

**TOWN OF HADDAM
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT
THURSDAY, 21 JULY 2016
APPROVED MINUTES**

Approved as Submitted at the 1 September 2016 Meeting

ATTENDANCE

X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
X	Arthur Kohs
X	Michael Lagace
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Carmelo Rosa
X	Edward Wallor, Secretary
A	Robert Braren, Alternate
X	Raul de Brigard, Alternate
X	Frank (Chip) Frey, Alternate
X	Lizz Milardo, First Selectman
X	Liz West Glidden, Town Planner
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

Mr. Laurenza, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates

Attendance was taken and all regular members were seated.

3. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

None.

4. Public Comments

None.

5. Public Meeting – A Special Permit to Allow a Detached Accessory Apartment for Property Known as 5 Evergreen Road, and Shown on Tax Map 54 Lot 33-6.

E. Paul Lambert, engineer, was present.

This is a continuation of the meeting from 16 June 2016. Public hearing held/closed on 16 June 2016.

Mrs. Glidden clarified the public hearing was closed at the 16 June 2016 meeting. This clarification was in response to Mr. Laurenza's reading of the agenda on which it states Public Hearing/Public Meeting.

Mr. LePard asked Mrs. Glidden the status of the house. Mrs. Glidden reported the house is permitted, the foundation has been poured, and the applicant has all building permits. Mr. LePard clarified there were no building permits issued at the last meeting. Mrs. Glidden stated yes. Mr. LePard stated the

Commission at that time could have denied the application as it wasn't an accessory apartment. Mrs. Glidden stated yes and no and explained the situation – house/barn permitted together and when the applicant made changes to the house plans, the building permit withdrawn (that is why there was an accessory structure without the principle structure). Mr. LePard asked if consideration of an accessory apartment being added came while the barn was being constructed. Mrs. Glidden stated yes. Mr. LePard stated his point is if the Commission were aware the house was not permitted at the 16 June 2016 hearing/meeting there would have been nothing to stop the Commission from denying the application at that time. Mrs. Glidden stated the Commission could have continued the public hearing and/or the meeting. Mr. Rosa stated the reason why the meeting was continued was to allow the rest of the Commission to read the minutes, look at the plan, provide input, and to discuss the matter with them. Discussion followed at length.

Mr. Bull asked if the access for both structures is from two different streets. Mr. Lagace and Mr. Rosa stated that's correct which creates another issue. Mr. Bull stated there is nothing currently within the regulations that addresses that issue. Mrs. Glidden stated not at this time. Mr. Bull briefly reviewed the definition for an accessory structure; and stated that for him, he has a problem with the application not meeting the definition as the structures are not connected in any way, shape or form. Mr. Bull citing Section 23.6.3.B.4 also stated when looking at the plan, the proposal clearly disrupts the single family nature of the neighborhood outlining the following: 1) there are two separate entrances, 2) the two structures are not connected in any way, and 3) there's separate parking for each structure (noted the Commission was about to vote against a previous application due to full parking for each of the proposed structures). Mr. Wallor noted there were two driveways on the previous application as well. Mr. Laurenza stated the reason for the two separate driveways is due to the topography. Mr. Rosa stated although not easy, the applicant could make one entry way. Mr. Bull stated the application is essentially for a two house lot and that's what he's having trouble with; and based on how the regulations are currently written, he would deny the application.

Mr. Laurenza asked Mr. Bull if he'd feel more comfortable if there were two separate lots. Mr. Bull and Mr. Rosa stated yes. Mr. Bull asked the size of the lot. Mr. Wallor stated 4.1 acres. Mrs. Glidden stated in order for the applicant to subdivide, he would need to meet the 200 foot frontage on Evergreen Road (cannot meet this requirement) and one of the lots would be an interior lot and would need to be one acre above the minimum standard. Mrs. Glidden stated the applicant could request variances through ZBA for those two issues. A brief discussion followed in regard to frontage on Evergreen and Beaver Meadow Roads. Mrs. Glidden stated in her opinion, the applicant doesn't meet the hardship for a variance.

Mr. Laurenza asked if the Commission has the ability to approve a split and decide the acreage. Mrs. Glidden stated no, as the application was advertised as such and there is no application with the property owner's signature requesting a split.

Mr. Wallor noted the proposed accessory structure would be getting water, septic, and utilities from the principle structure. Mrs. Glidden asked if the accessory structure were connected to the principle structure by a walkway or a driveway, would it change anyone's mind. Mr. Rosa stated not a walkway.

Mr. Laurenza asked the Commission their opinion. Mr. Lagace stated as the application stands it doesn't comply with the regulations and that the Commission doesn't need to find the solution. Mr. Rosa stated it definitely doesn't meet the intent of the regulations.

Mr. Bull asked if the mail box and address for the barn/accessory apartment would be Beaver Meadow Road. Mrs. Glidden asked why not. Mr. Bull stated that would disrupt the single family nature of the neighborhood. Mr. Wallor stated there would then be two different addresses for the same lot. Mrs. Glidden stated for emergency purposes the applicant would have to establish it as one address, which would be 5 Evergreen Road. Mr. Wallor stated the fire department will go to 5 Evergreen Road when they would need to go to the Beaver Meadow Road entrance. Mr. Wallor also stated with people living in the accessory structure, it's a whole different story (public safety issue).

Mr. Bull stated the applicant has a garage (28 feet by 26 feet) at the principle building and an accessory apartment could be created there and leave the barn as a barn. Mr. Lagace stated the applicant would need to resubmit an application.

The motion was made and the Commission discussed the matter further. Mr. LePard asked the Commission if the house and barn were built and the applicant came back in a year requesting an accessory apartment within the barn, would it change anyone's opinion. The majority of the Commission stated no, as the lot would still have two separate access ways, would not be connected, and have full separate parking for both structures, which does not meet the regulations. Mr. Bull stated the application is clearly for two separate dwellings with no connection between the two on one lot. Mr. Wallor stated his biggest problem with the application is emergency services due to one address with access off another road.

Mrs. Glidden asked if the applicant resubmits and proposes a driveway between the house and the barn, so there would be a connection from Evergreen Road all the way to Beaver Meadow Road, would that change anything. Mr. Wallor asked why go all the way to Beaver Meadow Road with Mr. Lagace stating the Beaver Meadow Road entrance is further from the main structure. Mrs. Glidden and Mr. Laurenza stated the driveway is already constructed. Mr. Rosa stated it wouldn't change his mind. Mrs. Glidden asked how the Commission would feel if the Beaver Meadow Road driveway were abandoned. Mr. Bull asked why. Discussion followed in regard to a possible driveway with switchbacks coming down the steep hill and there still being two houses on one lot even if the Beaver Meadow Road driveway were abandoned. Mr. Rosa stated if the Beaver Meadow Road driveway is abandoned, he would feel a bit easier. Discussion followed in regard to aiding the fire department by eliminating one access way. Mr. Rosa stated it's not about two different curb cuts on one road; there are currently two cuts on two completely different roads.

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to approve a special permit to allow a detached accessory apartment per the site plan submitted by J. Brian Buckley Design dated June 1, 2016 and the site plan drawn by Paul Lambert, P.E., dated 11/9/15. **Conditions:** Applicant shall obtain all Health Permits as required. **Exhibits:** 1. Application dated June 2, 2016. 2. Site Plan dated November 11, 2015 and drawn by Lambert Engineering. 3. Elevation drawings and Floor Plan by J. Brian Buckley Design, dated June 1, 2016. Plans Ahead LLC. Jamin Laurenza second. Motion denied with Mr. Laurenza abstaining.

Mrs. Glidden recapped the reasons for denial: 1) No connection between principle dwelling and accessory dwelling, therefore, it is not accessory, 2) public safety – emergency services (address for both structures will show as 5 Evergreen Road; access to principle dwelling will be from 5 Evergreen Road; whereas, access to the barn/accessory apartment will be from Beaver Meadow Road, and 3) proposal disrupts the single family nature of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lambert stated the applicant has spent a lot of money on the proposal and when turned down the money is gone (recognized risk). Mr. Lambert suggested the Commission contemplate putting a maximum size on the detached structure and a manner in which the applicant can come before the Commission before spending too much money. Mr. Laurenza asked Mr. Lambert if he would have felt more comfortable coming before the Commission for preliminary discussion. Mr. Lambert stated yes or anybody else. Mr. Rosa stated the applicant could have come before the Commission with a site plan prior to hiring an architect. Mrs. Glidden stated the applicant chose to get a building permit and start construction prior to receiving approval for a detached accessory apartment; and in this case, the size of the structure was what the applicant wanted. Mr. Lambert stated there was no intent to get the property subdivided citing the topography.

Mr. Lambert stated if the Commission wants to continue having detached accessory apartments in the town; the Commission needs to make the regulations clear up front. Mrs. Glidden stated this is the first detached accessory apartment application the Commission has denied. Mr. Laurenza asked Mrs. Glidden to suggest a preliminary meeting when people come in to look at the accessory regulations. Mrs. Glidden stated it was suggested to the applicant as the structure was very large and it had a separate entrance; however, he chose to move forward without a preliminary meeting.

6. Referral for Road Improvement Project for Roads known as Bartman, Foot Hills, Little City, Park, McTigh, Old Ponsett, Hidden Lake, Rock Landing, and Injun Hollow under State Statute 8-24.

Mrs. Glidden reported this is an 8-24 referral and this referral will touch on two points: 1) an approval to move forward with the bonding and 2) for those improvements to be conducted once/if the bonding is approved.

After reviewing the motion, resolution, and report, Mr. Laurenza asked if there were to be improvements made to Beaver Meadow Road as both have "Beaver" listed within them. Lizz Milardo, First Selectman, stated Beaver Meadow Road should not be included. "Beaver" to be struck out on all documents. Mr. Wallor asked about the Commission's previous approval for McTigh Road as it too is listed on the motion and report. Mrs. Glidden stated yes, the Commission had approved McTigh Road, Phase I, and McTigh Road is listed again for the other phases (Phase II and III).

After reading the motion, Mr. Laurenza asked what the "certain other roads" are. Mrs. Milardo stated there is a long list of roads generated by Jacobson and Associates (town's engineer) which prioritizes these roads by safety, traffic count, and condition. Mrs. Milardo also stated there are thirteen (13) roads in total that need work and the town is trying to work with the dollars that were put aside for bonding in this current budget and the estimates that the town has. Mrs. Milardo stated a very large contingency has been built in and if there are dollars that are left over, the town will work through the list. Mr. Laurenza asked Mrs. Milardo if she will need another 8-24 report from the Commission for the other roads, or will they be covered under this report. Mrs. Milardo stated the language was written by the attorneys, therefore, everything should be covered if work is taking place on one road and it needs to extend into another road. The Commission was fine with this.

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to approve a report to the Board of Selectmen, that supports the pavement resurfacing, sealing, milling, overlay, drainage improvements, repair, reclamation and/or reconstruction of all, or portions of, the following town roads: McTigh Road, Bartman Road, Park Road, Little City Road, Foot Hills Road, Old Ponsett Road, Hidden Lake Road, Rock Landing Road, and Injun Hollow Road and certain other town roads designated by the Board of Selectmen, in accordance with Section 8-24 of the CT General Statutes. **Exhibits:** 1. Resolution signed by Jamin Laurenza, PZC chairman. 2. Planning and Zoning Commission Report per CGS 8-24 dated July 21, 2016. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

7. 7:30 p.m. Presentation by Horsley Witten Group Regarding 2018 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) Revision

Horsley Witten Group: Krista Moravec, AICP, NCI, Project Planner; Jeff Davis, AICP, Project Planner; and Nate Kelly, AICP, NCI, Principal Planner, were present.

POCD Advisory Committee: Lynne Cooper, Mike Fortuna, Erik Jarboe, Lisa Malloy, Patrick Pinnell, and Gail Reynolds, were present.

Mrs. Glidden introduced the Horsley Witten staff, consultants for the 2018 POCD. Mrs. Glidden reported they have already met with some key people and did a driving tour of the town prior to the meeting.

Ms. Moravec gave a general overview of the process – 1) collect information to create a baseline report; 2) first public meeting/hearing in fall; 3) create a draft outline and plan and take back before the public for additional feedback; 4) look at priorities/actions and obtain feedback; and 5) present finished POCD and look for adoption.

Ms. Moravec reported they have been looking through the current plan, have done some interviews, and have collected information from the Council of Governments (COG). Mrs. Moravec noted that in the Request for Proposal (RFP) there were some issues that were highlighted and would like some feedback to provide direction on where research should be done. Ms. Moravec began reviewing items of concern:

Agriculture – Ms. Moravec asked if there had been discussion in regard to policies that might promote active farming or sustain those activities. Ms. Moravec also asked whether there are other types of activities such as farm stands, events at existing farms other than active farming. Mr. Laurenza suggested John Halfinger, Halfinger Farms, be contacted. Mrs. Reynolds recommended the Gibsons, Wellstone Farm. Mrs. Reynolds stated she felt it would be important to let people know that Haddam is a farm friendly community. Mrs. Reynolds spoke about Connecticut's Right to Farm law and how the Conservation Commission decided not to implement a regulation at the town level (too much regulation) and let the Statute stand alone.

Mr. Bull asked if the Haddam Neck Fair is deemed an agricultural fair. Mrs. Reynolds stated yes. Mr. Bull suggested consideration be given to preserving the fairgrounds from potential future development in the event the fair should cease to exist. Mrs. Glidden stated perhaps identifying prime agricultural soils. Mrs. Malloy stated the fairgrounds are owned by the Fair Association and the Association is share driven (everyone has a vote). Ms. Moravec stated there are ways to preserve existing agriculture through the Conservation Commission, transfer of development rights (regulatory process), and prioritizing.

Mr. LePard reported there are three or four horse farms currently in town; and asked where they fit in within the POCD. A brief discussion followed in regard to the potential conflict of farming and residential (farms wanting to expand; odors; noise, etc.).

Mrs. Malloy stated in terms of protecting scenic and historical qualities of agriculture, ordinances could be introduced to protect roadways, stonewalls, vistas, fields, etc.

In terms of private forests, Mr. de Brigard stated the town, not including the state forest, has a large resource in private forest that isn't utilized fully. Mr. de Brigard stated Public Act 490 promotes the non-development of land, but there's not enough effort to educate people on how to manage or make something out of these forests. Mrs. Glidden stated with P.A. 490 individuals receive a tax break and the only provision is that they do not develop the land. Mrs. Glidden also stated there is nothing about how to maintain the land such as selective harvest, etc. Mr. Kelly stated there are other states that use that model with conditions such as the requirement of a forest management plan. Mrs. Reynolds stated P.A. 490 has that condition and noted that an individual needs to have 25 acres in order to be covered by P.A. 490.

Mr. Frey stated there is a Green Movement going on where property is sold to develop green energy and this is something Haddam needs to think about.

Mr. Pinnell talked about historic forest agricultural function noting the 1938 Works Progress Administration (WPA) Guide to Connecticut points out historic houses and roads, but also locates vista points. Mr. Pinnell stated because agriculture had been on the decline through the 40s-60s, the forest have grown up losing some of those vistas, such as the Connecticut River (noted Portrait of a River Town) and the need to regain some of these views

Mr. Jarboe suggested the creation of a community garden noting that some people don't have the space and may be apprehensive about how to start or maintain a garden and community gardens can promote people getting together. Mrs. Reynolds stated the library has expressed interest in starting a community garden, but noted there is difficulty getting people to maintain them. Mrs. Reynolds stated Killingworth (Parmelee Farm), Old Saybrook, Essex, and Haddam (UConn Extension Center) currently have community gardens and that a lot of space isn't required as there are different models.

Tourism – Ecotourism (tourism around a sense of place). Mrs. Reynolds stated an issue that runs hot and cold is Rails to Trails. Mr. Pinnell stated in the lower Connecticut River Valley the tributaries tie together the natural and cultural resources and the need to be conscious of this. Ms. Moravec mentioned the Blackstone River Valley Corridor (Worcester, MA to Providence, RI).

Mr. Fortuna stated one of the challenges is connectivity as people have to get into the car every time you want to get somewhere and the only public spaces are for scheduled events. Discussion followed in

regard to neighborhood connectivity. Mr. de Brigard agreed with Mr. Fortuna's point, and noted that without the Connecticut River Haddam would be very different. Discussion followed in regard to the importance of the river economically - ecotourism, residential values, how land is used – and how to preserve the present and traditional character of the river (villages and undisturbed hillsides).

Mr. Jarboe stated he thinks it's important to focus on the villages (Higganum Center, Tylerville, and Haddam Center) as there's a lot of rural area beyond the villages. Mr. Jarboe suggested the focus should be on getting these three areas more ecotourism friendly and afterwards work on connecting the neighborhoods.

Mr. Fortuna stated one of the problems is that the civic buildings are not located in the more populated centers and individuals have to get in a car to get there. Ms. Moravec stated they may need to address the gaps and figure out a way to address those issues.

Mrs. Glidden stated in terms of connection, the town has hundreds of acres of state forest in it and there isn't a place for locating a trail map. Mrs. Glidden would like a way finding campaign that points places or a visit Haddam website.

Mrs. Milardo stated it's a different experience living on the Route 81 corridor than it is living on the Route 154 corridor. Mrs. Malloy stated don't forget Haddam Neck.

Open Space – Mr. de Brigard talked about the river front, the future of the Connecticut Yankee property, and where a lot of the other parcels of land are protected. Discussion followed in regard to what resources are involved and protecting the visual character within the town. Mrs. Reynolds stated the more public land that is conserved the better. Mr. de Brigard stated it's not necessarily the amount of land as it is what resources may be on it.

Mr. Davis asked about active open spaces and does it need to be defined (playgrounds, ballfields, swimming, etc.). Mr. Fortuna stated in his opinion the best open spaces are those that combine both active and passive; because when they are separated, two populations will not meet. Ms. Moravec spoke in terms of multi-generations using the same space. Mr. Fortuna used the example of taking a walk and a ballgame taking place and the potential of you stopping to watch the game.

Mr. Pinnell stated connected is the key word and connecting existing spaces is important such as the town green in Higganum Center with the gazebo. Mr. Pinnell spoke about the future development of the Rossi property and the three brooks that run through the center right down to Higganum Cove. Mr. Pinnell stated the idea of connecting the symbolic Center of the town with the river visually would be a very powerful thing to do for both the civic and recreational open spaces.

Mrs. Reynolds reported the Conservation Commission had hired an intern who mapped out a walking trail through/around the center, but the plan wasn't executed. Mrs. Reynolds talked about people who drive from one point to another just within the Center rather than walking from point to point. Ms. Moravec noted design aspects such as connecting parking lots, etc. Mr. Bull stated he's witnessed the same and that's behavior the town is accustomed too. Mr. Kelly stated educational awareness and communities investing in making their sidewalks more appealing. Mr. Kelly talked about community created privately run business improvement districts (businesses create an administrative body that creates money and with that money they create a unified streetscape such as plantings, lights, features).

Mr. Fortuna reported in Higganum Center there are streetlights that are all the same as well as the trees and shrubs along the sidewalk; however, in his opinion, the problem is there's no street wall (can't see another front door from the one you're standing in). Ms. Moravec suggested pedestrian signs, but will look more into it.

Energy – Ms. Moravec asked about energy efficient opportunities for the town. Mrs. Milardo reported there is an energy committee and that an energy study was completed at the various town buildings (currently reviewing that information). Mrs. Milardo stated there's a lot of work to be done in that area and

any suggestions are welcomed. Mrs. Milardo also stated Eversource, as part of a pilot program, just installed 50 new LED lights along Route 154 to reduce energy costs.

Mr. Davies asked how many of those present are on more than one committee. Everyone in the room raised their hand.

Mr. Pinnell and Mrs. Milardo spoke in regard to hydro power especially with the three streams in Higganum Center.

Mrs. Milardo reported solar farms are allowed for municipalities and the State currently has an RFP listed.

Also discussed was energy efficient transportation. Mrs. Milardo reported 9 Town Transit is offering public transportation and finds this to be a positive.

Mr. Jarboe asked if building efficiency should be in the POCD or should the energy committee be the one to handle this matter. Ms. Moravec stated the POCD is a good leverage force for funding and by showing you've put some thought into the matter it could be helpful. Mr. Kelly stated the POCD would not be the place to pound out the details, but merely to set goals. Mr. Fortuna stated it also helps to describe the ethos of the town.

Mr. de Brigard asked if they will be looking at population profile changes and noted that most of the State as well as Haddam needs to become elderly friendly as the population in general is getting older and part of it is transportation. Ms. Moravec asked about the town's shuttle (Senior Van). Mrs. Glidden stated 9 Town Transit. Mr. de Brigard stated transportation will help with the development of the town.

Mr. Bull stated Regional School District 17 Board of Education (BOE) should be met with as they have energy efficient initiatives for all their buildings and the majority of the high school athletic fields serve as town fields when school is not in session making them a resource for the town not just RSD17.

Mr. Kelly stated engaging the school districts for a variety of reasons tends to be a little challenging (mostly administrative). Mr. Kelly also stated opening that door and opening a sustained conversation across the whole land development means getting to the right individual or group or committee. Mr. Kelly asked for help. Mr. Bull stated perhaps Mrs. Milardo can assist in this matter. Mrs. Milardo stated she meets with the superintendent monthly and will be meeting with him Tuesday, 26 July 2016. Mr. Fortuna suggested getting on a BOE agenda; and noted that BOE members are on other committees.

Senior Housing – Ms. Moravec talked about locating elderly housing near community services; poverty; older housing stock (what condition is it in, does it need to be retrofitted). Ms. Moravec also talked about aging in place as well as downsizing closer to services; and asked how the residents/town can go through that transition.

Mrs. Reynolds stated there isn't much affordable housing within the town and noted that P&Z recently passed a housing zone. Mrs. Glidden reported the Commission approved a Housing Opportunity District (HOD) that has an affordability component.

Mr. Kelly stated because there is such a market for something like this there is a resurrection of old New England style cottage communities (dense development); and this may be something to discuss. Mr. Pinnell noted Camp Bethel. Ms. Moravec stated this type of housing can also be of interest to a single person as well. Mrs. Glidden stated one of the challenges is how to make it attractive to a developer without water and sewer. Mr. Bull stated the town has the vehicles – 55 and over regulations, conservation subdivision, and HOD regulations. Mrs. Milardo stated there's a need for elderly housing as well as for our singles.

Mrs. Milardo asked what can be done to keep the quaintness of the town while being able to provide some of these needs without water and sewer. Mrs. Milardo stated work is being done in terms of water

and sewer but it's not going to happen overnight. Mr. Kelly stated there is something out there such as public/private development.

Brownfields – Ms. Moravec stated there is no mention of Brownfields within the current POCD noting that Fuss and O'Neill is currently working at the Jail and there's also the Scovil Hoe Building. Discussion followed in regard to prioritizing sites, making sites attractive to start development, and the recently remediated Higganum Cove Project. Mrs. Milardo stated Scovil Hoe has contamination and the state's options are buy/take over the site as is and take on liability of contamination or they will bring in a developer. Noted that the town has dreams in regard to the site.

Mr. de Brigard asked Mrs. Milardo why Tylerville isn't being discussed in this context. Mrs. Glidden stated it needs to be addressed in the POCD it's just a matter of where. Mr. Rosa asked if Ms. Moravec, Mr. Davis, or Mr. Kelly were aware of the study grant for Tylerville. Mrs. Glidden reported the town received a grant from Connecticut Main Street to preform an economic development analysis market study.

Ms. Moravec asked if there are any other issues that should be investigated. Mr. Kelly stated they will be back and the issues can be addressed at that time. Mrs. Glidden asked how the document can be made more dynamic as it's rather flat. Ms. Moravec talked about the document being more user friendly. Mr. Davis talked about developing a more interactive web use of the document and the hard copy.

Mr. Pinnell talked about partially baked ideas being a part of the document as well as a statement about positive outreach with surrounding towns and common bonds with the each other. Mr. Pinnell brought up the joint meetings of the Haddam and East Haddam EDCs and the energy they generated. Mr. Jarboe agreed with Mr. Pinnell in regard to the positive outreach and being interconnected and using that within the document.

8. Discussion

Discussed above.

9. Town Planner's Report

Mrs. Glidden distributed copies of the proposed revisions to Section 23.6.3 (draft) as previously discussed at the 16 June 2016 meeting. Mrs. Glidden asked the Commission to review prior to the next meeting.

10. Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Carmelo Rosa moved to approve the 16 June 2016 minute as submitted. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

11. Chairman's Report

None.

12. Adjournment

MOTION: Carmelo Rosa moved to adjourn. Ed Wallor second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Bunny Hall Batzner
Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

**The 4 August 2016 meeting has been CANCELED.
The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 18 August 2016.**