



TOWN OF NEWTOWN
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, January 21, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

Zoom Virtual Meeting Participation Information

Thursday, January 21, 2021 at 7:00 P.M.

Call-In Number: +1 929-205-6099

Meeting ID: 921 6523 6710 #

Website: <https://zoom.us/j/92165236710>

Present: Don Mitchell, Jim Swift, Corinne Cox, Barbara Manville, Dennis Bloom, Andrew Marone, David Rosen, Roy Meadows

Staff: George Benson, Director of Planning, Christine O'Neill, Clerk

Mr. Mitchell called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

Public Hearings

Application 20.13 by Negreiro & Sons Construction, LLC, for a 16-lot residential Subdivision located at 203 & 211 Berkshire Road, as demonstrated on a set of plans titled ““Holly Estates,” Newtown Connecticut, 203 & 211 Berkshire Road, A Subdivision Plan” dated 9/30/20 last rev. 1/18/21 and supporting documents submitted to the Land Use Agency 11/19/20, 12/17/20, 12/29/20, 1/6/21, 1/11/21, and 1/19/21.

Larry Edwards, engineer for the application, explained that the three outstanding issues from last meeting were Open Space access along the right-of-way at the end of the cul-de-sac, a recommendation from the Conservation Commission to accept the Open Space, and the sightline off Holly Lane. Jason Edwards was operating the shared screen. Mr. L. Edwards attested that all three items have been addressed: the access was put on the site plan, letters from the Conservation Commission and Newtown Forest Association (NFA) had been received, and the materials that were submitted to the Connecticut Department of Transportation (DOT) were also submitted to the public record for review.

Mr. L. Edwards explained that the applicant team had used drone footage to create a 3D model of what the site would look like once the land is regraded and vegetation is removed, and how that would impact the sightline. He hoped this would address the Commission's concerns about the 630 foot sightline. Mr. J. Edwards displayed the image.

Mr. Meadows asked if all the vegetation to be removed was on the applicant's property, or if some was on the neighbor's. Mr. L. Edwards said it would all be on the applicant's property. Mr. Meadows was concerned that some bushes and rocks on the neighbor's property would obstruct the sightline. Mr. L. Edwards used the 3D model and site plan to explain how the sightline would work.

Mr. Rosen stated that when he walked the property, he felt that the sightline was adequate and safe.

Ms. Cox wanted to see a slide of the view looking towards Newtown on the 3D model. Mr. J. Edwards displayed it.

Mr. Mitchell contributed that with a State highway, the Commission had limited responsibility to base their decision on traffic safety.

Ms. Cox wanted to confirm that if the entrance to Holly Lane is blocked, there was another way to get out. Mr. L. Edwards said no - but the right-of-way access was provided at the end of the cul-de-sac would allow for a future connection if the adjacent parcel is developed. Ms. Cox expressed concern about emergency access if trees or poles fall. Mr. L. Edwards noted that utilities would be underground in this subdivision.

Mr. Mitchell invited public comment.

Dennis Casey of 23 Paugussett Road, Newtown, CT asked who would come into possession of the Open Space. Mr. Mitchell replied it would go to the NFA. He noted that the NFA put a letter in the file requesting a few things be taken care of maintenance-wise on the property first. Mr. Casey wanted to see the document, so Ms. O'Neill dropped the link in the chat feature. Mr. Casey requested a roll-call vote. Mr. Mitchell said that would not be necessary if the vote were unanimous.

Ms. Cox moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Swift seconded. All were in favor and the public hearing was closed at 7:21 p.m.

Mr. Meadows wondered if there could be a condition of approval that the 630 foot sightline be maintained. Mr. Mitchell mentioned that was already part of the application to be approved. Mr. Meadows asked what would happen if the DOT tried to reduce the sightline. Mr. Mitchell said generally the DOT is more conservative in their requirements than the Commission, but added that the State has the final word on safety requirements for state roads. Mr. Benson said the Commission had to vote on what was before them tonight, as opposed to the what-ifs of afterwards.

Mr. Mitchell read the following into the record:

BE IT RESOLVED that Application 20.13 by Negreiro & Sons Construction, LLC, for a 16-lot residential Subdivision located at 203 & 211 Berkshire Road, as demonstrated on a set of plans titled ““Holly Estates,” Newtown Connecticut, 203 & 211 Berkshire Road, A Subdivision Plan” dated 9/30/20 last rev. 1/18/21 and supporting documents submitted to the Land Use Agency 11/19/20, 12/17/20, 12/29/20, 1/6/21, 1/11/21, and 1/19/21, IS HEREBY FOUND CONSISTENT WITH THE PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND SHALL BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

- 1. The Open Space shall be deeded to the Newtown Forest Association, and a note shall be placed on the Mylar and copies designating said Open Space to the Newtown Forest Association on its reverter.*
- 2. Bonds shall be set for the following items, in the following amounts: Road Bond - \$ 420,000, Lot Pin/Highway Monument Bond - \$13,500*
- 3. The lot pins shall be set according to the above-mentioned map and the Subdivision Regulations.*
- 4. The applicant shall record on the Land Records the transfer of any real property, as approved, such as road widening and Open Space.*
- 5. The applicant/developer shall permanently field mark the Open Space prior to the issuance of a building permit to permit potential homebuyers to visually identify the area. The Conservation Commission or its agent shall specify the marker types and their locations.*
- 6. A CD-ROM or digital map submission of the approved subdivision must be filed with the Land Use Agency.*

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the approval shall become effective February 13, 2021.

Mr. Swift asked if there should be a condition about maintaining the sightline. Mr. Benson contributed that maintenance was a given part of the application, and it was an enforcement issue rather than a Commission issue.

Ms. Manville so moved. Mr. Bloom seconded.

The Commission voted as follows:

Don Mitchell - AYE
Jim Swift - AYE
Barbara Manville - AYE
Corinne Cox - AYE
Dennis Bloom - AYE

The motion to approve Application 20.13 carried unanimously.

Application 20.14 by Neviana Zhgaba and Aquila's Nest Vineyard, LLC, for a Text Amendment to the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Newtown, to §3.01.400, to allow for functions at a vineyard including food trucks, private events, recreational activities, art installations, and farmers markets, as described in documents submitted to the Land Use Agency 12/3/20.

Mr. Mitchell reminded the Commission that certain temporary uses have been allowed on the Aquila's Nest Vineyard property due to Connecticut's COVID-19 emergency orders. He noted that many uses in the text amendment seemed intensive for residential zones, where Newtown's vineyards are located. Mr. Mitchell shared his knowledge that the applicants Ms. Zhgaba and Mr. Llomi were more focused on outdoor uses being allowed, rather than indoors.

At the last meeting, Mr. Benson had displayed a draft text amendment regarding vineyards that he had been working on before Aquila's Nest was started. He had subsequently combined that draft with the applicants' proposal to create a new compromise draft. He sent this new draft to the applicants to see if they wanted to move forward. Ms. Zhgaba had added some revisions in red, so Mr. Benson asked her to comment on them while Ms. O'Neill displayed the document.

Most of the revisions centered on Ms. Zhgaba's hope that the indoor uses in Mr. Benson's draft would be allowed outdoors. She explained that they are not an event venue, but a farm - they do not have the capacity for large events indoors, and part of the charm for visitors is experiencing the vineyard and farmland itself. Events she requested to be held outdoors included parties, weddings, and art installations.

Ms. Cox stressed that she was concerned about having events outdoors in a residential area, especially with the noise. Ms. Cox felt there was no need to have another farmer's market when there is already one at Newtown, so she wished to see that provision stricken. Ms. Cox also noted there are not many grapes at the vineyard, so she wondered where the grapes were coming from. Mr. Llomi said about 80% of the grapes come from California, which Ms. Zhgaba contributed was a normal practice for Connecticut wineries.

Ms. Manville asked about the Special Event Permit section of the regulations. Mr. Benson explained that the Land Use Agency would administratively issue a permit for events such as weddings. Ms. O'Neill displayed the Special Event Permit application, which is available at the Land Use Agency and online.

Mr. Benson added that the "indoor" provision was meant to limit the noise of the music and groups of people - but guests would certainly be allowed to walk around the vineyard. Furthermore, the size of the building plus the parking spaces should function as a control to ensure the events did not become too overwhelming for a residential zone. Mr. Benson added that vineyards are only allowed in residential zones.

Mr. Mitchell expressed his concern about where vineyard activities fall on the continuum of farming and business. Mr. Benson wanted to clarify that all the uses being discussed tonight were accessory uses, which means the cultivation of grapes must exist as the primary land use for those other uses to be legal. Ms. Zhgaba agreed, and reinforced that this business is a vineyard first before it is an event venue.

Ms. Manville asked about the former winery in Newtown, McLaughlin vineyard, and how their events were permitted. Mr. Benson explained that those uses were unpermitted and not sanctioned by the Town.

Mr. Rosen wondered about events held on farms in town. Mr. Benson said a set of regulations for farms is currently being drafted. It is a tricky subject because the Town wants to support these businesses, yet they are located within residential zones.

Mr. Benson wished to continue this hearing to keep the dialogue going with the applicant, and called for more feedback from Commissioners. Ms. Cox added to her earlier suggestions that she'd like to see the applicants widen the end of the driveway for better visibility.

Mr. Mitchell asked if the permit that Aquila's Nest obtained from the State is a manufacturer's farm permit. Ms. Zhgaba said yes. Mr. Mitchell noted that since the vineyard's site plan approval, the state law has changed regarding alcohol being served at wineries, but has the potential to be limited by a municipality's Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Mitchell was also concerned that the administrative Special Event Permits might get out of hand. Mr. Benson that could be refined in the office. Mr. Swift also wondered if the Land Use Agency could deny a Special Event Permit based on a prior event that was non-compliant – for example, too loud or too many people. Mr. Benson said yes, and enforcement would also likely come in the form of a notice of violation and a cease and desist order.

Mr. Swift felt it was important to note that this regulation would be town-wide. So even though Aquila's Nest might be a responsible business, less cooperative businesses could take advantage of allowances that are written too liberally.

Ms. Zhgaba stressed that she would like food pairings, yoga, and photography to be allowed outside. Mr. Llomi added that weddings are also common outdoor activities at Connecticut wineries.

Mr. Benson asked the applicants if they would like to submit the application for a vote now or if they would like to continue revising. Mr. Llomi said they wanted everyone to be happy and on the same page, so they were comfortable continuing the hearing.

Mr. Mitchell moved to continue the public hearing to the next regular meeting of Thursday, February 4, 2021 at 7 p.m. via Zoom. Ms. Cox seconded. All were in favor and the hearing was continued.

Application 20.15 by the Town of Newtown Board of Selectmen, for a Text Amendment to the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Newtown, to §6.03.310, to allow rental residential housing in up to two of the existing campus buildings with a Special Exception, as described in documents submitted to the Land Use Agency 12/9/20 revised 12/17/20.

Mr. Mitchell had two revisions he wished to propose to the text amendment. His first suggestion was to remove the phrase "and waiver" from item 4(a). He noted that the Board of Selectmen (BOS) could add that at the time of an application if they wish. His second suggestion was to change the word "maintained" in item 5 to "restored." Mr. Benson and First Selectman Dan Rosenthal were amenable to both changes.

Mr. Mitchell shared that he understood the rationale for allowing parking structures, given that the Town was limited in its ability to add more impervious surfaces to the campus.

Mr. Mitchell also wanted to remind everyone that hearing the text amendment before the Master Plan was not necessarily 'doing things backwards.' Mr. Swift was a bit confused about how they could approve this application when the Commission was supposed to only make an approval based on alignment with the Master Plan. Mr. Benson clarified that multifamily residential uses on the campus are already allowed by the original Master Plan, from 2002. They are permitted uses, but not listed as preferred uses.

Mr. Benson reiterated the theme from last meeting that these regulations cannot do the job of the developer by creating a vision statement or requiring the specifics of a proposal.

Mr. Mitchell invited public comment.

Matt Schuster of 10 Timber Lane, Newtown, CT wondered who 'we' is in the context of 'we can deny an application if we don't like the proposal.' Mr. Mitchell explained that a developer would negotiate a lease with the BOS. If the terms of a lease are agreed upon, a project would then go to the Planning and Zoning Commission to examine parking, traffic, safety, and all other Special Exception factors. If the Commission approves the site plan, the BOS gets another look to make last minute tweaks. So to answer Mr. Schuster's question: mostly the BOS for the "flavor" of the project. Mr. Schuster asked if the public had any say in the approval. Mr. Mitchell explained that the Commission consideration of a project would take place in a public hearing, where the public could comment as they are doing now. Mr. Schuster referenced the proposals from the Fairfield Hills community conversation that took place in 2020, during which time two developers shared conceptual site plans. He felt that the public may not know the extent of what could be proposed under these regulations.

Bruce Walczak of Newtown, CT wondered: if multifamily housing has been an approved use on the campus since the original Master Plan, was this whole public process a charade? Mr. Mitchell took exception to that characterization, and Mr. Benson tried to explain that the Master Plan is not the same thing as the Zoning Regulations. Mr. Walczak asked if residential was already an approved use for the campus, specifying that he wanted Mr. Mitchell to answer as opposed to Mr. Benson. Mr. Mitchell said there has been a long process of the Town figuring out what to include in the Zoning Regulations based on Master Plan suggestions. Mr. Benson clarified that the Master Plan lists residential as a permitted use, but not the Zoning Regulations do not.

Mr. Walczak read a prepared statement. He felt that Newtown residents neither want residential units on the campus, nor do they want to pay for demolition. The Fairfield Hills Master Plan Review Committee (FHMPRC) put forth a recommendation to allow a commercial proposal with a residential component - wording that was also used in the referendum. The draft proposal has reversed the wording so it now reads residential with a commercial component. Mr. Walczak asserted that the change ignores the wishes of the voters and gives carte blanche to potential developers. He implored the Commission to restructure the text amendment to make the apartments on campus as palatable as possible to the 7,000 voters who did not want them.

Wayne Addressi of 14 Lovells Lane, Newtown, CT stated that he supports housing on the campus. He appreciated the hard work of Mr. Benson and Mr. Rosenthal, and felt that it is time to take action and move forward with the text amendment. Mr. Addressi shared his hope that condominiums might be allowed in the future. He might like to live on campus someday.

Kathy Grable of Mile Hill Road South, Newtown, CT felt that the public did not realize parking garages could be part of an approval. She feared that the campus would be overtaken by mass housing. She stated that renters don't pay taxes yet will send their kids to our schools. Who will maintain the buildings and police the outside of them, she wondered.

Ned Simpson of 42 Watkins Drive, Newtown, CT liked the path the Commission was on. He was in favor of item 5 and the "guardrails" built into the regulations. Mr. Simpson was optimistic that the developers could solve parking problems creatively like with underground parking or landscaping. He did not want to prevent developers from making recommendations.

Mr. Addessi agreed with Mr. Simpson's comment. He inquired if there would be any new buildings constructed, or just two existing buildings being renovated. Mr. Mitchell said just two existing buildings. Mr. Walczak interjected that parking garages could also be constructed. Mr. Addessi also wanted to know if a developer had a path forward to convert a building to condominiums. Mr. Mitchell said a developer would likely have discussions with the Selectmen, Department of Economic and Community Development, the Land Use Agency, and the Fairfield Hills Authority. Mr. Addessi said he felt confident that there were many controls and checks in place to shepherd a proposal towards something that would suit the town.

Mr. Benson explained that parking garages are already a permitted use at Fairfield Hills. They would just need approval from the BOS and site plan approval from the Commission.

Mr. Schuster expressed that the question from the referendum was misleading as to the proportion of commercial to residential. The current text amendment does not put a limitation on housing density, which could lead to a project that is very different from what voters envisioned. Mr. Schuster was concerned that once this text amendment was approved, the public would lose their ability to give input on a proposal. After some back and forth with Mr. Mitchell about the referendum, Mr. Mitchell said the purpose this meeting was not to "redo the vote."

Mr. Addessi asked Mr. Benson to clarify which parts of the process the public would be able to participate in. Mr. Benson reviewed the process he went over earlier, noting that the Special Exception application is really the time to discuss the specifics (and the public may participate in this). He also wanted to be clear that development cannot happen all over the campus - Open Space and ballfields will not be taken over by garages, for instance.

Ms. Grable pointed out that the other vacant buildings beyond the two slated for development would still cost the taxpayers millions of dollars to demolish. This text amendment, she expressed, is not going to solve the problem of the tax burden.

Mr. Swift asked, if residential was already in the Master Plan, why had it been discussed and updated? Mr. Benson said these conversations have been going on for all 16 years he has worked here, and with the changing conditions, perhaps the FHMPRC wanted to emphasize that it was still recommended for inclusion in the Zoning Regulations. Mr. Mitchell added that it is difficult to get a consensus when there are so many parties in the conversation: the FHMPRC, the Selectmen, the taxpayers, the Commission, etc.

Mr. Addessi wanted the leaders in the community to take action and not take too much time listening to opinions again and again. He felt there was too much community input.

Mr. Walczak felt that the regulations should have some more "meat" to protect the taxpayers from undesirable development. He pointed out that the Commission just considered very restrictive regulations for vineyards, so there's no reason they cannot do the same for this text amendment. Mr. Walczak felt that some of the flexibility in this proposed regulation is "beyond the pale." There is a way the Commission can approve a text amendment without ruining the collective dream of the community members, he said.

Mr. Marone moved to close the public hearing. Ms. Manville seconded. All were in favor and the public hearing was closed at 9:22 p.m.

Ms. Cox asked to wait until the next meeting to vote.

Mr. Swift said that he was leaning towards voting against the text amendment as it currently read. He tended to agree with Mr. Walczak's sentiments. He also felt the referendum was misleading in terms of the proportion of residential to commercial in the buildings. Mr. Swift brought up his concern that if a developer put forth a proposal with 300 residential units and a vending machine outside, what grounds would the Commission to deny it? Mr. Mitchell said none, but the BOS could and likely would.

Mr. Bloom said Commissioners should not discuss how they plan to vote. Mr. Swift clarified that he was still mulling it over and might change his mind if revisions were to be made.

Mr. Mitchell read the following into the record:

BE IT RESOLVED that Application 20.15 by the Town of Newtown Board of Selectmen, for a Text Amendment to the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Newtown, to §6.03.310, to allow rental residential housing in up to two of the existing campus buildings with a Special Exception, as described in documents submitted to the Land Use Agency 12/9/20 revised 12/17/20, IS HEREBY FOUND CONSISTENT WITH THE PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT, THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, THE FAIRFIELD HILLS MASTER PLAN AND SHALL BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:

- 1. That the phrase "and waiver" be removed from item 4(a).*
- 2. That the word "restored" replace the word "maintained" in item 5.*

Mr. Swift so moved. Ms. Manville seconded.

Mr. Mitchell noted that even though the public continued to say that the regulations should be more restrictive, they failed to make a single suggestion of what such restrictions should be. He was hesitant to add more restrictions.

Mr. Swift said he was concerned that this regulation would not give the Commission adequate discretion to deny a project. Mr. Swift wondered why an applicant couldn't be the one to propose a text amendment, so it would be specific to their project. Mr. Benson reminded him that the Board of the Selectmen are the owners of the property, and they created this regulation. Mr. Swift felt uncomfortable with the Commission effectively being "taken out of the loop" in the process, by giving all the discretion to the BOS. The pressure on the Commission to approve an application that has already gotten the green light from the BOS, he felt, would be enormous even if the public doesn't like it. Mr. Benson said the Commissioners need not base their vote on the opinions of the public, adding that it is far more common for people in opposition of a project to show up to a meeting than those in support. Mr. Benson spoke at length about how a Special Exception approval is not a "rubber stamp."

Mr. Benson, Mr. Mitchell, and Mr. Swift went back and forth about how a Commission might be able to judge or regulate a proposal.

Mr. Benson said if the Commissioners do choose to continue the hearing, they are not able to do further "research" by talking to members of the public or reading Facebook posts, etc.

Ms. Manville was in favor of voting tonight. Mr. Swift wanted to vote as well.

Mr. Mitchell entertained a motion to add: *BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the approval shall become effective February 13, 2021.*

Ms. Cox so moved. Ms. Manville seconded. All were in favor and the motion was amended.

The Commission voted as follows:

Donald Mitchell - AYE
James Swift - NAY
Barbara Manville - AYE
Corinne Cox - AYE
Dennis Bloom - AYE

The motion to approve Application 20.15 carried 4-1.

Application 20.16 by Heather Kimball of 5K Enterprises, Inc. for a 2-lot Subdivision located at 3 Edmond Road, as demonstrated on a set of plans titled “Subdivision Map, Assessor’s Map 27, Block 6, Lot 11, “Subdivision of Land,” #3 Edmond Road, Newtown, Connecticut, Prepared for 5K Enterprise, Inc.” dated 10/20/20 rev. 1/12/21 and supporting documents submitted to the Land Use Agency 12/10/20 and 1/15/21.

John Mack, PE of Stuart Somers Company, spoke on behalf of the applicant, 5K Enterprises. The proposed 2-lot subdivision would occur on a 22-acre parcel with some wetlands and steep slopes. A wetlands permit has been granted. Mr. Mack contributed that Edmond Road was realigned a few years ago, which resulted in an adjustment of property lines.

One page of the site plan depicted a conceptual building with parking, with Ms. O’Neill displayed Mr. Mack said that he had added grass pavers as requested by the Fire Marshal, and that he had spoken with Public Works Director Fred Hurley who said future development could tie into public water.

Mr. Mack explained that this application is a simple subdivision without proposed development.

Mr. Mitchell asked about a previous approval for five buildings on the property, not all of which are yet built. He pointed out that by reducing the size of the lot, it might impact the ability to finish constructing those buildings. Mr. Mack confirmed it would not be an issue. Mr. Mitchell also noted that an earth materials operation was ongoing on the land, and was using access through the Reverie Brewing property. Mr. Mitchell requested a road to be constructed to Edmond Road for the earth materials operation. Mr. Mack replied that the operation must be on the neighboring property, since he had seen nothing of the sort. Mr. Mitchell insisted he had walked the property and was very familiar with it. There is a huge pile of crushed stone on the property, Mr. Mitchell attested. Mr. Mack said if it was there, it was not operating legally. Mr. Mitchell agreed, noting those piles could be seen from Edmond Road.

Mr. Mitchell wondered about the development timeframe. Mr. Mack said he was unsure. Mr. Mitchell felt that if there was no urgency to approve this, he would like to do a site walk.

Charlie Spath, principal of Stuart Somers Company, said when he was out on the property six months ago he saw no such pile. Mr. Mitchell responded that there are mafia blocks separating piles of materials as well as construction equipment, and he believes they only began to appear within the last few weeks. Mr. Spath agreed to table the application to the next meeting and investigate the site in the meantime.

Mr. Mitchell explained that subdivisions usually require an Open Space donation to the Town; however, in this unique case, the realignment of Edmond Road led to the Town accepting a donation of a substantial area of Open Space from this property several years ago. While that transactions was not tied to this subdivision, Mr. Mitchell felt it would be appropriate to give the applicant credit for that land. Mr. Benson contributed that there was a handshake agreement between the Land Use Agency and the applicant that the transaction would count towards Open Space for a future subdivision, because these land swaps were necessary to complete the realignment project. The multiple landowners all cooperated in this complicated project.

Mr. Mitchell noted that this property was part of the Special Development District that includes the Starbucks drive-thru. Mr. Benson didn't think it was part of that district, but Mr. Mitchell was sure that the 5K property was included. Mr. Mitchell said he would look further into what the Special Development District status might mean for the subdivision.

Mr. Meadows asked if the red area on the site plan represented wetlands created to replace the wetlands that were destroyed in order to put in the access road. Mr. Mack confirmed this was the case.

Mr. Mitchell moved to continue the public hearing until the next regular meeting of Thursday, February 4, 2021 at 7 p.m. via Zoom. Mr. Swift seconded. All were in favor and the public hearing was continued.

Executive Session

Mr. Mitchell made a motion to add an item to the agenda: to enter into the Executive Session to discuss pending litigation regarding the 13 Hawleyville Road case. Mr. Swift seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Mr. Mitchell made a motion to enter into Executive Session to discuss pending litigation regarding the 13 Hawleyville Road case. Mr. Bloom seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.

The Commission entered into Executive Session and paused recording at 10:19 p.m. The Commission exited Executive Session and resumed recording at 10:39 p.m.

Minutes

Mr. Mitchell moved to approve the minutes from the meeting of January 7, 2021. Ms. Manville seconded. All were in favor and the minutes from the meeting of January 7, 2021 were approved.

Adjournment

Mr. Rosen made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Marone seconded. All members were in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 10:41 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,
Christine O'Neill, Clerk*

A recording of the meeting can be found here: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/19m8Y5gMfWXtT2m5IUkSW_qqqPcBL29bz