

The Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Avon held a special GoToMeeting on Tuesday, September 28, 2021. Present were Thomas Armstrong, Chair, Brian Ladouceur, Jr., Vice Chair, Peter Mahoney, Mary Harrop, Lisa Levin, Joseph Gentile, Dean Hamilton and Alternates Elaine Primeau (did not sit) and Raz Alexe (did not sit). Absent was Alternate Drew Bloom. Also present was Hiram Peck, Director of Planning and Community Development.

Mr. Armstrong called the meeting to order at 7pm.

OTHER BUSINESS

Affordable Housing – Staff Comments on Avon’s Affordable Housing Plan Draft Implementation Measures

In response to Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Peck indicated that all Commissions members can participate in the discussion. He suggested that the goal tonight is to come to a consensus to be able to complete the Draft Plan but the final wording doesn’t have to be determined tonight.

Mr. Peck referenced his proposed revisions (document dated September 9, 2021) to the goals and the 8 implementation steps of the Draft Plan. He reported that the Draft is not yet complete and that is why it is not available to the public. The hope is that the Plan will be completed and a public meeting held sometime in October. He explained that the definition of affordable housing is covered under the CGS Section 8-39a. Inclusionary zoning is covered under CGS 8-2i.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #1 – Establish a Standing House Committee – he explained that he disagrees with some who have noted concerns that the Commission would lose authority over housing adding that this is a way to get information to the Commission before a decision is made, without the Commission having to do extra work. He recommended that the Commission establish a task force to study the advantages and disadvantages of establishing this Committee. Create the task force in 2021 and identify their charge. He explained that he has done this for other towns and is simple to do. The task force would report back to the Commission regularly. His recommendations for members of the task force could be 2 PZC Commissioners and 2 members of the public selected by the Commission. Resources of the task force could be CRCOG, Partnership for Strong Communities, and possibly home builders associations and local bankers. There are over 20 ways to fund affordable housing (USDA, CT Housing Finance Authority, and some local hospitals). Town Staff such as the Assessor, Social Services, and the Senior Center would all be involved.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #2 – Promote (include in Regulations) Accessory Apartments (ADUs) as of right – he explained that this language already exists in the 2016 POCD but recommends some clarifications as follows: 1) allow only one ADU per property; 2) ADU can either be attached or detached; 3) Architectural regulations need to be adjusted to address things like physical access so that an ADU looks like it’s part of an existing neighborhood and doesn’t change the existing character. He suggested that this item be a medium priority to be completed by the middle of 2022. He pointed out that all single-family neighborhoods in Town are not going to do this. If all the standards and requirements are clearly spelled out in the Regulations and are available to anyone asking, there shouldn’t be much controversy. Town Staff reviews these types of requests very carefully and all application requests are referred to the Health District, PD, and Building and Fire for comment. This regulation helps all age groups.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #3 – Consider Incentives for Affordable Accessory Apartments – clarification is needed as to what the particular incentives would be and how they would be implemented and overseen. All regulations put in place require review and enforcement by Staff. He indicated that because about 50% of each day in Planning involves some type of enforcement activity the Regulations need to be very clear as to what is allowed and what isn't. He explained that currently the Town has no housing fund but noted that there are a lot of people who are involved with Social Services and the Senior Center who could probably use some help. This is a medium priority - middle of 2022.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #4 – Allow for Middle Density as Large Home Retrofits and Promote Ownership – this item needs clarification such that a floating zone could be created to allow the Town, Commission, or property owner asking to create one or two apartments in a large existing house, located on a good-sized parcel, because they don't need that much space anymore. A regulation could be created legally for a floating zone to explore the conversion of existing housing into 2-4 units. Architectural standards would be included in the regulation language. This would be a middle priority item.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #5 – Promote Attainable Housing Overlay Zone and TDR – while there is a lot of confusion surrounding TDR, there are sending and receiving areas that are already identified on the Town's official Zoning Map to transfer density from one area to another area. He recommended that the Zoning Map and the current Zoning Regulations for TDR be reviewed to see if the TDR Regulation could actually work. There are only a couple of towns in CT that have TDR Regulations and it has never been used in Avon because the Regulation is extremely difficult to use as currently worded. Staff could clean up the Regulations and also determine if the sending and receiving areas on the Zoning Map are accurate.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #6 – Promote Awareness of USDA and CHFA Loans – it's important to make the public aware of these available programs and tools. This is a medium priority to be completed by the middle of 2022.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #7 – Consider Development of Unused Municipal Land – he noted that a list of land (chart with addresses included) that could possibly be used for a variety of purposes already exists in the 2016 POCD. He clarified that this doesn't mean these sites are going to be developed for housing. The POCD is set up such that these sites could be used for housing or for open space. If the Town can't buy a site and the owner is not interested in selling it to the Town at a low price maybe it should be used for something else. Possibly a developer would be interested in doing something with a parcel that would benefit the whole Town. This item would keep the Commission informed as to the status of this existing list of parcels. He explained that some owners of some of these sites have asked the Town what they can do with their land and they were informed that it could be open space but if the Town is not in a position to buy these sites (the owner is not going to give it to the Town for free) there is no way to implement open space activities. This item would be a low priority to be further discussed by the task force and the Commission. He explained that some of the plans received in the last few years specifically call out some of the parcels on this list proposing multi-family housing.

Mr. Peck addressed Item #8 – Pursue Partnerships – this is unclear and recommended that this item be reallocated to the aforementioned task force to discuss what types of partnerships should

be considered. We are not talking about partnerships with just developers but rather the pursuit of others (Land Trust, churches, Historical Society) and other entities that have the Town's best interests in mind. The Inclusionary Housing Regulation (8-2i) would require, for example, that a proposal for a 20-lot subdivision must have certain percentage created as affordable housing. He explained that while an inclusionary zoning regulation is not used by a lot of towns in CT, it could be used in Avon.

Mr. Peck concluded by noting that these are his suggested compromises and offered to answer any questions so that we can hopefully come to a consensus and move forward. He explained that it is important that this Affordable Housing Plan reflect that the Town put in some effort because it has to go before the State for approval. The only way to have a Plan that works for the Commission and for the consultant to get paid is to create a Plan that is comprehensive and has taken into account the POCD as well as the consultant's recommendations.

Mr. Armstrong said that he feels the Town should opt out of PA 21-29 relative to allowing ADUs as of right.

In response to Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Peck acknowledged that many people seem concerned that if the Town does not opt out of PA 21-29 that it will change the way houses look and the overall community. He explained that the intent of Item #2 is that the Town doesn't need to opt out because we can achieve what we want by formulating detailed Regulations. If we opt out then we have the same process we have now – people come in to apply for a special exception, there is a cost, a public hearing, and time involved. All the standards contained in the Regulations currently are what are reviewed by the Staff prior to the Commission seeing the application. He further explained that he is not aware of any change that has been made to any of these applications that could not be handled by a properly written regulation. He suggested that we take a good look at what is required and where we want to be before making a decision. He indicated that he thinks this can be done with minimal, if any, disturbance to a neighborhood because many accessory apartments likely already exist without permits and without anyone (neighbors) knowing about them.

Ms. Levin addressed Item #7 and said that if everyone agrees she suggests that the actual list contained in the POCD be incorporated into the Plan.

Mr. Armstrong said that POCD charts being referred to are Tables 7-8 and 7-9.

In response to Ms. Levin, Mr. Peck clarified that a number of the parcels on the list (POCD) say that they should be set aside as open space, adding that if that is possible that is what they should be used for. He explained, however, that there are parcels on the list that are not open space and have never been open space or designated to be open space and would not likely be used for anything other than what the building has been zoned and used for. The parcels that could be used for development would be pulled off the list but all the parcels listed are not municipal land. Any parcel(s) already designated and dedicated as open space would not be used for residential development. He explained that there are some properties near the Town Hall complex that are not currently owned by the Town that would be just fine for a small residential development but the people interested have no idea where to start. He further explained that in this type of situation the Town could consider buying the properties or entering into an agreement with a developer,

who would take all the financial risks. These properties could be either affordable or market rate and appeal to a range of ages.

Mr. Ladouceur said that a State Agency needs to approve the Plan otherwise the consultant doesn't get paid. He said this is the first he's heard of this and asked for clarification. He said he was against hiring a consultant but there was a State Grant to pay for it. The consultant said there is no standard for what an affordable housing plan has to be; it could be a sentence or two and there's nothing specific in the Statute. Full disclosure should have been communicated at the beginning.

Mr. Peck offered to get a statement from the CT Department of Housing, as that is who reviews the Plan for approval and release of the funds. He confirmed that he never said the Plan could be a sentence or two. He said that he has been through three of these Plans so far with various towns and has never seen one that is a sentence or two survive scrutiny with the Department of Housing.

Mr. Ladouceur said that he emailed to the Commission and Town his revised draft Plan and four action items. He said something like this should be submitted to the Dept of Housing for approval; it contains more than what is in the POCD and takes some of the consultant's relevant information. It has recommendations that aren't in the POCD. He said he favors keeping it simple. If a task force is created that would be the place to determine the action items to implement the goals (e.g. CHFA, AHOZ, work/live, maybe municipal land). He is in favor of removing all the wording located just below each of the (7) recommendations listed on the September 9 document (just keep the bolded headings). He reviewed his document containing four goals (1. Promote USDA and CHFA loans; 2) Promote AHOZ, TDR, ADUs, work/live units; 3) Explore options through tax relief to encourage to convert existing stock of affordable housing "a" into affordable housing "A"; 4) Establish task force of Town Planning Staff and one PZC member alternate to report annually to PZC on progress and recommended actions to increase affordable housing opportunities in Town.

Mr. Levin said that while she appreciates Mr. Ladouceur taking the time to create a new draft, the draft dated September 9 (from Mr. Peck and included in the agenda package) is the draft we have been working from. Working with multiple drafts is unproductive, ineffective, and very inefficient. She said that we need to decide which draft we are working from.

Mr. Ladouceur said that if there was a draft that could have been easily red lined and workable there would not have been a need to create something different. There were things included in the consultant's document (e.g. blighted properties) that were not really necessary for Avon. The Commission can decide which draft they want to use.

Mr. Armstrong said he sees overlap with #6 on both drafts (promote awareness of USDA and CHFA loans). There seemed to be unanimous support for this item and there was a lot of agreement on AHOZ, TDR, work/live units, and ADUs. He said his preference is to create housing from existing stock rather than cutting down trees to build new housing. He said he would like to investigate properties receiving a tax abatement relative to eligibility. Both drafts mention in some regard the creation of a task force for a standing housing committee.

Mr. Peck explained that a charter could be drafted that would give charge as to the tasks to be undertaken by a task force. He indicated that listing these items in a very short format doesn't give anyone details or the needed information as to how the items would be carried out. He noted his understanding from past discussions with the Commission that the items stated were so brief and unclear that they were concerned it would have other implications. The reason the bulleted list of items was created was to provide a better explanation so people would know what was involved with each task.

Mr. Armstrong addressed middle density housing (retrofits for large houses, maybe blight) noting that he thinks there was large objection by the Commission to include this item.

Mr. Peck asked if he could get more information as to what the concerns are for doing something with these buildings to make them more productive. He confirmed that it is a popular misconception that there are no blighted structures in Town. There are sites that are covered by a lot of vegetation such that they can't be seen but there are probably six sites right now that are abandoned or close to it that Staff deals with all the time in response to calls from residents. He explained that Avon has a blight ordinance that pertains specifically to structures but does not address the property itself (overgrown, aesthetics). People will call about grossly overgrown sites that are impeding the sale of their house.

Mr. Armstrong asked how the Town would gain control of a blighted property (e.g. to create a duplex, retrofit) unless there's a tax lien or an enforcement action.

Mr. Peck explained that the Town may have tax liens on various properties but the Town does not sell them because the interest gained on the liens is significant but more information would be needed from the Assessor.

Mr. Ladouceur said that he doesn't think this item is something that needs to be dealt with right now; we're talking about .0016 percent of houses in Avon. If the task force thinks it's important it can be discussed at a future meeting. It seems like AHOZ would be the mechanism to deal with these types of sites rather than the bullet item on middle density housing.

Mr. Armstrong asked if it was acceptable to everyone to add ADUs to the item addressing the promotion of AHOZ, TDR, and Work/Live Units, rather than listing ADUs as a separate item. He noted his concerns with PA 21-29.

Ms. Levin asked Mr. Armstrong what his concerns are relative to ADUs because it is her understanding that this is an opportunity for efficiency such that the standards for ADUs can be clearly laid out in the Regulations and made "as of right" for review by our very qualified Town Staff.

Mr. Armstrong said that his concerns involve Public Act 21-29, which strikes down a good portion of Avon's existing Regulations for ADUs.

Mr. Peck indicated that the only change is who lives in what unit.

Mr. Armstrong said that he is not willing to allow Avon to go to owner absentee ADUs, where neither unit is occupied by the owner.

Mr. Ladouceur said that he doesn't see it as a huge burden for the Commission to review all applications for ADUs at this point because there haven't been that many and that's why he lumped it in with other items. This can be reviewed at a future date if need be.

Mr. Peck pointed out that the 2016 POCD already says to consider changes to the Zoning Regulations to permit ADUs as of right.

Mr. Armstrong noted his understanding reiterating that he's not ready to accept PA 21-29.

In response to Ms. Levin, Mr. Armstrong confirmed that while he wants an owner living onsite where an ADU exists he also has other issues with it. If the owner is living onsite, either in the main house or the ADU, there will be less blight because the owner will care about its tenants. He said that if we don't opt out (PA 21-29) we are bound by the conditions set forth in 6a-d and we are controlled only after that by the State legislature because we can't make a change. It handcuffs the Town too much and we need to opt out. He said he is not looking to make a change to the POCD but would like a few more test cases relative to detached ADUs.

Mr. Ladouceur said that we don't want to put "as of right" relative to ADUs in the recommendations and goals if we are going to opt out in the next few months. Leave the wording out and combine it with the other items. The POCD says to consider it and we have done that. He said that he is not in favor of "as of right" at this time but things could change in the future. He asked which draft is being worked from, his or Hiram's.

Ms. Levin said that we should be working from Hiram's draft and going through each item one by one instead of trying to red line and reconcile. She noted her support for creating a task force.

Mr. Mahoney noted his agreement.

In response to Ms. Levin and Mr. Peck, Mr. Ladouceur said that he does not support the task force item as worded because it's not what he put down on his point #4 adding that he doesn't think need the status, the time, the priority, the suggested members, or the additional text.

Mr. Peck asked if we should just make it up as we go?

Mr. Mahoney said that he supports Mr. Peck's recommendation.

Mr. Armstrong said that he could live with Mr. Ladouceur's recommendation to satisfy his #4 item and would have Ms. Levin and Mr. Ladouceur be the PZC members and Mr. Peck and either the Assessor or Social Services form a subcommittee.

Mr. Ladouceur said fine.

Mr. Gentile said he would strike the word "partnership" because partnerships are marriages and imply unions that can get nasty and contentious. He said the word "relationship" is better.

Mr. Mahoney said that relationships can also sour.

In response to Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Peck addressed “*Consider development of unused municipal land*” clarifying that the language has been changed/compromised to... “*Discuss whether any municipal land or vacant private land should be considered for development*”. He noted that the list already exists in the POCD and indicated that the purpose of explaining and broadening this topic is to clarify that it’s not just vacant or open space municipal land, it’s also vacant, privately-owned land.

Mr. Armstrong said that he does not want to encourage development that would not exist but for people seeking to develop land on their own; Avon residents cherish open space (88% per POCD).

Ms. Levin said that her understanding of this item is to simply incorporate and restate, by reference, a list of properties already named in the POCD that are considered for development, adding that she is ok with that. Mr. Peck has indicated that a subset of this list would be used. She said, however, that she is sensitive to putting something out that suggests that we are taking unused land and trying to develop it but noted that we’ve already gone down that road with respect to this list.

Mr. Armstrong said that it is his understanding that Mr. Peck would create a subset of the aforementioned parcel list (POCD) as to which parcels might be open space and which parcels might be considered for cluster-style development. He said that some of these parcels may have wetlands or other encumbrances.

Mr. Peck pointed out that at the bottom of Table 7-9, it says that.... “...*multifamily or cluster redevelopment may be appropriate if land cannot be acquired as open space.*” Every parcel would have to come before the Commission for approval.

Mr. Ladouceur said that he is uncomfortable and against any mention of the parcels in the list, however well intentioned. The Plan is for affordable housing and it would not be a good idea to give any indication that the Commission would plow over open space to put in cluster development or affordable housing instead of keeping it open and natural. Property owners have every right to sell to a private developer and the information is already listed in the POCD. The focus of the Plan should be to get more affordable units, both “a” and “A”.

Mrs. Harrop noted her agreement with Mr. Ladouceur such that we should not be encouraging the development of open space. That item should be taken out.

Ms. Levin said that while she appreciates a crisp document, she is in favor of having more words on the page because not having enough information/explanation would be a disservice to Avon residents.

Mr. Mahoney noted his agreement.

Mr. Ladouceur said that he is ok as a next step for Mr. Peck to rework the bulleted items (revise and maybe delete some) for review by the Commission. There should be just enough clarity/detail such that the task force is given direction but not the final solution.

Mr. Armstrong asked if ADUs (#2) can be combined with promoting AHOZ and TDR (#5) but deleting references to “as of right”

Messrs Gentile, Ladouceur, Hamilton, and Armstrong and Mrs. Harrop said they approve.

Ms. Levin and Mr. Mahoney said they oppose. Mr. Mahoney said that he prefers Mr. Peck’s approach for keeping the items separate with more clarity.

Mr. Armstrong asked if there is a consensus for combining the concept of Item #3 (incentives for affordable accessory apartments) with that of Item #5 (promote AHOZ and TDR).

Mr. Ladouceur said he is against that because if we are going to promote it (#5) incentives may be one of the ways but it may not be, so he wants to leave it to a future determination.

No further comments.

Mr. Armstrong asked if there is a consensus to drop Item #3 so that Item #5 includes accessory apartments and could include the concept of incentives but doesn’t necessarily.

Mr. Ladouceur said he is in favor.

Ms. Levin and Mr. Mahoney said they are fine with it.

Mr. Armstrong said it seems like we have a consensus to drop Item #3.

Mr. Armstrong asked if there is a consensus to drop Item #4 (middle density housing).

Mr. Ladouceur said he is in favor of dropping Item #4 at this time but added that in time possibly a floating zone for large houses converted to one or two apartments could be discussed.

Mr. Mahoney said he is in favor of keeping Item #4 because it will have to be dealt with sooner or later.

Ms. Levin noted her agreement with Mr. Mahoney adding that it’s appropriate to put it out there for public comment.

Mrs. Harrop and Mr. Gentile said they are in favor of dropping Item #4.

In response to Ms. Levin, Mrs. Harrop said that she is opposed to a large home retrofit because in her mind it’s just not allowable in Avon and wouldn’t fit in anywhere. If someone has a big old house on 4 acres that could be split up into six units which is next door to a nice small ranch it isn’t going to fit into the neighborhood. She said she’s trying to keep neighborhoods cohesive.

Ms. Levin addressed middle density/retro fits and asked whether the objection is a lot of people living in a house (once converted) or how it looks from the outside. If the Commission can place restrictions on a retrofit such that it still looks like one house would that be acceptable.

Is the issue what the Town looks like and who is living in these houses; this information could help get the Plan done.

Mr. Gentile said that his concern with Item #4 is that blighted properties would become rentals that are not owner occupied and would eventually turn into a blighted apartment building with four cars in the driveway and wouldn't fit into the neighborhood. This situation in time would be worse for the neighborhood than a blighted single residence.

Mr. Peck explained that there is nothing that would prevent an owner from converting a house like that and living in it and there's nothing to say that that is not going to be a significant improvement over what exists now in the neighborhood. He clarified that it would be limited to two to four dwelling units (not six units). Two or four units is the recommendation to specifically ensure that it still looks like a single-family house. At this time there is no mechanism to deal with these types of situations and this recommendation is to try and help some structures in bad shape and not being used properly; the idea is to make things better.

Mr. Armstrong said that it seems like we have a consensus to delete Item #4 (middle density housing).

Mr. Armstrong said that he believes we have a consensus to keep Item #6 (USDA and CHFA and other loans).

Mr. Armstrong said that there is a consensus to delete Item #7 (consider development of unused municipal land).

Mr. Armstrong said that item #8 (partnerships) was added/included in Item #1 (housing committee/task force). He asked where people stand on adding an item to explore converting existing housing into "A" affordable.

There was a consensus to add an item to explore converting existing housing into "A" affordable.

Mr. Armstrong asked where people are relative to the standing housing committee and task force and subcommittee. He said that he doesn't want anybody on the subcommittee that is outside the Town of Avon.

Mr. Gentile asked that the word "possible" be added to the sentence that says resources for the task force. The task force may not work with some organizations. If the word "possible" is added he supports Mr. Peck's recommendation to establish a standing housing committee.

Ms. Levin asked if the language for Item #1 could be revised to build in more discretion, while making it less prescriptive, for how the task force would operate. The members have to be identified and some framework provided from the onset.

Mr. Peck and Mr. Mahoney agreed.

Mr. Ladouceur said the task force should be capable of looking at the bullets to figure out what next steps they want. If they like the bullets that's fine; if they want to expand or take away items that's fine too. PZC members and Town Staff should be identified.

In response to Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Peck agreed that a task force should include some members of the Commission and Town Staff but should also include some members of the public so they have input into the process. Most committees work better with less than 10 people but said that the details can be worked out later.

Ms. Levin agreed that at this time we are just trying to get agreement on the big concepts.

Mr. Ladouceur said it's very important that members of the public chosen must be Avon residents. One of the residents, ideally, be a business owner in Town. His said his Item #4 works if a couple of the functions are added to it; their task is to increase the number of affordable housing opportunities in Avon.

There was a consensus that a task force/subcommittee would be comprised of either five or seven members with the composition of the committee identified in the recommendations (two PZC members, two Town Staff – Mr. Peck being one, and one member of the public). The details can be worked out later.

Ms. Levin asked that Item #4 (middle density housing) be left in for public comment. Putting this Plan out to the public is to try and understand what the residents want as well as for the public to understand what middle-density housing is all about. We owe it to the public to educate them on everything we are learning about.

Messrs. Peck and. Mahoney agreed.

Mr. Ladouceur said we should take out Item #4 and focus on the big things.

Mr. Peck said that the public may think this item is a great idea; we don't know. It's a really good idea to have public members on these types of committees because they very often have a very different perspective than the Commission.

Mr. Armstrong said that exploring converting existing housing stock to "A" affordable housing is now Item #9 (new).

Mr. Armstrong asked Ms. Levin and Mr. Ladouceur if they are in agreement with the information in the bullets in each category that has been decided will remain.

Ms. Levin said that there is still disagreement as to the format adding that she recommends that we defer to Staff.

Mr. Ladouceur noted his agreement with Ms. Levin and said that Mr. Peck can take the four bulleted items we have reached a consensus on and rewrite them for review at the next meeting. His opinion is less is more.

Ms. Levin noted her agreement on using one document.

Mr. Armstrong said that the Plan that goes to the public will list consensus items as well as the Commission's non-consensus item (i.e., middle-density housing/retrofit) to allow for public input/comments.

Ms. Levin noted her agreement.

Ms. Mahoney noted his agreement adding that the Commission makes too many decisions for the public.

Mr. Peck clarified that a public hearing is not required for the Plan but a public meeting should occur. The date of such a public meeting cannot be determined until the document is complete and the Commission is in agreement on the contents.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur, Mr. Peck explained that the public will see the entire Plan along with the aforementioned four bulleted items and the one non-consensus item, which are the implementation steps.

Mr. Ladouceur said that we should have one document and that his document should be used rather than the document prepared by the consultant because his document has been streamlined.

Mr. Peck noted his disagreement.

Mr. Ladouceur said that we have made countless comments and suggestions and keep getting back a document that has way too much that doesn't apply to what we need to accomplish. He is not in favor of using the consultant's Plan as it is very cumbersome to read and follow.

Mr. Peck said that he has gotten comments from some Commissioners that say there are errors in the document and projections are incorrect adding that he has no idea where these people are getting these ideas. The information provided is data and its data that applies to the Town; we are not making it up. If you don't give the public enough information they won't have a basis to make a determination.

Ms. Levin said that while she appreciates Mr. Ladouceur's work, she has reviewed the consultant's document and suggested, due to the late hour, that the Commission continue to work with the consultant's Plan.

Mr. Armstrong suggested that we wait to see what we get once the consultant modifies the document, taking into consideration comments/suggestions from everyone on the Commission.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30pm.

Linda Sadlon
Planning and Community Development