

## **Subject to Approval**

### **MADISON PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING MINUTES May 21, 2020**

The Regular Meeting of the Madison Planning and Zoning Commission was conducted Thursday, May 21, 2020, at 7 p.m., remotely, using Zoom Videoconferencing. The public was invited to participate remotely by joining the meeting through a Zoom webinar link password, telephone call-in number, and a webinar identification number. Log-in and call-in details were posted to the Town of Madison website (<https://www.madisonct.org/>) prior to the meeting.

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT**

Chairman Ronald Clark, Vice Chairman James Matteson, Secretary Elliott Hitchcock, Thomas Burland, Joseph Bunovsky, Jr., John K. Mathers, Joel Miller, and Giselle Mcdowall.

#### **MEMBERS ABSENT**

Brian Richardson.

#### **ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Peter Roos and Ron Bodison.

#### **OTHERS PRESENT**

Director of Planning and Economic Development David Anderson, Selectwoman Erin Duques, and the meeting was recorded via Zoom Videoconferencing software for You Tube viewing.

---

The Regular Meeting of the Madison Planning and Zoning Commission was called to order at approximately 7 p.m. by Chairman Ronald Clark, who outlined the procedures for the public hearing process. Chairman Clark seated Alternate Commissioner Ron Bodinson for absent Commissioner Brian Richardson.

#### **Public Hearing Items:**

**20-08. 503 Old Toll Road.** Map 143, Lot 20. RU-1 District. Owner: Madison Investment Group LLC. Applicant: Wildwood Behavioral Health, LLC. Special Exception Permit to utilize the existing buildings to provide professional outpatient behavioral health services for adults. The facility will be licensed by the Connecticut Department of Health to provide outpatient programming including individual, group, family and activity therapies for individuals with low to moderate severity psychiatric (including substance abuse) disorders requiring non-hospital, non-medically managed treatment. Treatment services will not include methadone maintenance.

Attorney Katy J. Armenia, representing the applicant, stated that Dr. Michael Hinkley, the applicant, and Consultant Peter Rockholz would speak about the project. Dr. Hinkley stated that he has lived in Madison since 1993 and gave a summary of his professional career and background in assisting individuals in solving substance abuse issues; his typical group consists of six working toward recovery from substance abuse. With an office at 11 Woodland Road, Dr. Hinkley stated that he has developed a national reputation, attracting people from major rehabilitation programs, and locating at 503 Old Toll Road would enable his practice to be separated into two separate buildings. What is attractive about the Old Toll Road site, is that it has a barn structure that will enable activities, such as pottery making, art and yoga to be offered

*Page 1. Madison Planning and Zoning Commission, Regular Meeting, May 21, 2020*

to the clients, with the addition of other professionals to assist in that type of expansion of the practice, thus serving the whole person, body, mind, and spirit, who is working toward conquering substance abuse issues, according to Dr. Hinkley. Clients tend to be upper middle class, high net worth families, and include children of such families, perhaps in their late 20s, who are looking to address their addiction, according to Dr. Hinkley, in an environment that provides more space and more opportunities. There would be three or four clinicians, and probably not all of them would be at the office at the same time; groups would consist of three to six in the room, he stated. Peter Rockholz stated that he is a licensed clinical social worker who assists people in navigating the licensure requirements of the state; he has 46 years experience in behavioral health, most of it in Connecticut, with 25 years providing direct service. He stated that the biggest hurdle he had was convincing the landlord to rent to Dr. Hinkley, because of the fears that along with a drug treatment program come people on drugs who commit crimes, deal drugs in the parking lot, and shoot up heroin; it has been found that in areas where such programs are offered, crime rates have actually gone down. Furthermore, this is not going to be a methadone treatment program, Mr. Rockholz stated, adding that he would not be involved with this, if it were not of the best quality, because he has a reputation to protect. Entered into the record, on the application's behalf, are the following materials:

- *Exhibit A, Appended State of Business Use for Wildwood Behavioral Health, LLC and Memorandum of Expert and Applicant's business consultant in regard to CT Department of Public Health Licensure for proposed facility at 503 Old Toll Road, Madison, CT, enclosing a May 20, 2020 Nature of my Psychotherapy Businesses from Michael F. X. Hinkley, PhD, MSW, LADC, STL and a Memorandum, dated May 20, 2020, from Peter B. Rockholz, M.S.S.W., L.C.S.W., explaining state of Connecticut Department of Public Health licensure procedures, governed by state statutes and regulations, how the Old Toll Road facility will operate, within the guidelines of Madison's Planning and Zoning Regulations, definitions for various terms used in the psychotherapy field and between local and state regulating agencies, and the fact that the CON Waiver Application was denied by the state, because a direct connection to addressing the COVID-19 pandemic could not be seen, so application for a regular Certificate of Need (CON) is under way. Once the regular Certificate of Need is awarded, which takes about nine months, the applicant will then be able to apply for state Department of Health licensure, which will take another month or two, Mr. Rockholz stated in his Memorandum, adding that the Old Toll Road site is required to be approved, in order for the regular Certificate of Need to be granted.*
- *Exhibit B, Appended business filings with CT Secretary of State for Wildwood Behavioral Health, LLC, dated March 25, 2020, and a Business Inquiry Commercial Recording Division, for Wildwood Behavioral Health, LLC, 503 Old Toll Road, Madison, CT, dated May 21, 2020, with Principals Details, Dr. Michael Hinkley, Business Address, 11 Woodland Road, Suite 2, Madison, CT, Residence Address, 4 Madison Ave., Madison, CT.*
- *Exhibit C, Appended relevant portions of Madison Zoning Regulations with revisions through October 25, 2019, 5.4(d) 5.4 Rural Districts, 19 Definitions – page 98*
- *Exhibit D, Appended relevant portions of Madison 2013 Plan of Conservation and Development effective November 9, 2013 Section 3, Community Character and Quality [of] Life – page 11*
- *Exhibit E, List of Adjacent and Neighboring Businesses and Churches to 503 Old Toll Road, Madison, CT*
- *Exhibit F, Appended Letters of Support for Applicant/Current Public Interest Newspaper*

*Stories regarding The Applicant's Principal and Outreach to Neighbors*

- *Exhibit G, List of Similar Substance Abuse Service Providers with offices located in Madison, CT*

Ms. Armenia summarized the contents of the exhibits, in response to an objection to the application with four reasons that were stated in a letter submitted by three attorneys representing nearby homeowners. Ms. Armenia stated that she hopes that the 23 objectors to the application, who are represented by counsel, have a clear understanding of the program. Attorneys Steven C. Rickman, Esq., Robert W. Blythe, Esq., and Christina Salamone, Esq., had submitted into the record a May 18, 2020 letter outlining the *Objection To Special Exception Permit Application of Wildwood Behavioral Health, LLC, #20-08. 5-3 Old Toll Road*, in which it was stated that the firm “represents the numerous homeowners listed on Exhibit A to this letter, who reside in and around the Northwood Farms Subdivision (at least 23 families have joined in this Objection),” for four reasons:

- *the Application materially understates the proposed use and contains material omissions;*
- *the Connecticut Secretary of State's website indicated that Applicant Wildwood Behavioral Health, LLC has no legal existence;*
- *the actual proposed use of the Property is not one of the permitted uses and is excluded by the zoning regulations; and*
- *the facility's anticipated negative impact on the neighboring properties far outweighs any public convenience and welfare that may be served.*

This application does not represent a new development or a redevelopment, modifications to the building will take place on the interior; this space is not intended to be operable as an urgent care facility; there will be planned visitors under a program licensed by the state of Connecticut, so the purpose of the application falls under the definition of professional and other office use in Section 5.4(d) in the town's Planning and Zoning Regulations, according to Ms. Armenia, and not Section 5.4(g), which is a private hospital, sanatorium or clinic. Dr. Hinkley's plan is a well thought out plan, it fits the goals of the Madison Plan of Conservation and Development for providing a need to the community, and it will be harmonious and complimentary to services that do exist in the town, according to Ms. Armenia. Director of Planning and Economic Development David Anderson asked that Madison Chief of Police Jack Drumm speak. Mr. Drumm stated that residents had contacted him with concerns about the project, particularly whether there would be an increase in emergency response in the neighborhood and whether anything about the application would affect the quality of life in the area. All of those concerns have been addressed by the applicant, according to Mr. Drumm. Dr. Hinkley stated that he has had programs in town since 2015, and there has never been an emergency call; people come to his program, because of his credentials and because he offers pastoral counseling.

Commissioner Joel Miller stated that this is not a zoning change that is being proposed; this is a special exception permit for a use that is allowed in this zone. Vice Chairman James Matteson stated that he did hear the term clinician mentioned four times, which to him would mean clinic. Dr. Hinkley stated that the word clinician is interchangeable with therapist, so in his office, currently he is still a clinician—they have skills of a therapeutic model that they can apply. Ms. Armenia explained the differences between the Madison Planning and Zoning Regulations definitions of outpatient clinic, medical, non life threatening models having limited facilities and personnel, wherein such facility may be open 24 hours a day, and a medical office, wherein patients are treated by appointment, under which the application fits. Dr. Hinkley stated that the bulk of the hours of operation are Monday through Thursday, in the morning before lunch,

however there are clients who work during the day and will have appointments after work, some at 7 p.m. Chairman Ronald Clark asked Attorney Steven Rickman to speak, but Mr. Rickman stated that he had no questions for the applicant, only comments, so Chairman Clark stated that he could address those comments following questions from the public. In response to questions from the public to the applicant, were the following answers from Dr. Hinkley: Both buildings at the site will be used for therapy; doctors and surgeons are clients, who are among those seeking professional therapeutic care, attracted to the site for the quiet and privacy that it offers; a 10 p.m. closing time was a misunderstanding—that time was recorded, in case the cleaning crew was in the building at that hour, but office hours for clients would not go beyond 8:30 p.m. or 9 p.m.; the outdoors would not be used for any activities, with the exception of staff possibly taking a lunch break between the buildings; the impact of the sound levels to the neighbors would be much less than a school building; there are no specific plans for weekend use; the vast majority of clients are alcoholics, and many of these alcoholics that he treats come from neighborhoods similar to those near the site of proposed service; and loitering and smoking in the back of the building at the rear of the site would not be allowed, but there probably would be a designated area for smoking, possibly in the front, in the driveway, though the practice does encourage the cessation of smoking. Regarding such concerns as the hours of operation, the Planning and Zoning Commission, when deciding on a special exception permit application, does have the ability to put conditions on the application. Chairman Clark stated that it is obvious to him that the commission is not going to get through this public hearing, tonight; there is a second application that must be heard in public hearing, and he asked that the commission decide to table the Old Toll Road application, when it is 8:45 p.m. In response to further questions, Dr. Hinkley stated the following: the fact that he is not involved with the treatment of methadone indicates that he would be prevented from expanding the scope of the facility, since being involved in that treatment is a procedure that requires a medical license; the lit sign on the site would turn off at 10 p.m., and he has no plans to add any additional exterior lighting; cars will not be allowed to be parked on the site overnight, and if any cars remain, notification would be made to have them removed. Attorney Steven C. Rickman spoke about the Certificate of Need (COM) that had been applied for, under the COVID-19 waiver, and he stated that the relevant Madison Planning and Zoning Regulations that it falls under is Section 5.4(g), a private hospital, sanatorium, or clinic, adding that he is just shocked at the difference between what is represented in the Planning and Zoning Commission application and what is in the state licensure application. This is a substance abuse center that runs afoul of the subsection, Mr. Rickman stated, adding that the attorneys represent 23 of the homes—literally the entire subdivision of this clinic is opposed to it. Across the street it is a rural shopping district; it is zoned for that, Mr. Rickman stated. This is not; this is a rural residential neighborhood, he stated. This is just totally inappropriate; he's got at least two facilities in this town, already, Mr. Rickman stated. He doesn't need to be here, nor is this the place for him to be, according to Mr. Rickman. The idea that there is a cloak and dagger thing going on—it just does not exist, Dr. Hinkley stated. Mr. Anderson stated that the public hearing could be continued in two weeks, to the June 4, 2020 planning meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**Commissioner John Mathers made the motion to continue the public hearing to the next planning meeting of June 4, 2020; it was seconded by Commissioner Ron Bodinson and unanimously approved.**

Vote to continue the public hearing to June 4, 2020 passed, 9-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Clark, Vice Chairman Matteson, Secretary Elliott Hitchcock, and Commissioners Mathers, Miller, Thomas Burland, Joseph Bunovsky, Jr., Giselle McDowall and  
*Page 4. Madison Planning and Zoning Commission, Regular Meeting, May 21, 2020*

Bodinson.  
OPPOSED: None.  
ABSTAINED: None.

**20-05+CSP. 908 & 916 Boston Post Road.** Map 39, Lots 3 & 4. R-2 District.  
Owner/Applicant: The General's Residence at Madison, LLC. Special Exception Permit Modification, Coastal Site Plan and Application for Deposit of Material to modify a previously approved, nine (9) unit small cluster housing development pursuant to Section 3.12 of the Town of Madison Zoning Regulations.

Director of Planning and Economic Development David Anderson stated that there was a peak of 104 attendees at the first public hearing, and there are 74 attendees, at the moment. Chairman Ronald Clark reviewed the procedures to follow in the public hearing and stated that he is seating Alternate Commissioner Peter Roos for absent Commissioner Brian Richardson.

Mr. Anderson stated that this special exception permit modification is for a small cluster housing development, which is allowed 500 feet from residential property, and the modification is for an application previously approved in May 2019 by the Planning and Zoning Commission. Attorney Marjorie Shansky, representing the applicant, stated that approval is being sought for the special exception permit modification, coastal site plan, and application for deposit of material; present on behalf of The General's Residence at Madison, LLC, are Commercial Residential Developer Salvatore Marottoli, Principals Timothy Herbst and Adam Greenberg, Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor Thomas A. Stevens, Landscape Architect John Cunningham, and Architect Duo Dickinson. The Advisory Committee on Community Appearance (ACCA) voted to recommend the design of this proposed development to the Planning in Zoning Commission, according to Ms. Shansky. She referenced a May 19, 2020 letter she sent to the Planning and Zoning Commission, which has been entered into the record. In the letter, it states that members of the development team have submitted revised plans, revised landscape plans and elevations and other reporting, in anticipation of the public hearing, and as a result of meetings with members of the neighborhood and other stakeholders. Appended to the May 19, 2020 letter are the following materials: restated use statement; letter from John Cunningham, TEC Landscape Design, describing buffer planting and invasive species control; letter regarding onsite investigation from David Lord, certified soil scientist and environmental consultant, dated July 6, 2019; letter regarding soil investigation from Robert C. Russo, C.S.S., dated May 6, 2020; letter from state Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), Natural Diversity Data Base Determination Letter 201906200, dated May 22, 2019 anticipating no negative impacts to state-listed species in connection with development at the subject property; and structural conditions report from Michael Horton Associates, Inc., dated May 19, 2020. The letter states that, "The Applicant has demonstrated its eligibility to receive approval of its requests," elaborates as to the reasons, and provides that the Planning and Zoning Commission may make several findings to do so, including that the application meets the requirements of the Madison Planning and Zoning Regulations. In addition to that letter, also entered into the public record is a letter from the town building official, dated May 11, 2020, wherein the General's Residence is given an unsafe notice. There is high community interest in this development, and both the Madison Historical Society and the Madison Historic District have provided letters, Ms. Shansky stated. Mr. Marottoli stated that the application consists of modifications of a previously approved project; several Madison residents expressed an interest in the housing but had concerns related to the safety and convenience of detached garages and a

desire for first floor bedrooms. Plans are to recreate the General's Residence and build a historically accurate code compliant house, according to Mr. Marottoli. Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor Thomas A. Stevens presented the plans, stating that the General's Residence will have two units, and there will be eight buildings; the site consists of 26,533 square feet and a 12.36 percent building coverage, 18 spaces for parking, three curb cuts with two to serve Boston Post Road and one for East Wharf Road; all the units will have basements, but three will have walk-outs. A total of 2,500 cubic yards of material will be deposited by 156 truckloads, which is 16 days of truck loads, with the hauling hours being between 7 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Saturday, according to Mr. Stevens. There will be storm water management and a viewing area with two benches for the public, he stated. Architect Duo Dickinson stated that the General's Residence is not protected by the Madison Historic District, nor does it have a national historic designation; photographs have been taken inside the structure, some of which Mr. Dickinson presented, along with drawings of the development, a photograph of the model, and streetscape views. Any building can be saved, no doubt about it, Mr. Dickinson stated, but plans are to take the porches and the doors, remove them, and install them on the recreated General's Residence. He compared the concept to Colonial Williamsburg, wherein the building's essence is preserved in its new construction, thus preserving its history. The alternative would be to tear down the General's Residence and build two new houses on this site, Mr. Dickinson stated. Plans are to rebuild the General's Residence completely and maintain that private park in the center, to provide a community space; an existing stone wall will be repaired and essentially made whole, and the units will have the commonality of a village, with each unit having its own space, according to Mr. Dickinson. Every specific aspect of the General's Residence will be as exact as it is today, and the porches will be retained, as well, according to Mr. Dickinson. All of these homes are 2,250 square feet and less, and efforts were made to fit the patterning of the existing neighborhood, with each building being a story and a half in height, according to Mr. Dickinson. The development meets Planning and Zoning Regulations, he stated. There were meetings with over 20 neighbors, direct neighbors, Zoom meetings, and personal meetings, as well as meetings with the Madison Historical Society, the Madison Historic District Commission, ACCA, the Planning and Zoning Commission, and Preservation Connecticut, according to Mr. Dickinson. With ACCA's approval, the units can be modified, for instance, if someone wanted less windows, according to Mr. Dickinson. John Cunningham of TEC Landscape Design stated that, over all, the plan has not really changed; they will try to keep as many trees as they can, and they will plant new shade trees, as well as ornamental trees. Invasive material in the buffer area will be removed and replaced with new plantings—the root mass of the invasive material will also be removed, according to Mr. Cunningham. Plans will continue to be reviewed by ACCA, until final decisions are made. Vice Chairman James Matteson asked if the phragmites will be removed, and Mr. Cunningham stated that they will not be removed, because someone with a license has to do that removal. Since that type of removal is ongoing, phragmite removal is usually left up to the association, according to Mr. Marottoli. Trash will be in rollout containers, moved to the driveway for pick up, and then returned to an area behind fencing, according to Mr. Cunningham. Commissioner Peter Roos asked in terms of replicating or restoring the General's Residence, how long would it take to restore it, and Mr. Dickinson stated it could take 10 months to two years to restore it, about twice as long as replicating through new construction. Commissioner Giselle McDowall asked about the percent of the General's Residence that would be used again, but Mr. Dickinson stated that a percent cannot be placed on it—the entry, the porches, two doors, four corner cabinets, and 10 interior doors are among the items that may be reused in the replicated General's Residence. Chairman Clark opened the hearing to questions from the public. The applicants provided the following answers to public questions: stone walls in the front and in the back, as well as the side step, will be kept in place; a cross walk from the

development across East Wharf Road was requested; the developers are willing to cooperate with the Madison Historical Society and the Madison Historical District Commission, but they do not want to over commit with all of these agencies; the General's Residence is not in the Madison Historic District, but the two historical agencies have the developer's commitment to keep this line of communication open; how much it would cost to restore the old General's Residence is unknown, but in retail it is twice as much—if it costs \$300 per square foot, it would be twice that, at \$600 a square foot; it is possible to absolutely save that building, but it would cost too much, and it would not be financially feasible, nor is the General's Residence a protected building—some things cannot be saved, they can only be venerated and reproduced. Chairman Clark asked if the applicants had any further comments that they wanted to state, but they had none. Chairman Clark asked if anyone wanted to speak in favor of the application. Robin Phillips of 880 Boston Post Road, stated that there are 11 neighbors along Boston Post Road and East Wharf Road who do not believe that this development is necessary, however, there are five concerns they raised to the developers, and the developers agreed to the suggestions offered by the neighbors, therefore, they support the application. Chairman Clark asked if some of those neighbors are abutters to this property, and Mr. Phillips stated that they are, indeed. Matthew Bennett of 917 Boston Post Road stated that he is among six neighbors who affirm their support for the project, because it will significantly improve the property, and it is fortunate to have the developers' commitment, along with the talent they have brought forth in the form of the engineer and landscaper. While they would love to see the General's Residence preserved in its present form, that is not possible, Mr. Phillips stated. Justin Murphy wrote a comment in support of the application, Mr. Anderson stated. Chairman Clark asked whether anyone want to speak in opposition to the application. Executive Director Jane Montanaro of Preservation Connecticut stated that the property is listed on the state register, but it is not protected, a replica is not a best solution, and making salvage and moving it off site is absolutely a last choice, however the organization would like to have the opportunity to be a part of a conversation for restoration. The building, itself, as a whole, cannot be saved, Mr. Dickinson stated, but parts of the building can be saved, adding that he really appreciates her offer. In terms of restoration, Mr. Marottoli stated that a thorough, five page report was done as to the viability of the General's Residence, and it was concluded that it would be ill advised to put workers inside the building, between the cost and the liability. That report, dated May 19, is a part of the record, according to Ms. Shansky. Kevin Johnson asked where can the pictures be seen that show that the house is in failure. Chairman Clark stated that Mr. Johnson is in opposition, obviously, but the Planning and Zoning Commission has to rely on engineers' analyses, of which there are several, and judging by what he has seen, he would not want to be in the General's Residence with a camera. In closing comments, Ms. Shansky stated that the application meets the town's Planning and Zoning Regulations, and it is beautiful.

**Commissioner Roos made the motion to close the public hearing; it was seconded by Vice Chairman Matteson and unanimously approved.**

Vote to close the public hearing passed, 9-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Clark, Vice Chairman Matteson, Secretary Hitchcock, and Commissioners Mathers, Miller, Burland, Bunovsky, Mcdowall and Roos.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

The Planning and Zoning Commission entered deliberations. Vice Chairman Matteson stated that the commissioners have been a part of the discussion on this property over the past three  
*Page 7. Madison Planning and Zoning Commission, Regular Meeting, May 21, 2020*

years, and he would, personally, love to see the General's Residence restored, but if it were restored, it would have to be a two-family, which is not restoring it to the original. He stated that he is prepared to vote in favor of the application. Commissioner Roos stated that he moved to Madison five years ago this weekend, and the General's Residence is in such a state of disrepair; it will just have to be replicated. Commissioner Mathers stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission has been talking about this house for years; it was on the blighted properties list, and the last two applications the commission has seen have said it is not feasible to restore it. The purview of the Planning and Zoning Commission is to decide whether the application meets zoning regulations, and not to decide historical aspects, according to Commissioner Mathers, who added that he is in favor of support. Commissioner Bunovsky stated that he, too, wondered why the commissioners discussed for so long something that is not in their purview, being the history, rather than the merits of the application. Secretary Hitchcock spoke in favor of the willingness of the developers to work with the abutting property owners, and he stated that he is in favor of the application. Commissioner Mcdowall stated that it was a great presentation, and she agrees with statements made by Commissioners Mathers and Bunovsky. It was great to hear from the neighbors, she stated. In the future, the Planning and Zoning Commission expects to see some great work, and with Duo Dickinson, the commission has a great commitment, so Commissioner Mcdowall stated that she will vote in favor of the application. Commissioner Burland stated that Commissioner Mathers captured his thoughts, exactly; the application meets all of the criteria of Madison's Planning and Zoning Regulations, so he is in support of it. Commissioner Miller stated that like a lot of people, he wants to see this structure preserved, but it has been found by the structural engineer that, in its present state, the house would be considered to be unsafe, though it is not overly conclusive, and it does not make a foregone conclusion that the building is unsaveable, adding that he is not thoroughly convinced that this building could not be saved. Commissioner Miller stated that he moved to this town 35 years ago. This is a modification to a special exception to an already approved project, and that one did not propose demolition, Commissioner Miller stated. He does think that this building could be saved, so he is not in support of the demolition aspect of the application, Commissioner Miller stated. Chairman Clark stated to Commissioner Mathers that it does not fall into the commission's purview, but it is important to find out what the options are, adding that if plans for the property crash, it would be worse to be presented with the fate of someone taking out a building permit to build two houses on that site. Mr. Anderson presented the conditions to the application, which are a part of the record, and stated that specific wording could be discussed, though the ones being presented capture the concept of approval. He also stated that he is not comfortable with any deviation in the design of the project. Chairman Clark stated that there can be no changes to materials or construction, adding that he would hate to see aluminum siding used in that development. Mr. Anderson stated that he included strict adherence to whatever designs come up; maybe it can say no deviation from the final plans shall be permitted without further review from ACCA, which was further edited to read, "No deviations from the final elevation and materials shall be permitted without further review from ACCA."

**Secretary Hitchcock made the motion to accept Special Exception Permit Modification, with the conditions listed by Director of Planning and Economic Development David Anderson; it was seconded by Commissioner Roos and unanimously approved.**

Vote to approve the Special Exception Permit modification, with conditions, passed, 8-1-0.  
IN FAVOR: Chairman Clark, Vice Chairman Matteson, Secretary Hitchcock, and Commissioners Mathers, Burland, Bunovsky, Mcdowall and Roos.

OPPOSED: Commissioner Miller.

ABSTAINED: None.

**Commissioner Burland made the motion to accept the Coastal Site Plan, finding it meets the goals and policies of the Coastal Management Act; it was seconded by Commissioner Roos and unanimously approved.**

Vote to approve the Coastal Site Plan passed, 9-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Clark, Vice Chairman Matteson, Secretary Hitchcock, and Commissioners Mathers, Miller, Burland, Bunovsky, Mcdowall and Roos.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

**Vice Chairman Matteson made the motion to approve the Application for Deposit of Material; it was seconded by Commissioner Mathers, and unanimously approved.**

Vote to approve the Application for Deposit of Material passed, 9-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Clark, Vice Chairman Matteson, Secretary Hitchcock, and Commissioners Mathers, Miller, Burland, Bunovsky, Mcdowall and Roos.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Chairman Clark suspended the next two items on the agenda.

**Approval of Minutes:** Planning Meeting, May 7, 2020 ~ Suspended item.

**Remarks: Commission Chair** ~ Suspended item.

**Town Planner** ~ Item suspended.

## **Adjournment**

**Commissioner Mathers made the motion to adjourn at 11:30 p.m.; it was seconded by Commissioner Roos and unanimously approved.**

Vote to adjourn at 11:30 p.m. passed, 9-0-0.

IN FAVOR: Chairman Clark, Vice Chairman Matteson, Secretary Hitchcock, and Commissioners Mathers, Miller, Burland, Bunovsky, Mcdowall, and Roos.

OPPOSED: None.

ABSTAINED: None.

Respectfully submitted,  
Marlene H. Kennedy, clerk