

**TOWN OF ELSMERE
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
October 7, 2025
6:30 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Anderson called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER FOR THOSE WISHING TO DO SO:

ROLL CALL:

CHAIRMAN	ROBERT ANDERSON	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER	DEAN DYER	ABESENT
COMMISSIONER	JOHN POCKETS	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER	JA'NIKKA CARABALLO	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER	FRANK OBARA	ABSENT
COMMISSIONER	JONATHAN WATTS	PRESENT
COMMISSIONER	MEGHAN WALLACE	PRESENT

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the minutes from the September 9, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting.

ACTION: Commissioner Watts made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 9, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting with no corrections. Commissioner Caraballo seconded the motion.

VOTE: 4 in favor, 1 Abstained, 2 Absent Motion carried

Anderson – Yes, Pockets – Yes, Dyer – Absent, Caraballo – Yes, Obara – Absent
Watts – Yes, Wallace – Abstained

OPENING STATEMENT:

Administrative Assistant for the Code Department Denise Lardani read the opening statement.

NEW BUSINESS:

2. Review of Petition 26-02 Tax Parcel Number 1900-400-215

The applicant seeks to operate an automotive repair shop at the subject parcel. The Planning Commission shall determine whether the automotive repair shop meets the Harmonious Development Intent of the Town of Elsmere Code 225-9. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment.

Code Enforcement Officer Facciolo read the site analysis. The request by the applicant, the applicant seeks to operate an automotive repair shop at the subject parcel. The statement of fact, the subject parcel is legal nonconforming as per Town of Elsmere Code 225 attachment 3. In regard to the front yard setback, the required setback is 20 feet, the existing is 15 ½ feet. The Rear yard setback, the required setback is also 20 feet, the existing is 15 ½ feet. The lot coverage, maximum allowable lot coverage is 75%. The current lot coverage is 79%. The subject parcel is currently noncompliant with the special exception use outlined for motor vehicle service stations as per Town of Elsmere Code 225-28D. In that code, a minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet shall be provided. The existing lot area is 9,375 square feet. Such lot shall be located within the following limitations: not closer than 100 feet to the intersection of any two streets designated as primary or secondary in the Comprehensive Plan, which I will state that the petitioner came in earlier this morning and he measured, and it is 110 feet. Therefore, that one is not included anymore. The yard requirements, which are applicable to all pumps, mechanical equipment, and other appliances in addition to the main structure, are as follows. The front and rear are 5 feet, maximum lot coverage is 20%, the current coverage is 79%. The issues, per the Town of Elsmere Code 225-19C, an Auto Service establishment is only allowed as a special exception use in the CC zone. Although the property was previously used as an auto repair station, it has been vacant since 2014 and must be reviewed under current codified ordinances. The Town of Elsmere Code 225-28D has further requirements for special exception uses of motor vehicle service stations as spelled out above. In granting of the petition, the Planning Commission of the Town of Elsmere would need to determine that the proposed meets the harmonious development intent of the Town of Elsmere Code 225-9. The planning commission of the Town of Elsmere would need to make a recommendation to the Board of Adjustment to grant, it says four on here, but there are now three variances for the following:

The minimum lot area of 15,000 square feet shall be provided. The existing is 9,375 square feet. The one that we are removing is letter B, about the no closer than 100 feet, so I am not going to read that one. Yard requirements which are applicable to all pumps, mechanical equipment, and other appliances, in addition to the main structure, are as follows. The front, side, and rear yard setback must be 25 feet. The current is 15 ½ feet. The front and rear must be five feet. And the maximum lot coverage is only allowed 20%. The current coverage is 79%. The Board of Adjustment would need to grant a special exception used for an automotive repair shop to operate at the subject parcel. The Board of Adjustment would need to grant a total of three variances for the following, which I have already read. And if approved, the applicant would need to obtain a business license from the Town of Elsmere Code Enforcement Department.

Chairman Anderson stated there is actually one variance that is not on here, and that is the 20-foot buffer between commercial and residential.

Code Enforcement Officer Facciolo said they are already going to do that. It is not a 20-foot buffer. The buffer has to be at least 10 feet tall. They are going to put a fence in between the property to block that. They have already added that on Exhibit 26-02J and K, you will be able to see where they wrote towards the bottom right corner, 10-foot-high solid fence. That is going to be the buffer.

The applicant Fausto Siquencia, owner of 1306 Kirkwood Highway stated he also owns 1308 Kirkwood Highway. I met Mr. Harold Reed who was the previous owner of the property, at 1306. We spoke about the shop and about the property. I told him once he is ready to sell and fortunately, we did it, and he was happy. He and I spoke about opening the mechanic shop because it has been a long time, actually, he worked there all his life. This is one of the first shops in Elsmere. I remember one day we were together, actually with his son, people in the neighborhood came and asked him when he is going to reopen it and now we are trying to reopen the shop as it is existing. We are not doing anything else. The only thing we are asking is just to give us permission to reopen. We are following what Elsmere is asking.

Chairman Anderson ask the applicant to verify what property he owns and where the mechanic shop is. Is he planning to modify the building in any way?

Mr. Siquencia stated no modifications, nothing at all, just as is. 1306 is the property in question for the mechanic shop and it was built I believe in the 1950's.

Commissioner Anderson asked if he was planning to reverse sub divide the properties that he owns, and Mr. Siquencia stated no he is not. His plan is to keep each property as individual properties. I do not know if you are familiar with 1300 Kirkwood, the one on the corner, it was a big mess over there before, like a year ago. I do not know if you have been over there. It is all cleaned up. Everything is in nice shape. I mean, we have been working on all these front properties to make Elsmere look better.

Code Enforcement Officer Facciolo states I have further insight. If you did not catch what he said, he actually owns pretty much all the properties on the 1300 block. So, he owns 1300, 1304, 1306, and 1308 but 1310, as we know, is the jewelers. I just wanted to further explain that.

Chairman Anderson asked if he would be renting the building out or would he be running the business. Mr. Siquencia responded he would be running the business, not renting.

David Reed, the previous owner's son stated Mr. Siquencia did the things he needed to do to bring everything up to code, repair things that had been neglected, were not fixed over the years, brought them up to what they should be, done a good job with it. And, like I say, I was so impressed with that, we asked if he would be interested in 1306? So, if my father had not died five years ago at 92 years old, it probably would still be a car repair shop. I

remember when we applied for the shop, I do not even think there was a setback at the time, at the rear of the property.

John Holloway, 4th District Councilman, stated he drove by and looked at the property this morning. I parked by Tamarack and looked in the driveway where the curb cut was and took a few pictures. From there, he owns all the property from 1300 down to the Jewelers, correct? Behind all those properties, it looks like a construction zone. I mean, it looks pretty bad back there, and I do not know if that's what is intended for the neighborhood to end up looking like or the result to end up being, but I do not think there's been a very good job done on the property. It looks really bad. So that is my only comment. I do not think it should be considered harmonious at this point.

Chairman Anderson asked if the conditions that Councilman Holloway was referring are code related like trash and debris?

Councilman Holloway stated that it is the whole stretch. The entire backyard or other than a small amount of grass at the rear of the house, from that grass back to the property line is gravel, broken asphalt, whatever. There is no other grass or vegetation beyond that point.

Code Enforcement Officer Facciolo stated this is impervious coverage that has been existing for quite some time.

Commissioner Pockets asked about the curb cut coming into the lot and whether it was asphalt or gravel and are you planning to keep the gravel? Mr. Siquencia responded he will be keeping the asphalt.

Councilman Holloway asked if the entrance on Tamarack will be used for part of the entrance?

Mr. Siquencia asked what he was referring to, and Councilman Holloway stated the entrance over here at 1300. Mr. Siquencia stated each property has its own individual entrances. They are all separate. Also, if you remember the corner house, it was a big mess. They took out over three dumpsters of garbage. It does not look bad there.

Councilman Holloway stated it does not look dirty it looks like a construction site at the residence.

Town Manager Steven Martin asked Councilman Holloway as far as it looks like a construction site, is it debris? Are there cars in the back alleyway?

Councilman Holloway stated no it is all just dirt and gravel and pushed up. There were a couple of piles back by the fence, but it looked like it had been recently groomed but not graded.

Chairman Anderson asked 1306 is where the garage is, where you are going to work at and then to the left, 1308 and 1304 are residential, correct? Mr. Siquencia said yes, sir.

Chairman Anderson asked what about a buffer between those? Is there going to be a fence between those properties?

Mr. Siquencia said no, not necessarily. No, we do not need it. Because since we own all of the properties, we have a good relationship with all. For years this was a mechanic's shop, and no fence was needed.

Code Enforcement Officer Facciolo stated because he owns all of the properties, the only buffer that he needs is for the residential in the back.

Mr. Siquencia does not think putting a fence up will look good for the view of the property but if it has to be put up for Code compliance he would.

Multiple conversations went back and forth about the buffer in between the residential properties and if they were to move and now a new person moves in without a buffer. More questions were asked about the plans for cars and where they will be stored.

Councilwoman Sally Jensen, 504 Baltimore Avenue, 2nd District stated she wondered how long the auto repair shop has been closed, not operating and she learned that is approximately 11 years ago and that is a long time for a business to not be operating.

My question would be is, will the mechanic shop be a commercial or a personal repair shop? What type of work will be performed? Tune-ups, mechanical, body work? Will there be a large number of vehicles parked on the property waiting for repair? Most of the other existing car repair shops in our town, as you are all aware, have delineated parking spaces, et cetera. You are all familiar. So, the number of vehicles being permitted on this CC zoned property.

I would like to know what the days of the proposed days of hours of operations and how many employees. Where will the employees park and where will vehicles waiting for repair be parked and how on that certain size parcel? Is the property large enough to accommodate both employees and vehicles awaiting repair? If the backyard is to be treated as a parking lot, shouldn't the property be lined like other commercial parking lots throughout town? Cars are already parked there haphazardly. I go there daily.

I'd like to know what the plan is for ingress and egress because when the fence was removed from around or on the inside, I'll call it, of 1300, and I'm aware you own just about the whole block, I noticed that there is a curb cut. And my concern is that since you own all the property and since it's all now, for many years, apparently, been stone, gravel, I can see this car starting to leave the lot, the mechanic shop, and cutting through the backyards and going out on Bungalow. That is my concern.

So, the first question really should have been is what is the plan for ingress and egress from the mechanical repair shop? Presumably, the president of the house, in front of the garage, will park in the driveway. If the intent is to either enter or exit the repair shop via the curb

cut, I would object. The three properties, 1300, 1304, and 1306, are separate properties and must be treated as separate.

How does the automotive repair shop fit the harmonious development intent? Noise. How will the noise from the business, this type of business, affect the quality of life for neighboring residents? The setbacks on the side yards are only five feet from the property line where the two residences are located and probably another five feet on the opposite residences. The setback of the rear yard is 15.5. There is a house immediately behind and another residence behind that, so kind of off to the side, catty corner, we will say, behind the garage, and the required setback is 20 feet.

I realize five feet is not much, but how will the noise from this type of business affect the quality of life in those living in neighboring residences? Have you ever taken your vehicle into the shop for brakes? I cannot remember what that hose is called that puts the lug nuts off and on. Remember how loud that is and that squeal? Okay, well, how would you like to listen to that emanating from a property next door to your home all day every day? You would hardly ever be able to be outside in your own yard enjoying the property in which you have invested as much. Another concern is disposal of fluids, again, not knowing the type of mechanical or repair shop we are discussing here.

What is the plan for disposal of oil and other fluids from vehicles that are in for repair? Odors. With the garage being located so close to residential properties, how will odors be contained not only from any fluids drained and stored, but also fumes from an idling vehicle when you are trying to check the timing, etc.? See, I remember stuff from being a teenager. I knew about cars then.

I have many concerns regarding the property located at 1306 Kirkwood Highway as well as the two properties located at 1304 and 1300, which were purchased by you. There have been numerous complaints filed by me and a former council person and who knows who else, not to mention the violations, the numerous ones noted by our own town code enforcement officers. I have grave concerns that based on past practices or actions by this property owner, the complaints will continue to be filed.

I ask you to think about how neighbors in the town would know that the town code will be complied with going forward considering experience with the property owner and the employees. Lastly, I have to say it. This is, as a friend of mine says, business, not personal.

I have to say that I do not believe those three properties have always been gravel or any other parking surface. There are photographs that show trees that had been on them prior and grass on some of the three properties. And I am sorry I had to say it, but I did. Thank you for your time. Did I stay under three minutes? Since you have so many written questions, could we get that submitted into evidence? I will retype it and forward a copy up because I probably will not be here for the Board of Adjustment meeting and I want my comments read into the record.

Mr. Siquencia responded I previously explained about the in and out from the shop. What

the lady is saying is, how is it going to be the entrance in and out. We have already supplied the drawing that is provided in your folder. Also, she is saying that the neighbors are to close. I know on the left side, the property, the house, is like 50 feet away. and the other property is located beyond the 1308 the Street, 25 feet behind the fence. So, there is enough space between the shop and the neighborhood. Besides, we plan to go to the fence which is going to be there. So that will help with all the noises. Actually, every job is not going to be quiet as sitting at the desk and writing. It is a mechanic shop. We are not planning to make a lot of noise, but it is a car repair. It is not for office space. It is my plan of retirement. My hours of operation will be 8 to 5, Monday through Friday and I will have myself and 1 worker. It is a small shop.

Commissioner Wallace asked what is the current usage of the property? The response from Mr. Siquencia is that the current usage is residential, and the mechanic shop has been there for years, and they have cleaned up the property and now complying with code they would like to open the small mechanic shop again. My partner currently lives there.

Mary Steppi at 113 Locust Avenue stated she is 20-year resident. I have served four years on town council, and I also served on the planning commission. What is before you tonight are, is this harmonious with the town of Elsmere? Would a jiffy lube put in that spot be harmonious with surrounding residential? Although this shop existed years ago, it existed before our code was adopted, the municipal codes across the board. The statement of facts, legal nonconforming.

In as many years as I have attended these meetings, this is the most egregious set of standards that will require variances that back up legal nonconforming. So, it is required to be 15,000 square feet when we only have 9,375. It is a small footprint of area. The setbacks are not sufficient. When you guys talk about a fence, the uses for those strips of houses along there are residential. The zoning is another thing. Many of our areas are zoned one thing, but usage is another. Being that they are all owned by the same person, this would set a huge precedent of investors coming in, buying up property, and doing whatever they want because they own the whole block or a strip and this would also set a precedent, anybody with a garage back in their property could open an auto repair shop. My concerns, there are several residential properties, specifically 3A Bungalow that backs up to it that are not here tonight speaking out. Storage of hazardous materials, batteries, tires, et cetera. Not harmonious.

Parking for customers. It is gravel. I walk my dog a lot through town. I, on a weekend, witnessed heavy equipment back there tearing everything up. All the trees were torn down. There are photos to prove on Google Maps that grass existed back there and not all that gravel. I would smell asphalt like somebody pouring a driveway or something and could not determine what it was because I could not see through the properties and now I know. Those were grassy lots. I saw people mowing the grass back there. That is neither here nor there. However, the residential uses next to these, the buffer is not adequate. Just because he knows who he is renting to does not matter. It is still in our code what we want for our town. Harmonious. Again, the 10-foot fence is behind, so if somebody were to do this, somebody do something. A neighbor in my property, could I get a 10-foot fence? No. I

cannot block out what other people are using for their properties. This would set a huge precedent for the town, for businesses to come in, for investors to come in and say, well, I own it all. Forget the code. I can do what I want.

Years ago, that was a shop, and we have had many stories of old businesses throughout town that are now gone. When that was abandoned in 2014, I filed several complaints because it was a junkyard left. I saw skunks roaming around, and we tried to work with them to get all the just, I am telling you, junkyard left for years and now this. There is better use for this property just because it was an auto repair shop at one point many, many moons ago. We now have code that covers all properties, residential and commercial. Regardless of zoning, regardless of use, what exists now, what was then, this is now. And I urge you to decline this petition.

Carmita Rodriquez, wife of Mr. Siquencia stated we bought the property and spent all savings there because I really liked the place. Like the lady say, it was a lot of trash there. You can see if it is grass or if it is gravel we cleaned and spent a year and a half cleaning all these properties. We are planning our retirement here. My husband knows how to be a mechanic. My husband and my son like the old cars. We have enough space inside, five space inside. If you close the doors and you see nothing, and that is why they are trying to do this permit. We are not asking for anything new, like the last petition. Our mechanic shop is there. It has been there for many, many years. We are not looking for the big business or something like that, no. We already work. We already spend our savings there. And we try to take life quietly and not work on the weekends. Our kids are big enough, so it is like our recreative time for us.

We have to get a permit to do the new things, the good things. You can see we spend a lot of money in permits. We follow the rules, and they know that. We are here every single day. Can we do this, what do we need to do to do for make this happen? The inspector has to go and check. We passed everything. We did a really good job on the properties. Now it is clean.

1300, they had bunnies there, 50 bunnies. The smell in that house was terrible you could not even breathe because it was terrible. We cleaned all of it. Like she said, it was tires. Every trash that you can imagine was there. We paid a lot of money to move all that stuff there. It was trees, yes, it was. But we took all trees down the tree because it is really dangerous for the house. Please help us. We deserve at least a point in favor of us because we cleaned up that property.

Mary Steppi stated let us go back to August of last year. There was an ozone alert period. I do not have the exact date. So, when this gentleman said he had three or four containers cleaning out that one house on the corner, 1300, I was home and noticed it was smoky. I thought it was just ozone, my asthma flaring up and one morning I was out walking my dog and I witnessed the construction debris that was thrown in piles in the yard being carried from one yard to the next to, I believe, 1304, being openly burned in the morning and for several days prior to that. I immediately called town hall, was ready to call 911, and Code Officer Facciolo went up and told them to Cease and Desist. I believe that was not the first

that minor changes are needed, and a plan amendment should be processed through preliminary land use service or the plus review and then the third option is determined that goals and objectives of the plan are no longer relevant, and a full update should be completed through the plus review. It is my understanding that there would be a couple pretty minor changes. Most likely the biggest thing that the town managers' pointed out to me is that the future land use maps and the comprehensive plan show a mixed use around New Road that might not be the case anymore. The town may want to change that, but that is up to you to discuss and determine and, if applicable, a recommendation would be forwarded to your council, which it would be if you had any changes. The council would then review the comprehensive plan and make any recommendations from step one and make a final determination on the outcome of the review and future actions if necessary.

It is recommended that the review happens during a public meeting to allow public comment. And then you would be required to send to the office state planning coordination a letter documenting the process and outcome of your review and attach any meeting minutes, resolutions, or ordinances. If the review process is satisfactory, the office of state planning coordination will send a confirmation letter and notify you of the due date for the next update and recertify the comprehensive plan. This is what the five-year review is about. I am happy to work with you on that and answer any questions you might have.

Mr. O'Neill provided a presentation that can be sent to the Planning Commissioners as a PDF.

Mr. O'Neill will reach out to IPA for training sessions. You can either work directly with them or if they will allow me to, I could present that material on their behalf potentially, but I should be able to work something out there.

There were multiple conversations from the Commissioners about the plan review, and should the plan be updated in the five-year review of accomplishments that have been completed since the 10-year review.

Mr. O'Neill stated it is not required but it can be included. If we had goals and recommended goals and they were accomplished maybe it is best to show they were accomplished.

Mr. O'Neill stated this is important, all required elements for all municipalities would be, you know, positions on population growth, housing growth, expansion of boundaries, development of adjacent areas, redevelopment potential, community character, general land use, critical community development issues, key infrastructure issues, and demonstrated coordination with state, county, and other municipalities, as well as maintaining accurate municipal boundary. Elsmere would apply to this. There are additional requirements for municipalities over 2,000, and it's, you know, public-private use of land, transportation, economic development, affordable housing, community facilities, open space recreation. There is also a source water protection element.

In terms of the land use element, I think you all are probably somewhat familiar with this,

but the future land use map is one of the most important things in a comprehensive plan. It basically determines what your future zoning is going to be. The zoning does not have to exactly match the future land use, but it has to align with it. And what I mean by that is if you call it residential, it could be a variety of different residential districts, but it has to be residential. If you call it mixed use, then it has to align with the language that you use to describe what mixed use means in the comp plan.

When you are reviewing, that is something to look at, particularly as the changes to New Road will happen. The mixed use in this comprehensive plan, you know, we were kind of looking at the redevelopment of those areas and sort of allowing for redevelopment of the Kirkwood Highway corridor primarily. And then it was decided at the time to extend that to New Road, which, you know, again, may have changed.

The existing land use is kind of just your existing land use pattern. And again, it is a little bit different than zoning. It is how the land is being used. So similar to what the Mayor said, those properties right now are residential, even though they were zoned commercial for existing land use, they would show up as residential, but for future land use, you might have something different like mixed use.

Generally, when you look at these maps, red means commercial, yellow means residential, orange is going to be mixed use, and then green is something either preservation or open space.

When there's a plus review process, which, you know, should not be too cumbersome for the five-year update, but when you are updating the full comprehensive plan, it is kind of a whole process. This is just a review. It is not intended to be a big overhaul necessarily, but it is a good, intended planned opportunity. The state wants you to go back and look through the plan. That is what the whole purpose of this is and if there's things that really jump out at you, things that seem off. Those are the things to focus on right now. One of the things that I think might be helpful, it is really best to focus on the goals and objectives and the maps. You do not necessarily need to read every single word of the plan.

Mayor, Joann Personti 108 Jefferson Avenue, stated that she wanted to point out a few things. If you all have your books, because I have my book tonight. There was one thing, and I know this was brought up before the, the rule about once you set out some sort of zoning change, it has to be accommodated in 18 months. Yes, that, that was on, I think, slide 25, because that was brought up before. And that was a concern before, but then we were told that there really is no rule that you must make those changes in that period of time. With what occurred in 2021, call your attention to page three, public feedback summary, where it clearly states that, you know, due to COVID, the amount of public feedback was basically limited to virtual pretty much next to nothing compared to what it used to be. It was in person. I think the presentation I showed you before was kickoff in September 2019. We had been like a few months in and then COVID hit, and we had to kind of stop for a little bit. At that point in time, it was already decided about the mixed-use on New Road. That is the point at which I was getting. By the time those maps came out, I recall only seeing them online. I do believe we need to revisit that map because what

happened afterwards was that there was an attempt. I do not know how much you are aware of.

The former Mayor had an ordinance drawn up with all these properties being rezoned and it was a major revolt. There was like standing room only in this room. So, it definitely was not supported by the public. We do need to revisit it just on that basis alone. It was not only a surprise to all of us. I could not find in the plan where it specifically said New Road when it referred to the mixed-use areas. And one area is a particularly long Kirkwood highway and Old DuPont Road. I think I have not come across anyone who said, "I am against mixed use in the Kirkwood highway corridor". Everybody was more or less saying It is a good idea. The problem came when it extended from those properties behind Kirkwood highway to New Road. Let us see the other area here it is on page 86 land use and annexation recommendations. It says under number three, promote mixed use zoning and development along the Kirkwood highway corridor and other select areas of town. So, yes, that was a confusion. It was a point of discussion, but you know, it's, even when you update your zoning it is fine to change that. I guess, cause there were some that thought, oh that we were in some sort of violation because we did not go ahead and rezone all that. So, and, and that is why I was trying to tell people as a no we are okay.

Sean O'Neill stated. I do not think that map should be present because since that's going to be under review and subject to possible change based on what everyone feels at the end of this process, I'm not comfortable with having that map present. Maybe the other maps, especially the flood zone, flood map, because some people may not even know they're in a floodplain and, the current existing land use, those would be the two maps that I think we should have.

There were multiple questions about land use and zoning are different things and that is correct. The future land use has to align with your future zoning. The existing land use does not as we saw tonight. It complies. It's just, it may be used. It may be currently being used for something different than it's zoned. Like the property tonight is being used as a residential property, but it's zoned commercial.

Land use is how the land is being used. Zoning is a legal characterization of what the property is allowed to do. You can rezone a property if somebody's already living there. They don't have to turn it into a commercial property, for example, it's still zoned commercial. The one thing I would say with the public feedback is if you're not going to show them the future land use map, you know, just to be careful it could conflict with the future land use map. In the case of New Road, I get that, but you could get a wide variety of other feedback that everybody doesn't agree with. So, the town determines what the future land use is.

Town Manager Steven Martin mentioned, Councilman Holloway, the new council people need copies of the comprehensive plan. If we're going to be looking at it too, I will email them to you tomorrow.

ITEMS SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN AND BOARD MEMBERS: None

ADJOURNMENT:

ACTION: Commissioner Pockets made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Watts seconded the motion.

VOTE: 5 in favor, 2 Absent Motion carried

Anderson – Yes, Dyer – Absent, Pockets – Yes, Caraballo – Yes, Obara – Absent, Watts – Yes, Wallace – Yes

At this time, the meeting was adjourned.

Votes are recorded accurately. The audio tape(s) of this meeting will be available at Town Hall for a period of two years from the date these minutes are approved. The audio tape(s) may be reviewed at Town Hall by appointment and in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.



ROBERT ANDERSON,
CHAIRMAN



-DEAN DYER, JANIKKA CARABALLO
SECRETARY