

# ***Planning and Zoning Commission City of Derby***

Theodore J. Estwan, Jr., Chairman

Steven A. Jalowiec

David J. Rogers

Richard A. Stankye

Albert Misiewicz

Glenn H. Stevens

Raul Sanchez

Anthony Szewczyk, Alt.

Maryanne DeTullio, Clerk

The regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission of the City of Derby was held on Tuesday, August 21, 2012 at 7:00 p.m. in the Aldermanic Chambers, City Hall, 1 Elizabeth Street, Derby.

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m. by Chairman Ted Estwan. Present were Ted Estwan, Richard Stankye, Steven Jalowiec, David Rogers, Albert Misiewicz, Raul Sanchez and Anthony Szewczyk. Also present were Attorney Joseph Coppola, Corporation Counsel, Ryan McEvoy, Milone and MacBroom and Maryanne DeTullio, Clerk.

## Additions, Deletions, Corrections to Agenda

A motion to add as Item 11c discussion of settlement of Walgreen's appeal was made by Mr. Jalowiec, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

A motion to add as Item 7a approval of June 19, 2012 minutes was made by Mr. Stankye, seconded by Mr. Szewczyk and carried unanimously.

A motion to move Item 11a before Item 9 was made by Mr. Jalowiec, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

## Correspondence - None

## Public Portion

Anita Dugatto, 69 Elizabeth Street asked about the revisions to the June 19, 2012 meeting minutes regarding the approval for 59-65 Elizabeth Street. She also stated that once the apartments are put in they could become low end or high end apartments. She felt that the decision should be rescinded. Mr. Estwan stated that this item is under appeal and asked that no further comments be made on the matter.

Dan Waleski, 21 Elm Street wanted to comment on Item 11a the application from BAMF Homes, LTD and Mr. Estwan stated that the public hearing has been closed and the Commission cannot consider any comments made by this time in their decision process. Mr. Waleski stated that some major changes were made to these plans and it should have gotten a second review. Mr. Estwan again stated that the public hearing has been closed and no further comments should be made.

Karen Kemmesies, 25 John Street also wanted to comment on the BAMF Homes, LTD application but Mr. Estwan stated that the public hearing has been closed and no further comments accepted.

### Approval of Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2012 meeting was made by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Jalowiec and carried unanimously.

Mr. Estwan stated that the approval of the June 19, 2012 minutes was tabled so that they could be reviewed and revised. They have not been revised at this time and Mr. Stankye moved to table the approval to the September meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Jalowiec and carried unanimously.

### Acceptance of Applications

Mr. Estwan stated that there are no new applications to accept

### Old Business

(a) Application from BAMF Homes, LTD for 5 lot subdivision at 16 John Street (Application # 2012-02-21-02).

Mr. Estwan asked if any Commission had any comments based on what was heard during the public hearing. Mr. McEvoy stated that an alternate site plan was reviewed and approved by Inland Wetlands Commission. Mr. Estwan stated that the alternate plan was introduced to this Commission at the end of the last public hearing and for the record the public had no opportunity to review and comment on it. He stated that engineering and legal staff had no chance to review it either. He stated that this Commission review, discuss and act on the plan that was presented, three lots in the front and two rear lots. Mr. Estwan stated that one of the things that needs to be done and proved to this Commission, because the interior lots are a special exception, Section 195-3 of the zoning regulations require that there be minimum requirements for the flag lots and the reason they are needed is that it has to promote public health, safety, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the City. He asked for any comments on the interior lots.

Mr. Jalowiec stated that he did not feel that there was any proof that they meet those requirements. He stated that to him they were trying to cram as much development into that parcel as possible. He felt it went against the intent of the zoning regulations and goes against the Plan of Conservation and Development that the Commission is looking to decompress the City. He also stated that more single family homes affect the tax base. He did not feel that the flag lots add anything of any value.

Mr. Stankye stated that he agreed and they did not prove that they need the flag lots.

Mr. Sanchez asked if the four lots in the front and one flag was off not being considered. Mr. Estwan stated that was presented at the end of the public hearing and the public did not have

an opportunity to review it. The Commission was at the end of any extensions that the applicant could grant to the Commission and he felt that it could not be considered. He stated that he felt that they were trying to cram in a lot and add those flag lots. He stated that he did not have anything against an applicant developing his property as long as it is within the regulations. He also felt that there were additional concerns with the number of driveways in the back and the runoff and the fact that the road is not crowned properly and knowing where the runoff goes.

Mr. Estwan moved that following review of the plan and supporting documentation submitted in support of this application, the Derby Planning & Zoning Commission hereby denies the Subdivision Application and Special Exception Application for BAMF Homes, LTD on property shown on Derby Assessors Map 3-2, Lot 13.

The denial shall be based upon the following documents submitted in support of this application:

1. Application for approval of subdivision.
2. List of property owners adjacent property and property owners across the street.
3. Request for Waiver of Section 3.11 of the Derby Subdivision Regulations.
4. January 11, 2012 Minutes from Derby Inland Wetlands Agency (DIWA) containing the conditions of approval for the subdivision.
5. "Site Engineering & Drainage Report," prepared for BAMF Homes, Inc., prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC dated September 1, 2011, revised to October 10, 2011.
6. Plan entitled "Subdivision of property, 16 John Street, Prepared for Carl DeCarli, Derby, Connecticut", dated February 14, 2012 at a scale of 1" = 30', prepared by Codespoti & Associates, P.C.
7. Plans entitled "5-Lot Residential Subdivision, 16 John Street, Derby, Connecticut" with the following attached drawings:
  - a. "Sheet SP-1, Site Development Plan," prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC, dated August 15, 2011, revised t May 11, 2012, and drawn at a scale of 1" = 30'.
  - b. "Sheet SP-2, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan," prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC, dated August 15, revised to February 14, 2012, and drawn at a scale of 1" = 30'.
  - c. "Sheet SP-3, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Details and Notes," prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC, dated September 1, 2011, revised to February 14, 2012, and drawn at varying scales.

- d. "Sheet SP-4, Erosion and Sedimentation Control Details and Notes," prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC dated September 1, 2011, revised to February 14, 2012, and drawn at varying scales.
8. Letter from Fire Marshall's office to Theodore Estwan dated February 23, 2012.
9. Letter from Fire Marshall's Office to James Rotundo dated June 19, 2012.
10. Comment Letter from Milone and MacBroom dated March 15, 2012.
11. Copy of Assessor's mapping for #14 and #14A John Street.
12. Copy of plan from Derby Land Records entitled "Map Prepared for Angelo Mongillo, Derby, Connecticut", scale 1" = 40', dated January 31, 1980, rev. February 5, 1980.
13. WPCA review from Weston & Sampson dated April 17, 2012.
14. Plans entitled "5-Lot Residential Subdivision, 16 John Street, Derby, Connecticut" with the following attached drawings:
  - a. "Sheet SP-1, Alternate Site Development Plan" prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC, dated August 15, 2011, revised to June 15, 2012, and drawn at a scale of 1"=30'.
  - b. "Sheet SP-2, Alternate Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan," prepared by Rotundo Engineering, LLC dated August 15, revised to June 15, 2012, and drawn At a scale of 1"=30'.
15. Letter from Soil and Wetland Science to Dominick Thomas dated June 19, 2012.

Furthermore, the application does not meet the minimum requirements for the promotion of public health, safety, convenience, comfort and general welfare as established in Section 195-3 of the Zoning Regulations for the following reasons:

1. The applicant did not adequately demonstrate to the Commission per Section 195-62.C.(3) that the land characteristics and physical site conditions make flag lot development practical, rational and desirable.
2. The flag lot configuration as proposed in referenced document #7 results in Flag Lot 4 being located behind Flag Lot 5 and is therefore not in conformance with Section 195-62.C.(7) of the Derby Zoning Regulations.
3. The lot configuration as proposed in reference document #7 does not include a permanent and continuous landscaped buffer on Flag Lot 5 between the lot line shared by Flag Lot 5 and Lot 2, and is therefore not in compliance with Section 195-62.C.(8) of the Derby Zoning Regulations.

4. The flag lots as proposed in reference document #7 will result in stormwater runoff being direction from the access driveways on the flag lots across Lots 1 and 2 and result in an undesirable burden on the future homeowners of Lots 1 and 2.
5. A Subdivision Map for the Alternate Site Development Plan with dimensions of the parcel prepared by a licensed surveyor and in accordance with Section 2.3.4 of the Subdivision Regulations was not submitted and therefore the Commission had no means to determine if the Alternate Site Plan conforms to the Derby Zoning and Subdivision Regulations. Furthermore, the Alternate Site Development Plan was formally submitted to the Commission at the final night of the public hearing and the Commission and the public were not afforded adequate opportunity to review and comment on the Alternate Site Development Plan.
6. The applicant has acknowledged that the paved portion of John Street as currently configured is cross pitched in the area of the subdivision, with stormwater runoff from the subject parcel and the roadway itself directed across John Street from west to east. The applicant did not adequately address the concerns raised by the Commission and members of the public regarding the potential for isolated increases in stormwater runoff along John Street toward the parcels on the east side of John Street.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Jalowiec and carried unanimously.

(b) Update on Redevelopment Zone.

Atty. Coppola stated that Eclipse will be here in September to make a presentation and he will extend an invitation to the Board so that the members can attend. He stated that it will probably be the first or second week of September.

(c) Introduction of settlement to Walgreens appeal.

Atty. Thom Regan, representing Walgreens stated that the approval of the Walgreens application by this Commission was appealed by an abutting property owner. He stated that they have been working on a settlement and he wanted to present the settlement that has been agreed with that addresses their three concerns. The first concern was the five lane driveway which needed to be consolidated. The second was the right in/right out at the Walgreens driveway, the pad was not completed restricted and the third was the left hand movement of trucks out onto Pershing Drive from Walgreens. Atty. Regan stated that they come up with a plan that addresses all three issues. He stated that under Connecticut General Statutes any settlement has to be brought before the Commission and they have to approve it before the Court can finalize it. He stated that they are making a rough presentation of the settlement and then will give town staff a month to go through the details of the plan and make any comments and come back next month and hopefully finalize it.

Ray Gradwell, BL Companies stated that the concern of the driveway with the right in/right out movement and part of the State DOT approval was to limit the access to right in/right out. He stated that they eliminated the left turn truck movement out of that driveway. He stated that the trucks will move through the site and exit from another driveway. He stated that it will also be a raised island. He stated that they will be cleaning up the intersection and making it a

more conventional four lane intersection. He stated that they worked with 98 Pershing LLC and have come up with this resolution. He stated that there will be cross easements and a four way intersection. Mr. Estwan stated that the Commission did receive a copy of the STC approval and everything in that will be presented at the next meeting. Mr. Jalowiec asked if the prints could be distributed to the Board electronically prior to the next meeting. Mr. Estwan stated they are technical in nature and everything that was asked for during the public hearing process he asked for a motion that they have been received and will be on the agenda next month for technical review. Mr. Jalowiec moved to acknowledge that this has been received and will be on the agenda for the September meeting for technical review. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

### Public Hearing

(a) Application from Brookside Development LLC for 8 Lot Subdivision with flag lots at 401 David Humphreys Road – Application #2012-06-19-04.

Mark Nuzzolo, Alan Shepard, D.J. Collins and Attorney Fran Teodosio were present for the applicant. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that the certified mailings had been presented to David Kopjanski and he signed off on it. Mr. Sanchez recused himself from hearing this application.

Mr. Nuzzolo gave the history of the parcel and stated that this is the balance of a 200 acre parcel that was developed by the Singer Estate. He stated that there is 1000 feet of road frontage and six acres of land. There is a commercial parcel on one side and across the street. There is a swimming pool on the parcel which is fed by a brook. This has been ignored overtime and the brook is full of invasive species. He stated that their application is pending before Inland Wetlands at this time. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that he is proposing to revitalize the watercourse and clean up and use the pool which will have a water quality basin. This will be a “green” development. He stated that there will be very minimal site work and he is proposing eight lots on six acres. He stated that they will be large lots with large footprints. The house will be a first floor masters and they will be put on the high side to take advantage of the solar juxtaposition. They will maintain the stone wall and one of the things that is critical to this parcel is the landscaping to block out the commercial development and the busy road. He stated that they have also tried to provide a buffer to homes on David Humphreys Road.

Alan Shepard, engineer stated that he will go over the review letter from Milone and MacBroom. He stated that the configuration submitted has three flag lots. The alternate plan would have the same number of houses with three having frontage on Sodom Lane and two on David Humphreys Road. He stated that the downside would be the lose of the existing house. This plan would also involve more grading. There will be one curb cut on David Humphreys Road and will work off the high side to allow for buffering. There will be a common driveway which the Association will have to take care of.

Mr. Shepard stated that they prepared a sight line map and the sight lines are in keeping with the subdivision regulations. Mr. Estwan asked if the Traffic Authority commented on the application. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that he spoke with them and it was reviewed. They had no problem and felt comfortable with the sight lines. Mr. Shepard stated that individual driveways would have caused more issues and one common driveway would work better.

Mr. Shepard stated that the letter indicated that the flag lots on Lot 1 and lot 2 should have 20' buffer in front of them. They front on the road and there is not a 20' buffer but the Commission could waive that. There is a detailed landscape plan. Mr. Estwan asked if the entrance from Sodom Lane will be removed and Mr. Nuzzolo stated that it will be taken out. He stated that he wanted to create a buffer to the commercial development and there will be a heavy buffer along the Lowe's property. He stated that he wanted to create a village effect.

Mr. Shepard stated that they looked at several alternate plans and one would have a lot of curb cuts for the lots and another with all frontage lots and a proposed road. This would involve a City road. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that they also looked at a condominium project but did not feel it was in harmony with the neighborhood. The existing home will be deed restricted to a single family use only.

Mr. Shepard stated that Mr. McEvoy commented on the lot width of Lot 7 and he stated that he tried to measure it in different ways and felt that it meets the regulation but will speak with Mr. McEvoy about it. He stated that he also looked at the lot lines and there is very little grading and it follows the contours. He stated that Lot 2 follows the contours of the land and it has a "tail" which is very useable land.

Mr. Shepard stated that the application is being reviewed by Inland Wetlands and their public hearing has been closed. He also stated that the stormwater management system is a little different. There will be a homeowners' association and blanket easements for maintenance of the detention areas. The drainage will be spread out a little more. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that they are going to make the lots attractive so that the homeowner will maintain it. They are proposing a rain garden for each lot. He also stated that they will provide more calculations for the water quality basins. Mr. Shepard stated that they have received an informal letter back from WPCA and are working with them. He pointed out the open space and stated that the area will have a protective buffer. He stated that they have put a lot of effort into the project and are making it attractive but it is in keeping with the regulations.

Atty. Fran Teodosio stated that this will be an exceptional subdivision with zero energy use. The regulations allow for the configuration that is being proposed. He stated that flag lot are cautious item and the regulations allow for flag lots. He also stated that the Commission has discretion to allow for flag lots. He stated that the applicant has to prove to the Commission that the flag lots are practical, reasonable and desirable. He stated that subdivision itself because of its location, the topography and the history of the site allow the Commission the discretion to allow the flag lots. He stated that it is in the public interest to preserve the main house which will remain as a private residence. Atty. Teodosio stated that the zero energy use could also be considered in the public interest. He stated that the property is located between a lot of zones and the flag lots allow for an oasis to the residential area without any intensive construction on the main street. He stated as far as the topography of the property. He stated that there will be no cutting or filling. He stated that a substantial amount of vegetation will be put in which will block the commercial developments from the residential uses. He stated that all of the reasons that the subdivision regulations allow discretion exist with this project. He encouraged the Commission to use their discretion and allow the flag lots.

Mr. Jalowiec asked the size of the proposed homes. D.J. Collins stated that they will be 1800 to 2200 s.f. Mr. Jalowiec asked about the cement pond on Lot 7 and Mr. Nuzzolo stated that it will be filled in.

Mr. Szewczyk stated that one of the arguments presented regarding the flag lots was the existing house and its historic significance. He felt that the public would want to see the house and use the roadway. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that is one of the reasons that they chose to close off Sodom Lane. He stated that it will be a private road and the Association will be maintaining it and they will have to deal with restricting it. Mr. Szewczyk asked about the positioning of the homes for the solar use. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that the challenge will be with the roof lines and positioning the homes for the best solar placement.

Mr. Stankye asked if there was any information available on the "green" development for the Commission to help them understand the concept. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that he will attempt to provide some information to the Commission. Mr. Stankye asked if it is a private driveway then the City will not have to maintain it or provide for snow removal or garbage pickup. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that the Association will maintain the road, but garbage will be picked up if brought out to the main street.

Mr. Estwan stated that the City Engineer did a review letter based on the flag lots. The Commission needs to decide if this is the way we want to go and do a more in depth analysis of this development or is it something we don't want to see. He stated that he felt that if you took away Lot 3 and the layout and design of it, besides the technical aspects and issues that would have to be reviewed, he would not have a problem with the development.

Mr. Estwan stated that the Commission has wanted to update the subdivision regulations but have never been funded to do that. He stated that this is the first time the Commission has seen this. He stated that he likes the concept and understands it. He stated that he likes it better than the alternates. He stated that he is looking for comments from the Commission regarding if this is what they would like to see. Mr. Misiewicz stated that he felt there were a lot of good points for the flag lots in this case especially with the buffers for the commercial zones and keeping one driveway. He asked if the Fire Marshal commented on the application. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that he did review the plans and commented on them. He had no problem but wanted a fire hydrant put in. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that he also presented the plans to the president of the Board of Aldermen, the Mayor, Economic Development Director and Valley Community Foundation.

Mr. Jalowiec stated that the concept is unique and there are lot of factors that could be considered for the flag lots. He asked about the width of the private driveway. Mr. Shepard stated that it starts at 22' and goes down to 18'.

Mr. Rogers stated that it helped to hear the proposal and there is a lot to like with the project.

Mr. Estwan asked for any public comment.



Robert Searles, 319 David Humphreys Road stated that his only concern is the exit onto David Humphreys Road. He stated that there is a lot of traffic on that road and a lot of speeding. He did not know if there was enough of a sight line and was concerned with fire trucks and emergency vehicles. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that the driveway will be improved and elevated. They will also move the stone wall back and remove some trees which will help the sight lines.

Mr. Searles stated that there is a lot of wildlife in the area and asked about a conservation area. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that they are proposing to revitalize the watercourse and add vegetation.

Mike Alberta, 325 David Humphreys Road was concerned about the driveway out to David Humphreys Road and the amount of cars and speeding on the hill. He felt that they should use the driveway on Sodom Lane. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that the sight lines are better from David Humphreys Road.

Carol Senfield, 238 Hawthorne Avenue was concerned about the width of the private driveway for fire and emergency vehicles. She also asked about the detention ponds and Mr. Shepard stated that they will be water quality basins. There will be a depression in the land and it will act as a filter. She asked if the individual homeowner will have to maintain it. Mr. Shepard stated that the homeowner and the Association. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that they want to make it very attractive so that it will be an amenity to the homeowner and they will want to take care of it.

Dan Waleski, 21 E Im Street felt that there is a better use of the property than what is being proposed. He questioned the exit and also felt that there are too many homes proposed and it is not in character with the area.

Drew Perry, 27 John Street asked if it can be restricted to 55 and older. Mr. Estwan stated that the application is not for 55 and older and Mr. McEvoy stated that 55 and older developments are not permitted in this zone.

Karen Kemmesies, 25 John Street felt that there are drainage issues and she encouraged the Commission to scrutinize the plans.

Anita Dugatto, Elizabeth Street asked the location of Lot 3 and Mr. McEvoy pointed it out to her on the plans.

Mr. Rogers asked if any consideration was given to using the Sodom Lane driveway. Mr. Shepard stated that the driveway is steep and they did consider it but it is not feasible. Mr. Nuzzolo stated that they wanted to block off the commercial properties to this development.

Mr. Stankye asked about the width of the road and Mr. Shepard stated that it is right-of-way widths. Mr. Stankey asked who will maintain the strip along the Lowe's parcel. Mr. Shepard stated that it will be a fee simple strip for Lot 1 but will become part of the buffer area.

A motion to continue the public hearing was made by Mr. Szewczyk, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

New Business

(a) Discussion and possible action – Application from Brookside Development LLC for 8 lot subdivision with flag lots at 401 David Humphreys Road – Application #2012-06-19-04.

A motion to table since the public hearing is still open was made by Mr. Misiewicz, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

(b) Informal Discussion – 253 Roosevelt Drive.

Alan Shepard and Pat Civitello were present. Mr. Civitello is the owner of 253 Roosevelt Drive which is an old factory building. He would like to change into a multi-tenant use and would like to come forward with an application but wanted to explain his ideas to the Commission. He stated that they would propose a certain amount of parking spaces and then let permitted uses go in there and use that parking. He stated that when they get to a threshold of so much square footage or so many parking spaces then they would come back to the Commission. They would be looking for approval up to a certain amount of parking spaces. He stated that they don't know what it will grow into but want to start somewhere. He stated that they would be looking for smaller businesses that need space. Mr. Estwan asked Mr. Civitello if he was going to move his business there. Mr. Civitello stated that he would like to use it. The property is located in an I-1 Zone. Mr. Civitello stated that he has a potential tenant to use some of the space for restoring cars but it would only be one at a time. Mr. Shepard stated that he will be using a lot of the space for storage. Mr. Stankye asked about renovations to the buildings. Mr. Civitello stated that he has started to clean up the site and is doing some roof renovations. Mr. McEvoy stated that retail use is not a permitted use in the I-1 Zone. Mr. Estwan asked if a retail use could be there if it is tied into a permitted use. Mr. Jalowiec asked if a condition of approval could be no outside storage. Mr. Ryan stated that outside storage is permitted in the zone but it has to be screened. Mr. Shepard asked if the project could be phased in.

Executive Session

(a) Update on Enforcement issues; discussion of pending litigation.

A motion to go into Executive Session to discuss pending litigation and have Atty. Coppola and Mr. McEvoy attend was made by Mr. Jalowiec, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 10:00 p.m. A motion to come out of Executive Session and resume the regular meeting at 10:10 p.m. was made by Mr. Rogers, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

Payment of Bills

Mr. Rogers moved that the following bills from Milone and MacBroom be paid. – Invoice #60818, #60819 #60481, #60820, #60821 and #60822 be paid. The motion was seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Stankye, seconded by Mr. Jalowiec and carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maryanne DeTullio, Clerk

*These minutes are subject to the Commission's approval at their next scheduled meeting.*

**Aquifer Protection Agency  
(Planning and Zoning Commission)  
City of Derby**

Theodore J. Estwan, Jr., Chairman

Steven A. Jalowiec

David J. Rogers

Richard A. Stankye

Albert Misiewicz

Glenn H. Stevens

Raul Sanchez

Anthony Szewczyk (Alternate)

Maryanne DeTullio, Clerk

The regular meeting of the Aquifer Protection Agency was held on Tuesday, August 21, 2012, in the Aldermanic Chambers, City Hall, 1 Elizabeth Street, Derby.

The meeting was called to order at 10:15 p.m. by Chairman Ted Estwan. Present were Ted Estwan, Albert Misiewicz, Richard Stankye, David Rogers, Steven Jalowiec, Raul Sanchez and Anthony Szewczyk. Also present were Atty. Joseph Coppola, Corporation Counsel, Ryan McEvoy, Milone and MacBroom and Maryanne DeTullio, Clerk.

Additions, Deletions, Corrections to Agenda

There were no additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda.

Correspondence - None

Public Portion

There was no one from the public wishing to speak.

Approval of Minutes

A motion to approve the minutes of the 06/19/12 meeting was made by Mr. Szewczyk, seconded by Mr. Stankye and carried unanimously.

Acceptance of Applications

There were no new applications to accept.

A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Stankye, seconded by Mr. Sanchez carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maryanne DeTullio, Clerk

*These minutes are subject to the Agency's approval at their next scheduled meeting.*