

Subject to Approval

**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
June 8, 2021**

The Regular Meeting of the Madison Zoning Board of Appeals was conducted Tuesday, June 8, 2021, at 7 p.m. by way of an online Zoom Webinar, with public participation available through a Zoom Webinar link and password, as well as through a telephone call in number, with a Zoom Webinar identification number, all publicly posted.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chairman Ned Moore and Commissioners Richard Gilbert, Jason Brown, William Piggott, and Dennis Crowe.

MEMBERS ABSENT

None.

ALTERNATES PRESENT

Jennifer Gordon.

OTHERS PRESENT

Zoning Enforcement Officer John De Laura; Director of Planning and Economic Development David Anderson.

Chairman Ned Moore called the public hearing and regular meeting of the Madison Zoning Board of Appeals to order at approximately 7 p.m., and he reviewed the procedures, including that by state statute, four votes are needed to approve applications, and a simple majority is not sufficient. The legal notice, as published, was read into the record. Agenda items were taken in the order prescribed in the minutes.

8243. 13 Harbor Avenue. Map 24, Lot 186. R-4 District. Request to vary Sections 3.6a and 3.6d of the Madison Zoning Regulations to allow a 25' 6" front yard setback where 30' is required to permit existing dwelling be demolished and new dwelling be constructed and to allow 8' 5" side yard where 12' is required to permit above ground propane tanks.

Travis Gulick, Travis Gulick Contractors, shared plans and photographs to demolish the existing dwelling and build a new structure, and he described the parcel as a small lot, very tight to build; it is a one story house on a stone foundation. Plans were to do a renovation and add a second floor, but it was found the foundation will not support a second floor, so the renovation and addition could not be accomplished. With a new construction, 100 percent of the building code has to be met, including regulations for the septic system, according to Mr. Gulick, who stated that on the south side, they are taking a nonconforming structure and making it conforming. In addition, the front porch meets open front porch zoning rules. While the septic system has not yet been designed, Mr. Gulick stated that its location is the best and only place where it can be installed. The main hardship is the septic system, with an inability to get closer to it, and a 25.6 foot front yard setback is being requested; a remaining existing shed, which is nonconforming, will be removed, as well as a sun porch, according to Mr. Gulick. Plans are not to get closer to the street, but the structure cannot go farther back, according to Mr. Gulick. This will be a two-

story building, kept in character for the area; there are no objections to the plans from the neighbors, according to Mr. Gulick. Commissioner Richard Gilbert asked if the propane tanks could go underground. Mr. Gulick stated that they could, but it is expensive. He also stated that even if the structure were built in the exact same footprint, a variance would still be required. On the south side, nonconformities are being reduced, the whole front of the house is being brought back, and the nonconforming shed is being removed, Mr. Travis stated. Commissioner William Piggott stated that it looks like the lot coverage has been reduced from 1,120 square feet to 1,045 square feet, and Mr. Gulick confirmed the reduction. The dwelling will remain three bedroom, according to Mr. Gulick. Zoning Enforcement Officer John De Laura stated that it is a reduction of nonconformities, and they are complying with coverage and floor areas; an existing shed will be removed, and the two yard variances are equal to or less than what currently exists. Chairman Ned Moore asked whether anyone wanted to speak in favor of or opposed to the application; no one spoke.

Chairman Moore made the motion to go into deliberations; it was seconded by Commissioner Dennis Crowe and unanimously approved.

Vote to move into deliberations passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Jason Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Chairman Moore stated that the lot is about half the size of the average lot size of the R-4 zone; it is a tiny lot to begin with, and by reducing the nonconformities and removing the shed, they are showing a good faith effort; they have designed themselves a very nice property. Commissioner Crowe agreed; they are in line with the other houses in the neighborhood. Commissioner Gilbert stated that he does not see the hardship; there is an overall reduction of nonconformities, but putting the propane tanks underground would reduce them more. Commissioner Gilbert asked if reducing the nonconformities is enough to grant the variance. Commissioner Brown stated that if the existing structure is demolished, the reduction in the nonconformities cannot be taken—when the structure is knocked down and built anew, the ability to claim nonconformities is lost. Commissioner Brown asked what does the board do about the fact that a nonconforming structure is being built? The legal hardship is that the lot is half the size of what the zoning regulations allow, according to Commissioner Brown, who stated that the lot size is not consistent with the zoning regulations. A variance could be granted, based on the fact that the hardship is that the lot size is half of what the zoning regulations require, according to Commissioner Brown.

Commissioner Crowe made the motion to approve the application as submitted; Commissioner Brown amended it to add that the application be approved as submitted, based on the legal hardship that the lot size is less than what is required by zoning; it was seconded by Commissioner Piggott and unanimously approved.

Vote to approve 13 Harbor Ave. as submitted passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

8244. 54 Stone Road. Map 12, Lot 101. R-4 District. Request to vary Sections 3.6a of the Madison Zoning Regulations to allow a front setback variance of 19.5ft where 30ft is required to permit second floor addition, Section 3.8b to permit 2949.6 sq. ft. where 2392 sq. ft. is allowed, Section 12.6 enlargement of non-conforming structure.

Attorney J. Michael Sulzbach and Architect Garry S. Leonard presented the plans. Mr. Sulzbach shared the plans and drawings, stating that the application involves three sections of the regulations: it is an existing house, it is pre-existing to zoning and nonconforming in a couple of respects, and setback issues. The variance has to do with setbacks, he stated. Mr. Sulzbach showed drawings of the exterior of the house and the existing and proposed street elevations. There will be a dormer with three windows, two living spaces almost outside of the setback, but it is all contained in the existing building, according to Mr. Sulzbach. There was a section on the house highlighted in yellow, which Mr. Sulzbach stated is the area on top of the existing building. The hardship is that the house got built and placed in its location, and the zoning regulations were applied afterward, according to Mr. Sulzbach. The actual lot coverage will be reduced; plans were shared with the neighbors, and there are no lot coverage, bulk, height, or coastal management issues, Mr. Sulzbach stated. What the Zoning Board of Appeals is dealing with is a setback issue, to permit 2,949.6 square feet where 2,392 square feet is allowed, according to Commissioner Brown. The request is not seeking any more than what is allowed; the truth is, square feet are being added in the yellow section, Mr. Sulzbach stated. Zoning Enforcement Officer John De Laura stated that there is a reduction in coverage of 20.35 square feet; it is less compliant than what it is now—it is 20.35 square feet less. Commissioner Brown stated that the maximum coverage for the floor area is 2,392 square feet. Building Contractor Chuck Mandel stated that the house is in the Coastal Area Management zone, so a Coastal Site Plan Review is needed; the septic system has been approved. Chairman Moore asked whether anyone wants to speak against or in favor of the application. Bryant Boyd of 28 Hartford Ave. stated that his house is directly across the street from 54 Stone Road, and it will be most clearly impacted by the second floor—they will lose their whole view of Long Island Sound. While Mr. Boyd stated that they do support the application, it is proposing five new windows facing east, with three of those windows facing their bedroom; the application will significantly impact the privacy of both homes. Mr. Boyd stated that he is seeking confirmation on discussions indicating the three windows could be blocked, or that skylights could be used. Mr. Mandel stated that the three windows are in the yellow section of the building. Mr. Sulzbach stated that this did not come up until after the plans were drawn and recently; there are architectural issues that have to be addressed, adding that they are dealing with these variances and this setback, as opposed to the architectural design. Mr. Sulzbach shared photographs of the relationship between the two houses and stated that there is a distance between the two houses, and they are not nose-to-nose, but the property owner and the architect will do all that they can to minimize the impact. Window treatments could be used in both residences, to maintain the sense of privacy, according to Mr. Sulzbach. Mr. Mandel showed photographs of looking out the front door of the residence and shared the drawings of the yellow section, again, stating that it is really not a direct view into a bedroom. Commissioner Crowe stated that there is room to consider a neighbor's view; it could be a valid consideration. Architect Garry S. Leonard stated that with reference to Mr. Boyd and his concern, they first met after the filing was made, and Mr. Leonard stated that he does not want to commit to something like glass blocks in the windows. There are a number of things he would be happy to do, but Mr. Leonard stated that he does not want to commit to any one thing. Commissioner Crowe asked whether that would be incumbent upon the Zoning Board of Appeals to dictate that, adding that he is not sure he agrees with that. Mr.

Leonard stated that they are willing to meet with Mr. Boyd and work with him to come up with a solution; they have talked about moving the bathroom windows, but glass block is not good for this house—there could be window treatments inside, translucent glass. Property Owner Kenneth Dale stated that translucent glass is used in offices, and his preference is to put in window treatments that can be adjusted to minimize the view, while also allowing the light inside. Mr. Boyd stated that the window shade solution does not appeal to them; translucent glass is the ideal solution. More discussion followed between Mr. Boyd and the applicants, regarding possible solutions for the windows, and then Commissioner Brown stated that he believes the board should move on to allow the commissioners to deliberate.

Chairman Crowe made the motion to go into deliberations; it was seconded by Commissioner Brown and unanimously approved.

Vote to move into deliberations passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Chairman Moore stated that regarding the window treatment, there seems to be one solution to that, and he would approve the application as presented, with the windows being translucent. Commissioner Gilbert stated that the commissioners do not want to do that in perpetuity. Commissioner Brown stated that he does not think the commissioners can condition the variance; he does not think it is appropriate to condition the variance as a “Thou shalt not violate thy neighbors’ privacy.” He asked the commissioners if they think it is appropriate to condition variances, based on design. Commissioner Crowe agreed with Commissioner Brown. Chairman Moore stated that there have been variances that have been conditioned. Commissioner Brown stated that normally when the Zoning Board of Appeals conditions a variance, it is structural, such as whether a screened porch should have windows; it is not within the commissioners’ purview to condition variances on the type of windows. Commissioner Gilbert agreed with Commissioner Brown and added that a condition goes with the lot and the land. It is in the record that they have a solution to the windows, according to Commissioner Brown, who added that he does not think they can condition it into perpetuity that it will have frosted glass. Commissioner Crowe stated that he cannot find a reason to condition the windows, either. Commissioner Brown stated that he does not think the commissioners can condition the movement of windows, legally, either; while the two parties came to an agreement in front of the commissioners, and it is in the record, Commissioner Brown stated that he does not know how that can be enforced. This application can be approved, based on the reduction in nonconformities; this is just about the variances, not the design choices, Commissioner Brown stated.

Commissioner Crowe made the motion that the application be approved as submitted, and Commissioner Brown amended the motion to state that the application be approved as submitted, based on the legal hardship of a reduction in nonconformities; it was seconded by Chairman Moore and unanimously approved.

Vote to approve 54 Stone Road as submitted passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Mr. Mandel stated that regarding the Coastal Site Plan, the property is in the shore lands; it is a reduction of coverage, and there are no adverse impacts to the coastal area.

Chairman Moore made the motion that the Zoning Board of Appeals finds the application consistent with the goals and policies of the Connecticut Coastal Area Management Act, and all mitigations will be put into place to prevent adverse impacts on the coastal area. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Brown and unanimously approved.

Vote to approve 54 Stone Road Coastal Site Plan passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

8245. 38 Godman Road. Map 77, Lot 14. RU-1 District. Request to vary Section 5.5f of the Madison Zoning Regulations to allow 18 ft. side setback where 30 ft. is allowed for the installation of a 14' x 20' garage.

Todd Anderson of Anderson Engineering and Surveying Associates stated that he is representing Jason Cavallaro of 38 Godman Road. Due to wetlands and the existing septic system, there is no other place to put this garage, Mr. Anderson stated. Original plans were to put the garage 10 feet from the wetlands, but Zoning Enforcement Officer John De Laura felt the best place for the garage is in tandem with the corner of the house; to meet zoning regulations of having the garage 15 feet from the house, as an accessory structure, would put the garage in the wetlands, according to Mr. Anderson. Forty-two percent of the property is wetlands; another choice for the garage would require a wetlands crossing and filling in of wetlands, according to Mr. Anderson. The garage cannot be in the front yard, and if the garage were placed on the east side of the site, trees would have to be cleared, and new driveway would have to be built; it only makes sense to put the garage in the existing driveway, in an existing lawn area, Mr. Anderson stated. An accessory structure needs to be 15 feet away from the existing house, and since this cannot take place, they pushed the garage up to the house; it will butt up to the house, and the variance is to allow 18 feet from the side setback, Mr. Anderson stated, adding that the garage is for an antique car. The house was built in 1967, back before there were a lot of regulations as there are today, according to Mr. Anderson; the property owner is constrained on where they can place this garage, and the neighbors have submitted letters of support; Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency approval is still needed, because the proposed garage is 20 feet from the wetlands. Zoning Enforcement Officer John De Laura stated that he is also the acting inland wetlands officer, and he recommended that the garage be as far away from the wetlands; the garage can be put in the front yard. An accessory building less than 15 feet from a structure is part of the primary structure for setbacks—in essence, it is an expansion of the existing building, Mr. De Laura stated. Commissioner Piggott asked what exactly is the legal hardship, if there are no reductions of nonconformities. Mr. Anderson stated that the legal hardship is the location of the wetlands; if they were to fill the wetlands, they would be able to put this garage farther away from the house, but at the rear of the property, that would require a major wetlands permit, tree clearing, and other land disturbances, according to Mr. Anderson, who stated that he does not think that they would get that wetlands permit. The house, itself, does not fit the compliance of zoning regulations, Mr. Anderson stated. With extreme difficulty, the garage could be placed in

the front, and Mr. Anderson stated that he does not think the neighbors would like to have the garage in the front of the house—it would change the neighbors’ opinions. Chairman Moore stated that they should not be encroaching into the wetlands; if there is a legal place where it could go, it should be taken. Mr. Anderson stated that at the end of the existing driveway is an existing lawn area; this is a pre-built garage that will be placed on gravel; it is not a built-in foundation structure—it is moveable, and it is a minimal site disturbance, with no tree removal. Mr. Anderson stated that he does not think the wetlands agency would have trouble approving this plan; the other side would require a major disturbance and a new driveway. Chairman Moore asked if the applicants could have gone to wetlands, first. Mr. Anderson stated that he could have, but on John De Laura’s recommendation, he came to the Zoning Board of Appeals, first. Commissioner Crowe stated that he cannot see getting into the wetlands. Commissioner Brown asked if the garage were moved to the other corner of the driveway, closer to wetlands, would that bring the structure 15 feet away from the house. There is no way to accommodate the 15 feet away from the house, Mr. Anderson stated. Commissioner Brown noted an area on the plans where he wondered whether the garage could be placed, instead. Mr. Anderson stated that they could accomplish that, but the garage would then be seven feet from the wetlands, which John De Laura said absolutely no way, and Mr. Anderson added that he agrees—it would involve two and a half feet of fill up against the wetlands, so in his mind, it is not an option. Commissioner Crowe asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of or opposed to the application; and while no one spoke, Commissioner Crowe stated that the commissioners do have letters in favor of the application from neighbors.

Commissioner Crowe made the motion to go into deliberations; it was seconded by Commissioner Brown and unanimously approved.

Vote to move into deliberations passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Commissioner Crowe stated that this is a rational request—there are property constraints with wetlands and the size of the lot; in addition, the front yard is not a good idea for garage placement. Chairman Moore agreed. Commissioner Piggott stated that due to the location of the house and the proximity to the wetlands, he cannot see where else he would put the garage, adding that he is glad Mr. Anderson mentioned what the hardship is, and he agrees with that. Commissioner Brown stated that the commissioners could make this garage an accessory by going to another agency—wetlands, which would have to approve it. Commissioner Brown stated that it would be easier for him if the application had gone to wetlands, first, and if that agency said no, then that is the hardship, and he would agree with that. The garage can be moved 15 feet away from the house, but it would probably require a different variance, Commissioner Brown stated, adding that he does not think that there is a legal hardship, and he does not think that it decreases nonconformities. The commissioners could grant a variance because the neighbors support it, and it makes sense; the garage is not going in front of the house, Commissioner Brown stated. A legal hardship or a reduction in nonconformities are the only reasons the commissioners have to grant a variance, Commissioner Brown stated. Chairman Moore stated that he agrees with Commissioner Brown, and he is wondering how the application even made it to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Commissioner Gilbert stated that the commissioners need to think about this use; it is a two-car garage for one car, and the house

already has a two-car garage; there are no reductions in nonconformities, and they really do not have anything on which to grant an approval. Commissioner Brown asked if the commissioners can put this on hold and make the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency rule? Chairman Moore stated no, and he asked Mr. De Laura if there were any other options. Mr. De Laura stated that the placement of the garage is not reducing the nonconformities; it is increasing noncompliance by 10 feet.

Commissioner Brown made the motion to deny the application for the variance; Commissioner Crowe seconded it, and it was unanimously approved to deny the variance.

Vote to deny the variance for 38 Godman Road passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

8246. 58 Overshores Drive East. Map 24, Lot 56. R-4 District. Request to vary Madison Zoning Regulation Section 3.6d to permit 4'.6" ft. side yard where 12' is required to add a second floor over existing first floor, Section 12.6 enlargement of non-conforming structure.

Attorney Marjorie Shansky, representing property owners Jason and Agatha Walker, stated that Denise Von Dassel, the architect, and Todd Anderson were also present on behalf of the application. This application represents alterations to the existing house, Ms. Shansky stated. It is located in the Overshores area, where parcels predate zoning regulations in the town of Madison, and the locations of the houses were established before zoning regulations, Ms. Shansky stated, adding that it has one nonconforming setback. This one nonconforming setback is the only nonconforming setback element in the site; the coverages and maximum floor areas are within existing limits, she stated. Ms. Shansky referenced her May 11, 2021 letter to the Zoning Board of Appeals, in which she stated that this application falls squarely within the board's discretion for approval, under the Madison zoning regulations and Connecticut Law. This variance request includes Section 12.6 of the zoning regulations, expansion of nonconformities, making the construction of a room over the existing structure a permissible intensification of a nonconformity, according to Ms. Shansky's May 11, 2021 letter, which also states that in *Zachs v. Zoning Board of Appeals*, 218 Conn. 324 (1991) the court held that a nonconformity may be intensified, if the current use remains consistent with the original use, and that consideration should be given to three factors: the extent to which the current use reflects the nature and the purpose of the original use; any differences in the character, nature and kind of use involved; any substantial difference in effect upon the neighborhood resulting from differences in the activities conducted on the property. Ms. Shansky invited Todd Anderson to speak, and she shared the site plans. Mr. Anderson stated that the house was built in 1940 and predates zoning; it is 4.6 feet away from the property line, and the intention is to rebuild the house and add a second floor to it; an existing porch will be reduced 22 feet from the property line; plans are at 89 percent of the maximum allowed for area coverage, and with the exception of a northerly portion, everything fits in the setbacks; a septic system lies at the east. Plans are to expand what is already there and go up with a second floor; this is an expansion over a nonconformity only in the small portion on the northern side of the house, Mr. Anderson stated. Architect Denise Von Dassel showed her architectural drawings; the existing central portion of the home is two stories, a dormer will be added on the west side, which is conforming, the central stairs are staying; the existing roof line remains, and the first story sun porch will be

removed. The second story addition is being added to the north side, Ms. Von Dassel stated, adding that they want to expand vertically, to balance the house and have an office and a bathroom; a hallway will be created where the old bathroom existed. Overall, the height of the existing house is 21'2", and coverage, setbacks, floor area, and height all comply with zoning regulations, according to Ms. Von Dassel, who then shared photographs of the house, the building as seen from Overshores Drive. The north portion is the reason for the application; the proposed northern addition height will be eight feet more than the existing roof at its peak, Ms. Von Dassel stated. There is an outdoor shower on the northern corner that gets even closer to the property line, but it will be relocated to the west side of the building, so the plans decrease the impact in the current setback, according to Ms. Von Dassel. Mr. Anderson stated that the existing shower is three feet from the property line. Ms. Shansky stated that 37.5 feet is allowed for height, 20.9 feet exists for height, and 22.9 feet is being proposed for height. Adjacent neighbors and 13 other neighbors all expressed support for this project, Ms. Shansky stated. This application meets the Zachs case, in that: adding additional space over the existing one-story element that has a nonconforming setback is consistent with the nature and purpose of the original house; with respect to differences in the character, nature and kind of use involved, the proposed alterations are improvements and reflect consistency with the neighborhood; and the third aspect of the Zachs case examines whether there is any "substantial difference in effect upon the neighborhood resulting from differences in the activities conducted on the property," and there is no adverse impact, according to Ms. Shansky. Two factors are also important, in that the application must be shown not to affect the Comprehensive Plan, and it uses the existing setbacks and adheres to existing regulations, according to Ms. Shansky. The hardship is borne of the adoption of zoning regulations on an existing structure; the application is a modest request that is enthusiastically endorsed by the neighbors, Ms. Shansky stated. This property has a conforming front yard; the structure is contained within a conforming setback, and it is, indeed, within the discretion of the Zoning Board of Appeals to approve, according to Ms. Shansky. Commissioner Crowe asked for the hardship to be restated. The imposition of zoning regulations on top of the existing structure qualifies an applicant to be eligible to seek a variance, Ms. Shansky stated; the hardship has to do with the adoption of regulations on top of an existing structure—the Connecticut Supreme Court with the Zachs case provides another element to seek a variance. The Zoning Board of Appeals has not been tutored in Zachs case law, Zoning Enforcement Officer John De Laura stated. The Zoning Board of Appeals has done this before, in terms of a second floor, he stated. This application is not egregious; it conforms to the Plan of Conservation and Development; it is a responsible massing or intensification of a structure; it is not in conflict with what the commissioners have learned—it is another way of looking at it, Mr. De Laura stated. The Zoning Board of Appeals has before it a discretion based on an intensification and no further encroachment in the side yard, Mr. De Laura stated. Chairman Moore agreed.

Commissioner Brown made the motion to go into deliberations; it was seconded by Commissioner Crowe and unanimously approved.

Vote to move into deliberations passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Commissioner Brown stated that the Zachs case was called out, and the application meets the
Madison ZBA ▪ Regular Meeting, June 8, 2021 ▪ Meeting Minutes ▪ Page 8 of 9

three criteria of the case. In addition, Commissioner Brown stated that he was not able to find anything within the Madison Planning and Zoning Regulations which prohibits the expansion of a nonconforming use; a nonconformity is expanded, but it is retained in the setback of the building, and the Zoning Board of Appeals is allowed to have an intensification of a nonconformity. The Zachs case is applied appropriately, and Commissioner Brown stated that he would be in favor of granting the variance, in accordance with the Zachs case. Commissioner Crowe agreed.

Commissioner Brown made the motion to approve the variance for 58 Overshores Drive East, based on precedent set in Zachs v. Avon Zoning Board of Appeals from 1991; the motion was seconded by Commissioner Crowe and unanimously approved.

Vote to approve the variance for 58 Overshores Drive East passed, 5-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Brown, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Approval of Minutes: April 13, 2021, Regular Meeting.

Commissioner Piggott made the motion to approve the April 13, 2021 minutes, as submitted; it was seconded by Commissioner Crowe and approved.

Vote to approve the April 13, 2021 minutes passed, 4-0-1.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Moore and Commissioners Gilbert, Piggott, and Crowe.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: Commissioner Brown.

Adjournment

Chairman Moore called the meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marlene H. Kennedy
Clerk