



Town of Warren  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
50 Cemetery Road  
Warren, Connecticut 06754  
[www.warrenct.org](http://www.warrenct.org)

Tuesday December 14, 2021, commencing at 7:30pm  
Lower-Level Meeting Room of Town Hall

Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Agenda

**1. Call to Order, Roll Call, and Designation of Alternates**

Chairman Baker called the meeting to order at 7:30pm. Members **PRESENT:** Mr. Ryan Curtiss, Ms. Ruth Schnell, Mr. John Papp, Mr. Paul Prindle, and alternate Mr. Pete Sandberg. **ABSENT:** Vice Chair Victoria Sahadevan Fossland, Deb Ouellette, Mr. Andrew Carollo, and Mr. Mike Zimet. Chairman Baker sat Mr. Sandberg for Mr. Carollo.

**2. Items to be Added to Agenda (if any, requires 2/3 vote)**

Chairman Baker requested for item 6a to be moved to the end of new business as he would be recusing himself for this application.

Chairman Baker made a **MOTION** to request the change in the agenda, Mr. Papp **SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

**3. Public Hearings**

**ZPA# 21-58 & 21-57** / 85 Curtiss Road, Assessor's Map 7, Lot 19 / Paul Szymanski, P.E. of Arthur H. Howland & Associates, P.C. for Davidson and Elizabeth Goldin

**ZPA# 21-58** / Special Exception and Site Plan Application for grading more than 20,000 square feet of land per Section 22.1 related to the demolition of existing house and shed and construction of a new house with appurtenances including driveway, pool, spa, pergola, septic well. *(Received by Commission 9/14/21; public hearing opened 10/12, continued to 11/9 (day 28); must close by 11/16 (day 35); extension from applicant of 45 days was granted to 12/31 (20 possible days remain to close public hearing through 1/20/22))*

**ZPA# 21-57** / Special Exception and Site Plan Application for structures outside the buildable area per Sections 6.1.4 and 6.1.5 related construction of a new house with appurtenances including driveway, pool, spa, pergola, septic well. *(Received by Commission 9/14/21; public hearing opened 10/12, continued to 11/9 (day 28); must close by 11/16 (day 35); extension from applicant of 45 days was granted to 12/31 (20 possible days remain to close public hearing through 1/20/22))*

**Chairman Baker opened the Public Hearing with the Public Comment portion of the Public Hearing**

Mr. Szymanski representing the applicants reviewed that since the last public hearing a buildable area summary and the aerial overlay have been submitted. The IWCC approved the application with conditions for 85 Curtiss Rd. Received the blasting report from Lenard Engineering. We agree with their

comments and recommendations and are in agreement with following them. They had requested two items. One was showing any wells that we're aware of within 500 feet of the blasting and a clean map showing the areas of the curtain drains areas of the blasting and where the blasting material would be placed. Mr. Szymanski stated they are working on those requests. Mr. Szymanski stated that on Monday, December 13, 2021 he received a letter from Lake Waramaug Task Force, and on Tuesday December 14, 2021 he received a letter from Elizabeth Gildersleeve. Mr. Szymanski is working on those responses currently.

Attorney Perley Grimes from Cramer & Anderson LLP, who is representing Ms. Elizabeth Gildersleeve. Attorney Grimes spoke and reviewed his concerns that have been found while reviewing the file for 85 Curtiss Rd. Attorney Grimes expressed concerns regarding blasting, section 31.4 in the Regulations, an actual field survey contours, and a soils delineation by a Wetlands soil scientist on the plants. Attorney Grimes spoke about feasible alternative locations; 1. Preliminary feasibility plan from Wolfe Engineering on July 27, 2017 which shows a feasible location for a residential house. This plan can be found at the Warren Town Hall. 2. A set of plans called a Site Plan for 1<sup>st</sup> Division of Land completed on 6/6/2018. This plan provides 2 lots and 2 additional areas where homes can be built. Attorney Grimes had their engineer review the blasting issues and to consider the environment and the impacts if any of those 3 alternate locations were to be used. Another issue Attorney Grimes pointed out is the letter from Mr. Szymanski on November 12, 2021. In this letter it states that Mr. Szymanski felt it to be indisputable that the only place that could be built on is the location that is indicated on his plans/maps that are submitted. Attorney Grimes feels that there are 3 different locations that would have significantly less impact on the environment and less blasting.

Attorney Grimes introduced Jeremy A. Haugh, P.E. a Technical Expert and Senior Project Manager with Haley & Aldrich, INC. Mr. Haugh was asked by Attorney Grimes and Elizabeth Gildersleeve to review the engineering-related aspects of the proposed new residence at 85 Curtiss Rd. Mr. Haugh's reviewed his report that he has submitted to Ms. Gildersleeve and the Planning and Zoning Commission. A copy of this report including a document list, Area of Concern Aerial Photo, Calculations (3 site plans) and his resume can be found at the Town Hall for public record in the Land Use Office.

Attorney Grimes spoke in regards to the Regulations of concern for this application. Attorney Grimes reviewed a print out that he had of the regulations. Regulation: 9.0 Driveway; 9.3 Sightline Distances. Regulation: 22.0 Excavation and grading; 22.3 B & F. Regulation: 22.4 Information; A, B, C, D, E, F, G. Regulation: 22.7; Slopes. Regulation: 22.11; Restoration. Regulation: 22.12 Issuance of Special Exception; 22.12.1 A, B & 22.12.2. Regulation 28.0 Zoning Permit; 28.3 Submission of Application. Regulation 28.5 Determination, 28.5.3 A, B. Regulation 29.0 Site Plans; 29.1 B, 29.2 A, B, C and 29.5 Site plan 29.5.1 B, D, F, H, I, M, N, O. Regulation 29.7 Performance Bond; 29.7.1. Regulation 31.0 Special Exception Applications; 31.4, 31.5, 31.5.1, 31.5.2, 31.5.3. Regulation 31.6 Conditions of Approval; 31.6.1 A, C, D and 31.6.2. Regulation 32.0 Erosion and Sediment Control Plan; 32.7 Inspection. Attorney Grimes feels that all of these regulations need to be addressed in the application. Attorney Grimes brought up the point about the burden of proof is on the applicant to establish each and every requirement of your regulations has been met, and referred to the Mackenzie v. Planning & Zoning Commission back in 2013 and submitted a handout of that case. Attorney Grimes concluded with stating to not look at this as a NIMBY problem [ Not in My Backyard], but to look at it as his clients wishing to be sure that responsible decisions are made, based on responsible development.

Chairman Baker wanted to point out that it's very hard to digest all the information submitted the night of the Public Hearing at such short notice and that, if possible, to submit this information sooner in

order for the Commission to review the material to make any decisions in the future and if the applicant grants another extension of the Public Hearing.

Attorney Grimes expressed his understanding and stated that the Commission will have everything at least a week ahead of time to review.

Ms. Hodza asked Mr. Haugh, how is it possible that at least four different engineers, possibly five who have reviewed this site come up with such vastly different numbers, and how is it possible for a commission to determine, which engineer is closest to the actual activity and disturbance of the site? Can you explain the vast difference, not only between yours and Mr. Szymanski's, which you mainly focused on but also, the engineer that we had for the Wetlands Commission, and the blasting engineer, how is it so different?

Mr. Haugh stated that the Engineer for the Wetlands Commission referenced the 2500 yards to information in the record, and I don't believe it was an embedded analysis by that engineer. That is the impression I got from reading Lenard's Letter.

Ms. Hodza stated that it seems like different engineers have been focused on different aspects or that they have been hired to look at certain aspects and not others and that's the reason these are so different.

Mr. Haugh stated that is fair to say, he stated he was asked to look at the concerns relative to blasting, cuts and fills and the zoning regulations. He looked at the concerns as someone who has experience with earthwork, blasting, cuts and fills and slopes, and slope design. He feels that each engineer had a little bit of a different view of this because Lenard is a Hydrogeologist, he is a Geotechnical Engineer. The engineers all have a different professional background in Civil Engineering and Engineering Geology.

Attorney Grimes stated that everyone who has testified in any manner in Wetlands or in Planning and Zoning has assumed that 2500 cubic yards is the number. This number came from Mr. Szymanski, and we don't believe that number is correct. This is why we hired a blasting expert with his credentials.

Chairman Baker asked if the other site plans that have been weighed against the site plan that has been submitted by Mr. Szymanski have been given the same scrutiny that have been given to this plan?

Mr. Haugh stated that they have gone through the same scrutiny as far as cuts and fills, but they have not gone through the same compliance as zoning.

#### **Chairman Baker turned to any public comments on Zoom**

Mr. Hayden stated that the Lake Waramaug Task Force has asked Attorney James R. Strub to help the LWTF to understand how this project relates to your regulations. Mr. Hayden had written a letter that he read for the record. This letter can be found at the Warren Town Hall in the Land Use Office or on the Town's Website [ [85 Curtiss Rd Special Exceptions | Town of Warren CT](#) ].

Attorney James Strub of Secor, Cassidy, & McPartland, P.C. was hired by the Lake Waramaug Task Force. Attorney Strub addressed his letter reviewing the application and the relevant provisions of the Regulations. Attorney Strub reviewed Section 6.1 Building Area Regulations and its various subsections. This letter can be found at the Warren Town Hall in the Land Use Office or on the Town's Website [ [85 Curtiss Rd Special Exceptions | Town of Warren CT](#) ]. Attorney Strub also read an email that he received

from Mr. Tom McGowen that relates to the intent of the regulation and the Commissions interpretation. The email states, The Planning and Zoning Commission alone interprets its regulations. If this plan is accepted by the Commission, it would critically undermine a fundamental purpose of this regulation to protect water quality. In this case that includes Lake Waramaug.

Attorney Strub showed the Commission a map with the proposed location from Mr. Szymanski and the location from Mr. Wolfe's report. On a clear sheet there were 2 squares and those squares equaled 20,000 square feet. If you take the clear sheet with the 2 squares and lay it over the map that indicates the 2 areas it shows the steep slopes in the top location which is the location that Mr. Szymanski is proposing and the lower square is the location Mr. Wolfe's report shows has a small amount of slope areas. Attorney Strub stated that he is not an engineer but this is something that his office uses and wanted to share it with the Commission.

Ms. Hodza asked Mr. Haugh's did you analyze that existing house site in your report, where this buildable area is? Mr. Haugh stated to be clear he has not reviewed what the land use attorney just went over. Ms. Hodza stated when you were reviewing the Wolfe plans, on one of those sites there was a buildable area. Mr. Haugh stated that his calculation was specific to look at blasting and earth work and there's none shown and referred to in his letter.

Attorney Neil Marcus from Cohen and Wolf; Danbury, CT who also represents the applicants spoke. Attorney Marcus reviewed the cases that have been in the Supreme Court, and the Court determined that Inland/Wetlands and Planning & Zoning are independent Commissions and that they have their own regulations. The suggestion from Attorney Grimes that this Commission is acting on an application that is improperly filed is wrong. Attorney Marcus also reviewed that Attorney Strub who was hired by the Lake Waramaug Task Force, if there is something unconstitutional or illegal about that regulation, then the LWTF should challenge that in Court. It is not something that is done with the Commission, and it should go to Superior Court. Attorney Marcus addressed that Mr. Haugh and Mr. Trinkaus spent a lot of time on the Wolfe concept plans and that to our knowledge they are not fully developed. Mr. Trinkaus in his report refers to old plans. Attorney Marcus stated that this is about whether or not the site plan meets the regulations. There has been a lot of requests to figure out a way without blasting. Mr. Szymanski and his team are going to meet and discuss on site if they can trial with a hydraulic hammer or a drop hammer to test the rock site to see if they can rule out blasting.

Mr. Trinkaus from Trinkaus Engineering, LLC. Mr. Trinkaus reviewed his letter that he has submitted to the Chairman and Commission. This letter can be found the Warren Town Hall in the Land Use Office and on the Town's Website at [ [85 Curtiss Rd Special Exceptions | Town of Warren CT](#) ] .

Mr. Goldin, 85 Curtiss Rd informed the Commission that facts matter, and that some of the reports tonight have not been 100% true. Chairman Baker intervened informing Mr. Goldin that everyone has different opinions and that is what we have heard tonight.

Mr. Szymanski responded to what Mr. Trinkaus presented. He reviewed the existing buildable area adjacent to the house. The area is shown on a larger map that Mr. Szymanski showed the Commission, and this is the Wolfe's contours on the plan, you can see directly in the Northwest corner of the house there are 2-foot contour. If it was a 25% slope, or less, it would have to be 8 feet greater. It's only 7 feet directly adjacent to that on the next contours. That represents 40% slope. The statement that Mr. Trinkaus just gave is patently false.

Ms. Hodza stated that Mr. Szymanski emailed her a similar scenario and that can be found at the Town Hall in the Land Use Office in the 85 Curtiss Rd file.

Attorney Grimes asked why wasn't that email or letter on the website?

Ms. Hodza stated that all information and documentation regarding this application is at the Warren Town Hall for public knowledge and that anyone can come to the Town Hall to look at these documents, request copies or take photographs.

Jane Flanagan, 218 Melius Rd- Thanked the Commission for all their hard work. Ms. Flanagan stated that the term NIMBY is not appropriate term to be used.

Mr. Hermann Tammen, 50 Curtiss Rd- 1. There was never a blasting engineer at IWC, the public asked for that, and today was the first time we have heard of this from a different engineer. 2. This is a building lot, an existing building lot. The site plan used by the applicant states, their planning building site as an existing building site, this to is wrong and should be corrected. 3. Talk to the assessor of Warren, if you look at 85 Curtiss Rd, it says a single-family house lot 2 acers valued at \$255,000 excess 8.2 acers \$51,730. The tax assessor of Warren believes there is a building lot and a house. I asked the Land Use Officer to do some research, there was some activity and there should have been some approval by TAHD or by Warren Town Agencies to put up a garage of 418 square foot in 1954, to put up a frame shed in 2000.

Ms. Tammen, 50 Curtiss Rd- Believes that in July it was decided by IWC to hire an expert on blasting. Today is the first time the public is hearing from a blasting expert. Believes that the approval of the IWC is based on incomplete and incorrect information. The review and evaluation concluded that the proposed development as depicted in the available documents significantly underestimates the volume integration of the blasting and scale of cutting and filling and may not meet the criteria for granting special exceptions because blasting is as a primary determine factor in the criteria of zoning regulation's part 31.5.1 and 31.5.2. Also, the proposed plans ignore at least 2 alternative buildable areas which likely entail this blasting and disturbance. Thirdly, this does not conform to the Town of Warren zoning regulations. Ms. Tammen requests that this application is denied as presented without prejudice as there are other buildable areas on this 10-acer property. Ms. Tammen referred to the applicant's attorney regarding the NIMBY statement. She has never heard of anyone saying this.

Ms. Hodza read 4 letters into the record. These letters can be found at the Warren Town Hall, in the Land Use Officer, or on the Town's Website [ [85 Curtiss Rd Special Exceptions | Town of Warren CT](#) ] .

Ms. Katia Zero, 52 Mountain Lake Rd- Shared her concerned about Curtiss Rd. Curtiss Rd is the only access to her home. She is not opposed to anyone building a new home, but wants it done responsibly and to follow the regulations because it's a very sensitive area because of the lake.

Mr. Tammen, 50 Curtiss Rd- The neighbors sent in over 60 signatures to the IWC asking the Commission for an analysis of the negative consequence of the intensive blasting whether it is clearly within the purview of IWC.

Ms. Tammen, 50 Curtiss Rd- We do respect the process and we want things to be done right and respectfully, especially in regards to the Lake.

Attorney Grimes- Does the Commission have the report from Mr. Temple? Did Mr. Temple check the cut and fill and blasting discrepancy between 2500 and what Mr. Haugh has said? Chairman Baker stated that was a good suggestion.

Elizabeth Goldin, 85 Curtiss Rd- Thank you and they are very appreciative.

Ms. Hodza stated that Mr. Szymanski has emailed a written extension through January 2022.

Mr. Papp stated that he had a few questions as he was not going to be able to attend the next meeting on January 11, 2022. Mr. Papp stated he has a professional relationship with Attorney Grimes, but that it will not affect his decision in any capacity.

Mr. Papp asked Attorney Strub- your arguments under Section 6.1.4, can you agree that if the applicants just expanded upon the existing house, they could build a much larger dwelling and then use the existing driveway and then they would not need a special exception? Attorney Strub stated that is correct.

Mr. Papp asked Attorney Grimes- you keep saying 2017 & 2018 there were plans by Wolfe Engineering. You keep referring to those plans as if you would rather those plans be approved versus the one that's proposed right now, is that correct? Attorney Grimes stated you need to examine those other alternate locations to determine if there's going to be a lesser impact as a result of blasting.

Mr. Papp stated that your expert said that there's going to be lesser impact. So, assuming the argument that you're making, the current plan as proposed by the applicants is going to have this drastic impact on the site. And as your expert has shown the Wolfe plans have little to no impact whatsoever is what you're proposing Correct? Attorney Grimes stated, lesser. Mr. Papp asked Attorney Grimes, more acceptable? Attorney Grimes stated we have to look at the plans and see what they look like and those locations.

Mr. Papp asked Mr. Haugh, you were asked if in your opinion, that based on the other engineers that were hired. If they were subjective? You were hired by Attorney Grimes's client Elizabeth Gildersleeve to examine the application for cut and fill? And you did the exact same analysis on the other prints? Mr. Haugh stated, correct the same method. Just for cutting and fill, and also on the amount of blasting. Mr. Papp asked if somebody wanted to, they can say you are subjective, correct? Because you were just looking at that one specifically. Mr. Haugh stated I was just looking at the cut and fill the and the other issues in my letter.

Mr. Papp asked Mr. Haugh, could you take a couple minutes or even before you come back and see if you agree with Mr. Trinkaus or with Mr. Szymanski as to if there is another buildable area. Mr. Haugh stated he can't do that right now, Mr. Papp stated he can do it for the next meeting.

Ms. Hodza stated that the Commission members can always email her with any questions and she can forward them.

Chairman Baker made a **MOTION** to continue the Public Hearing to the next Meeting on January 11, 2022. Mr. Sandberg **SECONDED; MOTION CARRIED** .



#### 4. Approval of Minutes

- a. Regular meeting and public hearing, November 9, 2021
  - i. Mr. Curtiss made a **MOTION** to approve the regular meeting and public hearing minutes from November 9, 2021, Mr. Prindle **SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

#### 5. Old Business

- a. Possible deliberations and/or decisions on closed public hearings
  - i. None at this time

#### 6. New Business

**ZPA# 21-76** / 152 Curtiss Road / Assessor's Map 07-15-01 / Michael J. Mazzucco, P.E. for Elliott B. Davis, of 5 Mine Hill Road, Roxbury / Special Exception per Sec. 22.2.G for excessive grading with provision per Sec. 22.9 processing of rock; and Special Exception per Sec. 6.1 for structures located outside the buildable area for construction of single-family dwelling, detached garage, septic, well, and driveway (*Received 11/10/21 by LUO; to be received by Commission 12/14; set public hearing for 1/11/2022*)

Chairman Baker made a **MOTION** for Mr. Papp to take over as Chairman regarding this application and the remainder of the meeting due to Chairman Baker is recusing himself for this application. Mr. Papp **ACCEPTED, MOTION CARRIED.**

Mr. Mazzucco, P.E. for Elliott B. Davis reviewed the previous application that was denied due to the excessive amount of grading and filling required. Mr. Mazzucco reviewed the new application that is being presented on 12/14/21. The application is for a proposed development of a single-family home, 3 bedrooms with a new revised plan to eliminate the access up to the house and put a detached garage at the point where the existing driveway ended. With this being done it eliminated a lot of grading. This plan provides a turnaround area for emergency vehicles that can either pull off or backout to exit the site. The septic was modified from the previous plan, this cut down the overall disturbance to about 40-50%. The house will be built on a slab opposed to a full basement due to the ledge being very high to the surface. The proposed plans can be found on file in the Land Use Office.

Ms. Hodza asked for a letter prior to the public hearing from the Fire Marshall or from the Emergency Management that it won't be a problem because the driveway has to be within 50 ft from the home just in case of an emergency. Will people actually be able to access the house?

Mr. Elliott Davis asked in what regulation does it show that the house needs to be within 50 ft of the driveway? Ms. Hodza stated it's not a zoning regulation, but that the Commission has the right to refer applications to any other governing body.

Mr. Prindle made a **MOTION** to set a Public Hearing for January 11, 2022 at 7:30pm, Mr. Curtiss **SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

**ZPA# 21-78** / 28 Reed Road / Demetrio Meduri for Star Marie Meduri / Construction new home (*Received 12/8/21 by LUO; Commission to receive and possibly act 12/14/2021*)

Ms. Hodza stated that this application was brought to the Commission because in the past Mr. Meduri has had multiple violations from the past Land Use Officer and now that Mr. Meduri has filed this application there are neighbors that are not happy. Ms. Hodza feels that this application should be tabled until the next meeting seeing Mr. Meduri is not present for discussion.

Mr. Papp made a **MOTION** to table this application until the next Planning and Zoning meeting on January 11, 2022, Mr. Prindle **SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

**ZPA#21-79** / 110 Rabbit Hill Road, Assessor's Map 5 Lot 4 / Brian E. Neff, P.E. for Amy L. Walsh and William A. Walker, 147 Congress Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. / Special exception per Section 22.1 for fill in excess of 100 cu yds for septic and driveway. (*Received 12/13/21 by LUO; to be received by Commission 12/14; set public hearing for 1/11/2022*)

Mr. Neff explained his application that this project is on a very challenging site and quite a bite of fill is required for the septic system and installation which pushes it over the 100 cubic yard threshold. The plan has been approved by the TAHD and the Wetlands Commission.

Mr. Prindle made a **MOTION** to hold a Public Hearing on January 11, 2022 at 7:30 pm, Mr. Papp **SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

#### **7. Other Business Proper**

- a. Affordable Housing Update B. Request for Proposal for work on Commission administrative and regulatory documents

The latest update has been sent from Vice Chair Sahadevan Fossland for the Commission to review. Ms. Hodza stated that this is a request for a proposal to assist the Land Use and assist the Zoning Commission to revise the regulations and to ensure that they align with the current state statutes. A vote tonight will determine that this will be the final document to send out.

Mr. Prindle made a **MOTION** to approve this document, Mr. Curtiss **SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

- c. 2022 Schedule of Meetings- possible change of time from 7:30 to 7:00 pm

The schedule for 2022 has been approve at a previous meeting and any changes can be discussed for the next year in 2023.

#### **8. Zoning Enforcement Officer's Report**

- a. Ms. Hodza stated there are a few issues that have been brought to her attention but they are minor at this time.

#### **9. Correspondence Received**

- a. None at this time

#### **10. Opportunity for Public Comment**

Jen Benham, 14 Reverie Lane- Ms. Benham was following up on a meeting regarding 28 Reed Rd- Mr. Meduri. Ms. Benham's friends are at 26 Reed rd. and the driveway that Mr. Meduri has his right of way, is her friend's full driveway. Ms. Benham stated that at the last meeting Mr. Meduri lied to the Commission that he never uses that driveway. Pictures have been submitted to Ms. Hodza regarding activity from Mr. Meduri. Ms. Benham stated that cease and desist orders have been issued to Mr. Meduri and it doesn't work, he doesn't stop. Ms. Benham states that Mr. Meduri doesn't make Ms. Hodza feel safe and Ms. Benham wants the Commission to think about those neighbors that have to deal with Mr. Meduri on a regular basis. Ms. Benham is wondering tonight why the Commission or Land Use Officer has not done anything for the harassment situations and why isn't the right of way taken away from Mr. Meduri because he has another driveway already on his property. Ms. Benham feels that this town is going to have many lawsuits and it's embarrassing for a small town.

Mr. Tammen, 50 Curtiss Rd- Mr. Tammen wants to know why doesn't the Commission demand a staff report from the Land Use Officer? He feels that if this was done the meetings would be much shorter.

Randy Shrack, 26 Reed Rd- Mr. Shrack stated that Mr. Meduri has never removed his business off of his property. Every time he receives a cease-and-desist order he lies. Mr. Shrack has sent pictures to the Land Use Office for the past 11 years and Mr. Meduri has never stopped running his business off his property. Mr. Shrack feels that this is unfair that Mr. Meduri continues to get approval for his permits and also continues to violate the Wetlands.



Ms. Tammen, 50 Curtiss Rd- Ms. Tammen feels that someone must look into the situation on Reed Rd and do something about it.

Mr. Papp stated that if people are afraid for their life, that the police should be called if that's that case, and that this is not a planning and zoning issue.

11. Adjournment

- a. Mr. Prindle made a **MOTION** to adjourn the meeting at 10:25pm, Mr. Curtiss

**SECONDED, MOTION CARRIED.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Robin Tanner-Hoskinson  
Land Use Clerk / Recording Secretary  
Date: 12/20/2021 Time: 9:45pm

Link to Zoom Recording

[https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fus06web.zoom.us%2Frec%2Fshare%2FMczN429YxlcUerLeJD4Sf5MZfhHdM2EVK79Hhp5F\\_tr94328mP\\_QvMOc3iDX3t8v.k2sV7RxWalQ0ne1A&data=04%7C01%7C%7Ce0b76d06c42d4404084808d9c0b74b65%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637752715747982334%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ij1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Bpe2kX7R22qtC%2FAAE0YjtNeqWC5B8LzNoIBPA98qGgo%3D&reserved=0](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fus06web.zoom.us%2Frec%2Fshare%2FMczN429YxlcUerLeJD4Sf5MZfhHdM2EVK79Hhp5F_tr94328mP_QvMOc3iDX3t8v.k2sV7RxWalQ0ne1A&data=04%7C01%7C%7Ce0b76d06c42d4404084808d9c0b74b65%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637752715747982334%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzliLCJBTiI6Ij1haWwiLCJXVCi6Mn0%3D%7C3000&sdata=Bpe2kX7R22qtC%2FAAE0YjtNeqWC5B8LzNoIBPA98qGgo%3D&reserved=0)