zoning Commission did not consider the square footage of the main building or the cottages, as no square footages were ever submitted.” He stated that “the current plans show that the “footprint” of the main building is within the approved site plan; as has been stated in the public hearings, the ProCon floor plans show the footprint of the main building being partially outside of the main building shown on the approved site plan.”

Atty. Fisher responded to Atty. McTaggart’s comments regarding Condominium form of ownership. He stated that the “applicant has already stipulated that the units are not intended or permitted to be used for residential purposes” and the proposed “Public Offering Statement” reinforces that these units will not be used for residential purposes. Atty. Fisher gave examples as to how the applicant has modified the proposed plan and offering statement that includes restrictions on the units and the owners to insure that the units cannot be considered “dwelling units” or “residences” under Section 21.1.22 of the Town of Washington Zoning Regulations.

Atty. Fisher discussed the definition of an “Inn.” He noted that the “Commission and all parties, have acknowledged that the Washington Zoning Regulations do not have a definition for an “Inn” and have been using the Mayflower Inn as a guide as it is the only existing Inn in Washington. He noted the similarities and differences between the proposed Wykeham Inn and the Mayflower Inn.

Atty. Fisher stated that the argument as to whether there should be an Inn, its type, size, scale proportion and intensity” has already been approved in the 2013 Settlement Agreement and ratified by the Superior Court. He said that “Atty. McTaggart’s arguments based on alleged nonconformities are simply inapplicable.”

Atty. Fisher addressed Atty. McTaggart’s claim that “the minor grading being requested is so the applicant can “squeeze in another floor.” He stated that the Commission approved 3 levels above ground and that is what is being proposed. “The Renderings A and B, reviewed by the Commission for architectural style, the main building was approved with three levels above ground.” Atty. Fisher noted that the proposed plans show 3 levels above ground as well.

Atty. Fisher summarized by explaining the Atty. McTaggart asserts that the proposed plan would be an expansion of the nonconforming uses and the inn does not belong in the R-1 Zone. He noted that the 2013 Settlement Agreement approved the inn and was deemed to be conforming. Atty. Fisher stated that the Commission has continually used the Mayflower Inn as

a model because there is not a definition of "Inn" in the Zoning Regulations. He then continued to compare the Mayflower to the proposed Wykeham Inn.

Atty. Fisher submitted the most recent revision of the Public Offering Statement.

Atty. Kelly submitted a letter dated July 19, 2018 addressed to the Zoning Commission responding to those who oppose or concerned about the proposed plan (on file in the Land Use Office). He stated that he was shocked at how many times the opposition have misstated or misrepresented the facts of what was and was not approved by the 2013 Settlement Agreement. He listed these facts and that they do comply with the specifically enumerated Settlement Agreement conditions and which otherwise meet the applicable regulations:

1. Defines or limits the footprint of any building as smaller than the approved footprint as shown on the approved site plan.
2. Defines or limits the total floor area of any building other than the spa building, which is specifically limited in the Settlement Agreement as less than what may be built in the approved footprint.
3. Defines or limits the total number of floors on any building as less than what may be built within the approved footprint.
4. Defines and limits the total volume of any building as less than what may be built within the approved footprint.
5. Defines or limits the use of any of the permissible floors, floor area, volume, footprint to anything less than all uses that are incidental to the use of an inn.
6. Claims that the renderings from January 2013 are anything more than a representative rendering of the exterior design style and appearance of the main building. More specifically that the rendering somehow defines or limits the height, size, footprint, floor area, number of floors or the volume of the main building as less than what may be built within the approved footprint.

Atty. Kelly stated that everyone knows what is in the settlement agreement and informed the Commissioners that it is their job to learn. He noted that the only parties that have to agree on what that is are the parties to the Settlement Agreement. Atty. Kelly informed the Commissioners that if they decide that "what was approved to be meaningfully different to the rest of the parties to the Settlement Agreement," they would have to return to the "Superior Court by way of a motion to enforce or clarify the Settlement Agreement."

Atty. Kelly stated that the applicant believes that the Commissioners will agree to this after they have each read the 2013 Settlement Agreement. To learn what is known, he suggested four things:

1. Each Commissioner should read the Settlement Agreement and listen to the audiotape of the meeting of January 2013.
2. Reach out to the two commissioners that were part of the Zoning Commission in 2013 that voted in favor but are not currently on the Board.
3. The current member that was on the Commission and voted against the majority in 2013 work hard to respect the majority vote from 2013 and ask questions to Town Counsel

4. Review memorandum written by Atty. Olsen in July 2015 responding to questions posed by the Commission.

Atty. Kelly advised that the Commissioners not listen to the misrepresentations by Atty. McTaggart and the opposition. He read excerpts from a letter dated January 14, 2013. He discussed how the author of the letter discusses what the parties, including the Zoning Commission, agreed to. He noted that this letter has not been referred to with her research for this revision. Atty. Kelly discussed the misrepresentations by the author. He discussed Mr. Owens presentation where he compared what was approved originally versus what is being proposed. He informed the Commission as to how Mr. Owen's presentation was a misrepresentation.

Atty. Kelly discussed the misrepresentation of Renderings A and B. He played 3 separate portions of audio from the January 2013 meeting that resulted in Settlement Agreement. In each recording the parties discussed the renderings. He noted that this was the sum total discussion of the renderings during the Settlement Agreement discussions.

Atty. Kelly discussed the memo submitted by Mr. Owens from December 2017 and how it was a mischaracterization of how the Pro Con Plans somehow define the use, the floors, the floor area, and the volume of the buildings.

Atty. Kelly was going to discuss the definition of an "Inn" and he quoted Mr. Solley's statement from the June 25, 2017 Zoning Meeting about the definition of an "Inn" and using previous and existing inns as examples of what an Inn should be. He compared The Mayflower Inn to what is being proposed for the Wykeham Inn.

He closed by saying that the revision to the approved plan is a voluntary reduction from what was approved in 2013. Atty. Kelly stated that the applicant has added a voluntary condition that if there is a tented event that any tented event of weekend event would require a purchase of a certain amount of rooms. He informed the Commissioners how the applicant has addressed the concerns of the Commission and the opposition. He asked the that the chairman acknowledge and read the names of those that wrote in favor of the proposed inn since the last public hearing.

Mr. Solley addressed Atty. Kelly and said that there are times the Commission cannot differentiate between total square feet and lot coverage and when he referred to "above grade total square feet of all 6 occupied buildings...as 78,148, what did you mean?"

Atty Kelly responded that this includes any floors in the main building that do not have windows on both sides, so it is the top three floors of the main building, the spa, the pool and the top two levels of the three cottages because the bottom level is partially submerged. He said the total square footage of all the buildings is approximately 110,000 sf.

Atty. Kelly addressed a comment that Atty. McTaggart made about him.

Atty. Kelly addressed the issue of parking and stated that if there is an issue of needing more parking the property owner owns adjoining property.

Atty. Kelly noted that when Atty. McTaggart made the comment about him referring to the ownership of the units as being under the Condominium Act was incorrect, he agrees with comment and acknowledged that it is under the Common Interest Ownership Act. He emphasized that these units will be nonresidential.

Mr. Solley stated that while he reviewed some of the deliberations from that last two years, he finds them very complicated. He said that he listened to Atty. Olsen's comments from the January 7, 2013 deliberations regarding the Settlement Agreement. He paraphrased her words, "The applicant and the Commission...does not have to worry about the size of the building, the dimensions...anything of that nature because they had already been approved by University #3." He noted that this was not refuted during the deliberations by any of the parties. He described the size and shape of the main building on the approved site plans. Mr. Solley stated that he approximated 40,000-50,000 sf for the main University building. He asked how this evolved to the 92,482 total gross square footage of today's proposed plan.

Atty. Kelly responded, "Before I answer that question can I ask you a question? What was the basis for your voting no?"

Mr. Solley responded that that is in the minutes and recording of that meeting.

Atty. Kelly asked Mr. Solley what he recalls from the Settlement Agreement meeting.

Mr. Solley stated, "The reason for voting 'no' was quite simply... the Settlement Agreement was complicated enough and... because there were at least 2 regular members and 1 alternate that knew we all needed a little bit more time to digest this."

Atty. Kelly informed Mr. Solley that the square footage on the site plan, just for the main building does not match the ProCon Plans that everyone is claiming are part as the Settlement Agreement. He stated that Mr. Solley may have been a victim of misrepresentation of his counsel. Atty. Kelly said that there are no floorplans and the square footage calculation is based on the footprint x the allowable height of buildings.

Mr. Solley stated that everyone, including Mr. Szymanski and Atty. Fisher heard Atty. Olsen's statements.

Atty. Kelly continued to argue his point. He noted that all the changes that have been made by the applicant have been done voluntarily and is a reduction from what the applicant is allowed by the Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Solley announced that he believes it is time to allow Atty. McTaggart to speak.

Atty. Kelly stated that they had requested that to be the last to speak so that they would be able to respond to any of the comments before the hearing is closed.

Mr. Solley disagreed and stated that this is still a public hearing. He added that the applicant will have the opportunity to be the last to speak.

Mr. Werkhoven stated that the Commission discussed that they would not keep going back and forth and feels that this a good time to stop.

Mr. Solley disagreed.

Atty. McTaggart stated that she feels they (the opposition) have the right to respond. She stated that there has been a lot of “cherry picking” of comments and she is concerned. She submitted a memorandum addressed to the Zoning Commission dated July 23, 2018, regarding Documentation of expansions of nonconforming use areas for 101 Wykeham Application (on file in the Land Use Office). Atty. McTaggart provided a transcription of the beginning of the hearing from January 2013 and the end of the hearing. She informed the Commission that they have no intention of misrepresenting anything. She attached Mr. Owen’s report dated December 11, 2017. Additionally, she provided a reduced size set of Wykeham University 3 Plans with elevations with the memorandum.

Atty. Mc Taggart distributed and reviewed the materials she submitted with the Commissioners. She stated that the main focus of the applicant was to obtain approval to use the Wykeham University as and inn. She noted that Atty. Olsen had advised the Commission to not treat this as a de novo application and to focus only on changes from the Wykeham University Plans. Atty. McTaggart stated that a Special Permit approves specific uses. She pointed out that this use can be legal and still be nonconforming.

Atty. Mc Taggart reviewed the history of the Wykeham University III Plans.

Atty. McTaggart discussed why Mr. Owens’ reports are important. She stated that he is an architect and he compared the plans to try and figure out the basis of the renderings.

Atty. McTaggart discussed her concerns regarding parking and the size of the proposed ballrooms. She stated, per the Town of Washington’s Zoning Regulations, the amount of parking is determined by taking the gross square footage (including the plating kitchen). She also pointed out that this proposed inn will be on a town road not on a state highway like the Mayflower.

Atty. McTaggart stated that their concerns are not just the number of square feet, volume and height, but of bars and ballrooms and these uses in this residential community. She informed the Commissioners that the Public Offering Statement still does not have a declaration with it, which is required by law. She said that if the owners occupy the units for 75 days it’s a mixed use – both residential and business for when guests are occupying the units. Atty. McTaggart explained that the units do have a kitchen because there are microwaves.

Atty. McTaggart closed by stating that her clients were favorable to having an inn on this property until they found out how large the inn would be. She stated that this is a substantial increase in a nonconforming use and recommended that the Commission deny this application.

Mr. Solley asked if Ms. Purnell and Mr. Owens had any response to the comments that have been made tonight.

Ms. Purnell stated that Mr. Szymanski gave some information tonight regarding the comparison to the Mayflower Inn and she feels that this is not the issue in question. She said that the Settlement Agreement approved a nonconforming use for this property and the proposed revision is an increase in this nonconforming use. She noted that the comparison of units to the Mayflower is incorrect because the Mayflower has 30 units the proposed Wykeham Inn has 37 units but some units have 58 bedrooms. She also pointed out that there is a discrepancy in

numbers with DEEP for their design flow worksheet. Ms. Purnell stated that she stands by her words that Atty. Kelly read. She added that she feels Atty. Kelly is calculating square footage by assuming that the proposed structure goes straight up, which it does not.

Mr. Owens commented that Atty. Kelly made a reference to two documents that were part of our work product when they were engaged with Ms. Klauer. One was titled a WR Areas Tabulation and the other was a WR Program Matrix which was essentially a wish list and not a representation of what any building square footage would provide. He stated that, in his opinion, is not germane to the point he (Atty. Kelly) was trying to make. He explained that regarding the Areas Tabulation, they calculate square footage in a variety of different ways for different reasons. This particular calculation was created as the basis of a cost estimate and does not correlate with the definition of floor area in the Town's zoning regulations.

Ms. Rodin of 119 Wykeham Rd stated that the Zoning Commission received a letter from Aquarion that has not been addressed. She submitted her information for the record.

Mr. Solley stated that they would not be discussing this tonight. He announced that he did not plan to open this to public discussion but if anyone has a letter that they would like to submit for the record, they are welcome to do that. He granted the applicant and opportunity to make final comments.

Mr. Szymanski addressed the comments that were specific to him. He submitted backup documentation as to how he calculated parking and asserted that the plan complies with the regulations. Mr. Szymanski disagreed that they should be complying with the plans for Wykeham University III.

Mr. Solley stated that he thinks that in the Settlement Agreement hearing that Atty. Olsen had clearly stated that the dimensions of what the applicant was proposing had already been approved with the Wykeham University III application.

Mr. Szymanski disagreed. He said that what Atty. McTaggart just submitted for the record has the silo on it and that is "patently false." He displayed the plans of Wykeham University III submitted this evening and pointed out that on the site plan there is no silo, no bump out in the rear of the building, the connection of the right side of the building to the left side of the building is at an angle, and there is no corridor connecting. He continued to point out more differences. He noted that when they received IW approval they did not look at the number of floors or use. The site plan was the only thing considered.

The Commissioners asked what exact site plan Mr. Szymanski was referring to.

Mr. Szymanski responded it is titled the "Overall Site Plan – 101 Wykeham Rd, LLC., dated December 6, 2016, scale of 1 inch = 60, Sheet OSD.1, last revised July 2, 2018." He informed the Commissioners that those footprints of the building are the same footprints that were approved as part of the Settlement Agreement and the Zoning Commission approval of January 2013. He stated that they are being told that they have to follow both ProCon Plans and Wykeham University III Plans and that is impossible.

Atty. Fisher commented on Atty. McTaggart's statement that the Public Offering Statement doesn't include the Declaration. He explained that a Declaration is a labor intensive document

and is required before condominium units are offered to the public and is not required at the Zoning Commission public hearing.

Atty. Kelly asked that the names of people that have sent letters in favor of the proposed plan be read into the record.

Atty. Kelly stated that the documents that he submitted of Mr. Owen's work, when he was working with Ms. Klauer, was given to him by Ms. Klauer. He was told by Ms. Klauer that Mr. Owens was charged with figuring out what complies with the Settlement Agreement. He read the emails that he sent to Mr. Owens with these documents attached and he did not receive a reply.

Ms. Hill read the list of people that sent in letters of support since the last meeting.

Atty. Kelly noted that these people were sent a link with the proposed plan and asked to provide their opinion.

Atty. Ziska wanted to provide clarification on a comment in Ms. Klauer's letter that was submitted tonight. He explained in the letter there was a reference to the Commission telling the applicant what they would like to see and the attorneys telling the applicant what they would like to see. He noted that he does not think Ms. Klauer meant to mislead the Commission but it is not exactly accurate. Atty. Ziska stated that the Commission can only speak as the Commission it cannot speak individually and the Commission can ask questions to the applicant and the applicant can respond. He mentioned that his understanding of the conversations between Ms. Klauer and Atty. Olsen was that Atty. Olsen said explained that we may not be able to support a particular position before the Commission legally and we might be able to support another position for the Commission legally. He does not think that Atty. Olsen intended to say to the applicant, "this is what the Commission wants" because until the Commission votes, the attorneys don't know what the Commission wants.

Mr. Reich asked Atty. Ziska if he "thinks the applicant's sentence tonight is useless tonight is useless where she asks if there are any areas that they're not in compliance."

Atty. Ziska responded that it would be an odd procedural thing, but it is possible for an individual commissioner to express concerns. He explained that, legally, you are not supposed to make that decision whether there is compliance or there is not compliance until you have had the opportunity to get into deliberations because it could come across as prejudgment.

MOTION: To close the public hearing for 101 Wykeham Road LLC. /101 Wykeham Road/Revision of Special Permit for Inn, by Mr. Solley, seconded by Mr. Werkhoven, passed by 5-0 vote.

PUBLIC HEARING (Regular Meeting)

8:52 pm - Mr. Solley seated all the regular members.

SEBEC Investments, LLC. (Hardy)/233 Litchfield Turnpike/Special Permit: Section 10.4.1.A/Eating and Drinking Establishment/Hot Dog Cart:

Mr. Solley read the Administrative Review, by Ms. Hill, dated July 23, 2018. The reports states that the if the Commissioners do not have any questions the hearing may be closed, and a vote taken and if there are outstanding questions, the hearing may be continued to August 27, 2018.

There was a brief discussion with Mr. Hardy as to whether he needs to obtain a vendor license from the Town Clerk. Mr. Solley noted that if this request for Special Permit were to be voted on tonight it would be conditional that Mr. Hardy would have to make sure that all applicable permits and licenses are obtained.

There was a brief discussion regarding the menu and the hours of operation.

It was noted that Mr. Hardy will drive the cart up to the sight and remove it daily.

Mr. Solley read a letter from Mr. Nicholas, property owner, giving Mr. Hardy permission to use his property for the cart.

There were no further questions.

MOTION: To close the public hearing for Hardy (SEBEC Investments, LLC.)/233 Litchfield Turnpike/ Special Permit: Section 10.4.1.A/Small Scale Retail Establishment/Hot Dog Cart, by Mr. Werkhoven, seconded by Mr. Averill, passed by 5-0 vote.

REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Solley called the regular meeting to order at 9:00 pm.

Seated: Mr. Solley, Mr. Reich, Mr. Averill, Mr. Werkhoven, Mr. Armstrong

CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES

The Commissioners considered the regular meeting minutes from June 25, 2018.

MOTION: To approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of June 25, 2018, by Mr. Averill, seconded by Mr. Werkhoven, passed by 5-0 vote.

PENDING APPLICATIONS

101 Wykeham Road LLC. /101 Wykeham Road/Revision of Special Permit for Inn:

Mr. Solley suggested that there are 5 weeks between tonight and the next regularly scheduled Zoning Commission Meeting and he would like to schedule a special meeting sometime between that time period.

The Commissioners discussed availability and possible dates.

MOTION: To schedule a Special Meeting on 8/7/18 at 6:30 pm at Bryan Memorial Town Hall in the Upper Level Meeting Room to discuss 101 Wykeham Road LLC., 101 Wykeham Road - Revision of Special Permit for Inn, by Mr. Solley seconded by Mr. Averill, passed by 5-0 vote.

Erben Partners, LLC. /169 West Shore Road/Administrative Permit - Dock:

Ms. Hill informed the Commissioners that Mr. Szymanski had submitted a letter to withdraw this application.

SEBEC Investments, LLC. (Hardy)/233 Litchfield Turnpike/Special Permit: Section 10.4.1.A/Eating and Drinking Establishment/Hot Dog Cart: The Commissioners considered this application. There were no further questions or need for discussion.

MOTION: To approve the request of Hardy (SEBEC Investments, LLC.), 233 Litchfield Turnpike for a Special Permit: Section 10.4.1.A/Small Scale Retail Establishment, for a Hot Dog Cart, by Mr. Reich, seconded by Mr. Averill, passed by 5-0 vote.

NEW APPLICATIONS

Caporizzo/40 Shearer Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11.3 - Detached Accessory Apartment: The Commissioners considered this application.

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing at the Regularly Scheduled Zoning Meeting on August 27, 2018, 7:30 pm, at Bryan Memorial Town Hall, for Caporizzo/40 Shearer Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11.3 - Detached Accessory Apartment, by Mr. Solley, seconded by Mr. Reich, passed by 5-0 vote.

Tracy/47 Rabbit Hill Road/Special Permit: Section 13.16/ Shop and Storage Use by Contractors and Building Tradesmen: The Commissioners considered this application. There was a brief discussion regarding the existing special permit that has expired.

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing at the Regularly Scheduled Zoning Meeting on August 27, 2018, 7:30 pm, at Bryan Memorial Town Hall, for Tracy/47 Rabbit Hill Road/Special Permit: Section 13.16/ Shop and Storage Use by Contractors and Building Tradesmen, by Mr. Solley, seconded by Mr. Werkhoven, passed by 5-0 vote.

Fairbairn/9 Golf Course Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11.3/Detached Accessory Apartment: The Commissioners considered this application.

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing at the Regularly Scheduled Zoning Meeting on August 27, 2018, 7:30 pm, at Bryan Memorial Town Hall, for Fairbairn/9 Golf Course Road/Special Permit: Section 13.11.3/Detached Accessory Apartment, by Mr. Solley, seconded by Mr. Averill, passed by 5-0 vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Petition to Amend Sections 12.8 and 12.8.1 of the Washington Zoning Regulations:

Ms. Hill suggested that the Commissioners discuss what they would like to include in this proposed revision.

There was a brief discussion regarding the time line. Ms. Hill stated that the proposed revision must go to the surrounding Councils of Government and then to the Planning Commission.

The Commissioners discussed how they should proceed, the difference in Town owned property and Region 12 property, permitted days of operation, and what could be an administrative signoff vs. public hearing.

MOTION: To schedule a public hearing at the Regularly Scheduled Zoning Meeting on September 24, 2018, 7:30 pm, at Bryan Memorial Town Hall, to discuss the Petition to Amend Sections 12.8 and 12.8.1 of the Washington Zoning Regulations, By Mr. Solley, seconded by Mr. Reich, passed by 5-0 vote.

ENFORCEMENT

Ms. Hodza distributed her Enforcement Report, dated 7-23-18. She briefly summarized her actions cited in the report. She read a letter from Mr. Ingrassia of Spring Hill Farms, regarding 292 Bee Brook Rd, dated July 23, 2018 (on file in the Land Use Office).

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting at 9:55 p.m., by Mr. Averill, seconded by Mr. Reich, passed unanimously.

By: _____

Shelley White, Land Use Clerk
July 30, 2018
(Revised 8-28-18)