ITEM #1
CALL OF THE ROLL:
Chairman Christiansen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and the roll was called.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Mark Christiansen, Chairman       Barry Levine, Vice-Chairman
Jim Kelly – Secretary             Karl Saszik              James Fielding
Wayne Vendetto, Jr.               Chris Nelson            Daniel Conley (A)

STAFF PRESENT:
Harry Smith, City Planner
Shelly Briscoe- Land Use Assistant

THE FOLLOWING CITY OFFICIALS WERE PRESENT:
Mayor Martin T. Olsen, Jr., Council Liaison
Deputy Mayor, John Russell

ITEM #2

Robert P. Pryor, Licensed Engineer and Land Survey, LRC Group, 160 West Street, Suite E, Cromwell, CT addressed the Commission. Mr. Pryor provided a brief overview of the project, stating that the proposed development is consistent with the allowed uses in the R-3 Zone, that there would be no impact to traffic congestion or impact to City Police and Fire services. He said that the results of the stormwater management would be a reduction of run off to the brook and the stormwater system on Bayonet Street. Mr. Pryor said that the garbage service would be taken care of by the condominium association.

Discussion followed about the fiscal impact to the City’s Board of Education for school children who would reside in the development. Mr. Smith noted that the applicant is under the impression that the City receives reimbursement for each student that attends the New London School System and that the information provided by the Board of Education indicated that the State reimbursement rate is a flat rate, not per pupil.
There was a brief discussion about easements for the sewer line. Mr. Pryor said that the City Public Utilities did not want the City to own or be responsible for maintaining the sewage lines. He submitted email communications between himself and Mr. Lanzafame, the Public Utilities Administrator for the City, confirming his statement.

Mr. Levine asked for clarification from Mr. Smith what, if any action the Commission needed to take on the Environmental Impact Statement. Mr. Smith stated that the Commission needed to take no action.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak on the Environmental Impact Statement. There was no one.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Vendetto and voted unanimously to close the Public Hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

ITEM #3

Robert P. Pryor, Licensed Engineer and Land Survey, LRC Group, 160 West Street, Suite E, Cromwell, CT addressed the Commission providing an overview of the existing development abutting the proposed development site.

The Chairman noted that the Memorandum for the Record to the Planning Commission indicated that there were numerous comments made by staff that continue to be unaddressed by the applicant.

Mr. Pryor stated that the Memorandum for the Record was received by the applicant on September 29, 2011.

Mr. Smith acknowledged that there were several items City that have not yet been addressed by the applicant, noting that the two most important are the proposed easement on the TVCCA property for sewer line and the drainage issues. Mr. Smith noted that the proposed language in the draft easement prevents the landscaping and lighting on the TVCCA property from being replaced after the sewer line, and that the landscaping and lighting are part of the approved Site Plan for the TVCCA property. He added that nothing has been submitted to indicate that TVCCA is willing to grant the easement.

Mr. Pryor submitted a letter dated August 30, 2011 from TVCCA stating that they have met with the applicants and have agreed to grant a sewer easement and stormwater discharge easement in connection with the proposed development. The letter stated
that the finalizing of the documents for those grants is in process. Mr. Pryor said that as far as conditioning the easement, the language in the draft easement has been modified to allow structures or improvements required as a zoning condition for TVCCA’s property. Mr. Pryor submitted a copy of the modified draft easement.

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 7:45 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

The Chairman said that there are unanswered questions and outstanding documentation that has not been submitted for the record. Chairman Christiansen told the applicant that when they appear before the Commission again, these outstanding items need to be submitted to the Office of Development and Planning in a timely manner so that the information can be reviewed by staff and provided to the Commission members prior to the meeting. The Chairman stressed that when the applicant comes before the Commission again, all paperwork should be together and complete.

Mr. Smith noted that the Commission was short on time for this application and suggested asking the applicant for another time extension.

Mr. Levine said that absent a time extension from the applicant, he was in favor of denying the application without prejudice. He said that with a time extension he was in favor of tabling the item.

Mr. Becker offered a time extension until November 21, 2011.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously to accept the generous offer of a time extension to November 21, 2011.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously to table agenda item #3 to the November 3, 2011 regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

ITEM #4
PUBLIC HEARING. Special Permit. Proposal: Establish a Respite Center and off-site parking. Site: 730 State Pier Road (Map F09/ Block 247/ Lot 8). Applicant/Agent: The Respite Center, a division of New London Homeless Hospitality Center, Inc, Catherine Zall, Executive Director. Property Owner: Saint Peter & Paul Polish Church. A-2 Survey and Site Plan Waivers Requested.

Joel Norwood of Robinson and Cole, 200 Trumbull Street, Hartford, CT addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Norwood provided a brief history of the process the New London Homeless Hospitality Center Inc., has undergone to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission seeking a Special Permit for The Respite Center.

Mr. Norwood explained that Respite Center guests would not use the Homeless Shelter, but would be able to utilize the Hospitality Center during their stay at the Respite
Center. He noted that the only other use on the same floor would be for medical services provided by the Community Health Center.

Mr. Norwood stated that the applicant withdrew the application for a Special Permit for off-site parking as the Planning and Zoning Commission approved off-site parking for the site as part of the Special Permit issued in August 2011 for the Homeless Shelter.

Mary Lenzini President, Visiting Nurses Association of Southeastern Connecticut, 403 North Frontage Road, New London addressed the Commission in support of the application. Ms. Lenzini stressed the need for the Respite Center by sharing a few scenarios of homeless individuals with medical needs. She noted that the care given at the Respite Center is the same care an individual would be provided at home. Ms. Lenzini said that the Respite Center is a low cost, respectful alternative to hospitalization, it is a cost effective alternative to patients staying in the hospital because their care cannot be met in the traditional shelter setting.

Bill Stanley, Vice-President of Development at Lawrence & Memorial Hospital, 365 Montauk Avenue, NL addressed the Commission in strong support of the application. Mr. Stanley said that people who have no one to care for them at home, or for that matter have no home at all, are much more likely to have difficulty understanding, following or implementing their own care instructions after they’ve discharged. Mr. Stanley said that Respite beds at the Shelter/Hospitality Center would ensure better post-discharge care, better health for the patients and less repeat volume in the Emergency Department, which frees up staff to care more quickly for other patients whose wait times would otherwise be considerably longer. Mr. Stanley said that Lawrence and Memorial Hospital is strongly committed to the Respite Center.

Catherine Zall, 400 Bank Street, NL addressed the Commission. Ms. Zall reiterated that the Respite Center is not a walk-in facility but an impatient care facility that collaborates with medical health professionals to provide respite care.

Ted Olynciw, a member of the Board of Directors for the Homeless Hospitality Center addressed the Commission and distributed a plot plan and floor plans for the ground, first floor and second floor of the building at 730 State Pier Road. Mr. Olynciw reviewed the outside features of the lot including parking and screening from abutting properties. He noted that the Respite Center Facility is on a completely separate floor from the Homeless Shelter as well as the Hospitality Center.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak on the application. There was no one.

Mr. Smith reviewed the four additional restrictions and requirements for uses indentified within Section 510.3 (31) (Private, public, or quasi-public rehabilitation facilities) of the Zoning Regulations for the City of New London and the suggested conditions of approval with the Commission.

Mr. Smith noted that the floor plan distributed by Mr. Olynciw differs from the one that was approved for the Homeless Hospitality Center in August 2011.
It was the consensus of the Commission as well as the applicant that the only floor plan being considered as part of the application for the Respite Center is for the Respite Center; all other floor plans distributed were for illustration purposes. Any changes to previously approved plans would need to be submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Vendetto questioned the maximum length of stay a resident at the Respite Center. Attorney Bates said the length of time a resident would stay at the Respite Center would be determined by the individual medical needs of the resident.

There was a brief discussion about the maximum number of residents and non-residents that would be on site at the same time.

Mr. Levine asked Attorney Bates if the applicant was agreeable to the findings and suggested conditions, including the suggested limit of 15 residents and non-residents at any given time. Attorney Bates said that applicant was agreeable to all findings and conditions.

There was a brief discussion about licensed care at the Respite Center. It was reiterated that the Visiting Nurses Association would provide professional services as needed to residents and that the care provided to residents by the Respite Center staff would be the same care given to an individual at his or her home.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously to close the Public Hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously to approve Special Permit proposal to establish as a rehabilitation facility under Section 510.3 (31) a Respite Center, site 730 State Pier Road (Map F09/ Block 247/ Lot 8, applicant/agent, The Respite Center, a division of New London Homeless Hospitality Center, Inc, Catherine Zall, Executive Director, property owner, Saint Peter & Paul Polish Church. The Commission waived the A-2 survey and site plan as requested. Incorporated into the Special Permit, the findings and suggested conditions of approval from the Memorandum for the Record to the Planning and Zoning Commission for the October 6, 2011 regular meeting, page 26 of 31, finding one (1) and conditions one (1) through three (3) as presented and condition number four (4) is added “There shall be no more than fifteen (15) residential and non-residential patrons on site concurrently.”

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously to the extent legally possible, the Commission waived the fees required for the application for item number four (4) of the agenda.

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 8:42 p.m. and resumed the meeting at 8:49 p.m.
ITEM #5
PUBLIC HEARING. Special Permit Modification. Proposal: Modification to Approval #497 (01/18/01) and Approval #952 (07/17/08) to allow a free medical clinic as an accessory use to an approved Place of Worship. Site: 35 Redden Avenue (Map D13/Block 157/Lot 18) Applicant/Agent: Debra Pennuto. Property Owner: Daniel Martino. A-2 Survey and Site Plan Waivers Requested.

Debra Pennuto, Director of Ministries, First Hispanic Baptist Church of New London, 35 Redden Avenue, NL addressed the Commission. Ms. Pennuto stated that the application was for a Special Use Permit to allow the operation of a free medical clinic in the multi-use center of the First Hispanic Church in order to service members of the community that are uninsured. She said that the growing number of unemployed persons as well as the undocumented members of the community is the population served by the free clinic.

Chairman Christian asked if the clinic was strictly for parishioners or is the clinic open to the public.

Ms. Pennuto clarified that the only criteria for attending the free clinic was being uninsured. She stated that the clinic was opened on June 23, 2011, about a month prior to receiving a letter from the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Ms. Pennuto said that the clinic has been inspected and licensed by the State of Connecticut.

Ms. Pennuto said that the clinic would operate under the auspices of the church.

Ms. Pennuto said that the physician licensed to run the clinic is a member of the church and works pro-bono.

Mr. Smith said that the church is in the R-3 Zone and that the Commission would have to determine if a medical clinic which is offered to the public at large is considered to be an accessory use. Mr. Smith said that if the Commission determines the free clinic to be an accessory use then a modification to the Special Permit for the place of worship could be issued. If, however, the Commission determines that the use is not accessory use, then the clinic would need to be handled differently because a medical clinic is not an allowable use in the R-3 Zone.

The Chairman asked Ms. Pennuto if other churches were offering these services. Ms. Pennuto said no, not in this area.

Commission members briefly discussed charity work done by a church as part of the church’s mission. Mr. Nelson noted that churches provide charity to members of the community that are not members of that church.

Ms. Pennuto said that parishioners are community members, they are not all members per-se of the church but many people come in off the street and may only visit once or twice, but they are considered members of the church. Ms. Pennuto said that she didn’t know how to make the distinction of church members so that the Commission could
make their decision. She said that while the clinic is open to the public, the hours of operation are limited to one day a week for four hours.

The Chairman said that it isn’t customary for doctors to work out of churches.

Commission members stated that medical clinics are not an allowable use in the R-3 Zone and suggested that perhaps the church could provide these services off-site in a site where medical clinics are an allowable use.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak on the application.

Christine Rosetti of 63 West High Street, New London addressed the Commission. Ms. Rosetti expressed concerns about an increase in traffic in the area if the Commission determines that the medical clinic is an accessory use to the church. Ms. Rosetti stressed that this is a residential zone and said that she agreed that the First Hispanic Baptist Church should find another location to conduct the medical clinic since it is not an allowable use in the residential zone.

Commission members expressed concern about setting a precedent noting that there are churches all over the City, many of which are in residential zones.

Mr. Levine stated that he did not believe a medical clinic is an accessory use to a place of worship.

Mr. Vendetto said that he believed the church could fulfill its mission in an area of the City that is appropriately zoned. He stated that no one wants to see the uninsured unable to access the services they need, but that the Zoning Regulations are in place to protect the rights of all of the City’s citizens. Mr. Vendetto reiterated that this property is in the R-3 Zone and medical clinics are not an allowable use in the zone.

Mr. Nelson suggested that the Commission give Ms. Pennuto the opportunity to provide information about other churches in residential zones that are providing a medical clinic.

Mr. Vendetto said that the zone and regulations in other towns would be different from the City of New London and that the City’s regulations are clear about the allowable uses. Mr. Vendetto said that he doesn’t believe the churches’ mission will not be impeded if the Commission does not approve the application, reiterating that there are appropriate zones within the City where the church could offer the medical clinic services.

Mr. Nelson suggested that the relevant thing would be to find out if there is a way and if there are instances of communities that have allowed this use only in churches and have done it in a way that minimizes the impact to the neighborhood.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Fielding to close the Public Hearing.
The motion passed.
PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Mr. Levine made a motion that the Commission finds that the applicant's proposed use is not an accessory use under the definition of the Zoning Regulations of the City of New London and that Commission denies the application for a Special Permit modification, proposal, modification to approval #497 (01/18/01) and approval #952 (07/17/08) to allow a free medical clinic as an accessory use to an approved Place of Worship, site, 35 Redden Avenue (Map D13/ Block 157/ Lot 18) applicant/agent, Debra Pennuto, property owner, Daniel Martino, because the proposed use is not an allowed use in the R-3 Zone. Mr. Kelly seconded the motion. The motion passed.

ITEM #6

Chairman Christiansen said that he would like the applicant to review the plans originally approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and then review the proposed modifications to the site.

Ron Bomagen of Fuss & O’Neill, 146 Hartford Road, Manchester, CT addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Bomagen said that everyone is aware that there is a drainage problem on site. He displayed the drainage plan for site, which were approved by the Commission in 2008 in conjunction with the addition to the church. The stated that this is the only approved plan on record in the Office of Development and Planning.

Mr. Smith stated that there is an approved plan dated 2001 in the Office of Development and Planning.

Mr. Bomagen reviewed the plans approved in 2001 pointing out the structures on the plans that are listed as drywells and catch basins. He said that the site plan does not show any pipes. Mr. Bomagen went on to say that there are no drainage analysis or drainage reports on file.

Mr. Smith noted that the revised September 28, 2001 Site Plans being displayed by Mr. Bomagen are not on file in the Planning Office. Mr. Bomagen agreed to submit the displayed plans for the record.
The Chairman asked if the drywells and catch basins shown on the approved plans were installed.

Mr. Bomagen said no, that there are pipes, however, the applicant does not believe that the drywells were ever installed.

Mr. Bomagen said that there is an email from a City inspector that state the site was inspected and installed as planned.

Discussion followed about the language in the email from the City Inspector.

Regarding the email, the Chairman said, be that as it may, there is an approved plan that is stamped and sealed by the engineer and not built as submitted and approved.

Mr. Bomagen said that he was surprised the City did not have the displayed plans because these plans addressed the ten conditions of approval. He said that sheet two of the plans show the pipes connecting down through a drainage easement. Mr. Bomagen noted that the easement is on record, but the plan is not. He noted the plan shows a pipe going down through the Oasis and Restoration property out to Garfield Avenue. He said this pipe does not exist. Mr. Bomagen said that perk tests were a condition of approval, however he does not know if they were ever done. He said there is an email communication from 2000 or 2001, to a City employee stating that perks tests were going to be done and inviting the employee to attend, noting that this is prior to when the church was being constructed. Mr. Bomagen said he would submit a copy of the email for the record.

Mr. Bomagen said that a drainage analysis of the existing site has been done and that the drainage system does not have the capacity to handle the flow passing through it. Mr. Bomagen then provided the Commission an overview of the current flow pattern for water from the site.

Mr. Bomagen said that sheet three of the revised plans, September 28, 2011, show drywell detail.

Mr. Bomagen said that the same engineer provided plans for the church in 2008 when an application was submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission for an addition to the existing church. He noted there was no drainage improvements submitted as part of the application for the addition to the church.

Mr. Bomagen reiterated the information about the email from the City inspector who stated that an inspection of the site had been done and that it appeared as though the drainage system was installed as presented in the plan, which resulted in a Certificate of Occupancy being issued by the City.

It was noted by staff and Commission members that the email isn’t clear about what the City inspector was told and what plan was being referred to.
Chairman Christiansen said that he remembered the discussions that took place at the Planning and Zoning Commission about the drywells and catch basins.

Mr. Bomagen explained the modifications proposed by the applicant to address the drainage issues. He said that the proposal is to take a large portion of the drainage area away from Garfield Avenue, away from the system going down toward the Oasis and Restoration property. He said that the pipe would be split between the lower and upper portions of the property at First Hispanic Baptist Church. Mr. Bomagen said that the existing pipe would be blocked and a trench drain installed that would use two existing catch basins located in the corners of the trench drain to route the water back towards Redden Avenue. A said a new manhole and a spill basin/ catch basin down on Redden Avenue that would be below the pipe system. He explained that when the pipes fill with water, it would spill out on Redden Avenue and flow down the gutter line.

Discussion followed about the water flowing down the gutter line, not necessarily into the storm drains, but down onto Jefferson Avenue.

The Chairman stated that Jefferson Avenue is a State road and inquired if the applicant had obtained a permit from the State Department of Transportation to do improvements on Jefferson Avenue.

Mr. Bomagen said that the applicant has been in contact with the State and is in the process of applying for the necessary permits.

There was a brief discussion about the fact that the drainage problem is not being addressed, but instead being diverted elsewhere.

Mr. Bomagen said that the ultimate concern is that the Commission doesn't want water to leave the property, however, there is nowhere for the water to go. He noted that all the properties in the area have water impacting their properties. Mr. Bomagen said that there is no pipe network that has a discharge point anywhere in this area.

The Chairman asked why the drywells included in the approved plan aren't being installed.

Mr. Bomagen said that the information about the soils included in the approved plans indicate that the soil is a clayish material and that water would most likely not infiltrate into the ground, thus creating the same problem.

The Chairman said that the Commission was never told about the problem with the soil conditions and asked if the proposed plan was going to resolve the drainage problem.

Mr. Smith noted that neither staff nor the Commission have seen the proposed plans.

Mr. Bomagen reviewed the proposed plans and said that the system would be flowing at full capacity during a 10-year storm but that there would not be over topping over the curbing down into the lower property. He said that the basin would have one and a half to two inches of water bubbling out of the top, but with curbing behind it, would be a
lot better than the drainage problem that currently exists. Mr. Bomagen said that the water would remain in the parking lot of the Oasis and Restoration as a puddle.

The Chairman said that this takes the water from draining onto one site and moving it to another site. He asked Mr. Bomagen if the Oasis and Restoration was aware of this proposed drainage plan.

Mr. Bomagen said that the applicant is improving the problem and that Oasis and Restoration is aware of the plan. He stated that the only reason this is being done is because of the legal matter and that the proposed modification is a drastic improvement.

Katherine L. Matthews of Gordon, Muir and Foley, LLP, 10 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, CT, Legal council for the First Hispanic Baptist Church addressed the Commission. Ms. Matthews stated that Oasis and Restoration is a party to the litigation that caused The First Hispanic Baptist Church to come before the Planning and Zoning Commission to try and fix the problem. She said that Oasis and Restoration as well as Mr. Suntup, the other downstream property owner supported the application. Ms. Matthews said that she believed that Mr. Suntup submitted a letter of support for the application, which was a condition of the church coming before the Planning and Zoning Commission.

The Chairman said that he wanted the City Engineer to review the proposal before the Commission makes any kind of decision.

Mr. Vendetto asked why the applicant doesn’t install the drainage system that was already approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission. He said that the Commission approved the Site Plan; the applicant did not construct it as approved and then made changes without the approval of the Commission. Mr. Vendetto reiterated that the applicant should go back the approved Site Plan and built as approved.

Mr. Bomagen said that there is no documentation of what happened between the approval and the installation. He said that it is believed that when the contractor started the bad soils, that couldn’t be infiltrated the water, were noticed in that area and changes were made and approved by a City Inspector. Mr. Bomagen again referred to the email from City Inspector, which said that the system was installed per plans.

The Chairman stated that changes were not brought back to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval.

Mr. Smith stated that it isn’t clear from the records that the City Inspector approved the site as constructed.

The Chairman said that the original plan was prepared, stamped, signed, and sealed by an Engineer. He said that the engineer said this system works and the City looked at it and agreed then that is what the Commission should be looking at. Chairman Christiansen said now the Commission is being asked to redesign something that was
never completed. He questioned if the City could issue a Cease and Desist this long after the approval.

Mr. Smith noted that a letter was received in the office from Mr. Suntup and read the letter into the record.

Ms. Matthews said that Mr. Suntup has seen the proposed plans as presented to the Commission.

Mr. Vendetto reiterated his frustration with the fact that the site was not built as approved by the Commission and that any modifications needed should have presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission prior to changes being made by the applicant to the Site Plan.

The Chairman expressed concerns about the alleviating the water problems on one property and creating problems on others.

Mr. Smith noted that the City Engineer has reviewed the plans that the Commission members have, but not the plans being shown by the applicant. He noted that many of her comments have not been addressed. Mr. Smith suggested that the Commission require the applicant to provide the City Engineer the information previously requested as well as the new information being presented.

Mr. Bomagen provided statistics about the current water flow onto Jefferson Avenue as well as prior to the construction of the Church.

Mr. Smith asked Mr. Bomagen to submit this documentation. Mr. Bomagen said that it would be submitted next week.

The Chairman asked if there was anyone from the public who wished to speak on behalf of the application.

Christine Rosetti of 63 West High Street, NL addressed the Commission and expressed concerns about the effect of the proposed stormwater drainage system on the septic systems in the neighborhood.

Dawn Fortin of 11 Redden Avenue, NL said that currently when there is a rainstorm, the water on the street travels so swiftly that it comes up over the back of the parked cars.

Richard Paul of 122 Jefferson Avenue, NL said that the church should install the stormwater drainage system that was originally submitted and approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission, as part of the Site Plan for the construction of the church.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted unanimously to continue the Public Hearing for the application for a Site Plan modification proposal, Stormwater drainage improvements on Redden Ave. and Garfield St. site, 35 Redden Avenue (Map D13/ Block 157/ Lot 18) applicant, Debra A. Pennuto. Agent, Fuss & O’Neill, Inc. Jim Parry, property owner, Daniel Martino with an A-2
Survey waiver request to the November 3, 2011 regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

ITEM #8
OTHER BUSINESS.
There was no other business.

ITEM #9
CORRESPONDENCE.
The Correspondence was received for the record.

ITEM #10
MINUTES.

Mr. Levine made a motion to amend the agenda item 9b to read September 15, 2011 Special Meeting. Mr. Levine withdrew his motion.

(a) September 1, 2011 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Fielding and voted to approve the minutes of the September 1, 2011 regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission as presented. Mr. Nelson abstained from the vote.

(b) September 15, 2011 Special Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Fielding, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2011 special meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission as presented. Mr. Nelson and Mr. Levine abstained from the vote.

(c) September 15, 2011 Regular Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Kelly and voted to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2011 regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission, with the removal of the arrival times listed for Mr. Levine and Mr. Vendetto. Mr. Nelson abstained from the vote.

ITEM #11
ADJOURNMENT.

A motion was made by Mr. Levine, seconded by Mr. Fielding and voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting 10:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shelly Briscoe
Land Use Assistant

APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION ON: December 1, 2011