

CITY OF NORWALK
PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MINUTES
April 17, 2024

PRESENT: Louis Schulman, Chair; Ana Tabachneck; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Galen Wells; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams (left the meeting at 8 pm)

STAFF: Steve Kleppin; Michelle Andrzejewski

OTHERS: Vanessa Valadares; Atty Liz Suchy; Dean Martin; Jim Travers; Matt Popp; Matt Popp; Tim Currie; Colin Grotheer; Colin Grotheer; Michael Devonshire; Len D'Andrea; Nick Havan; Tom Rich; Frank Fish; Atty Adam Blank; Wes Haynes; David Goslin; Tod Bryant; Lisa Britain; Dana Laird; Kristen Sokich; Todd Lindvall

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Schulman called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m. It should be noted that this meeting was held on Zoom.com with participants calling in, separately.

II. ROLL CALL & SEATING OF MEMBERS

Mr. Kleppin called the roll. Mr. Schulman seated Ms. Tabachneck for the entire meeting.

III. PRELIMINARY REVIEW & ACTION ON APPLICATIONS

a. #2024-29 8-24 Referral – Department of Public Works – Conveyance of a +/- 72sf temporary construction easement for the purposes of installing a temporary guy anchor in Veteran's Park – Report & recommended action.

Vanessa Valadares, the chief of operations for the Department of Public Works, began the presentation by explaining the reason for the 8-24 request for a construction easement for the Walk Bridge project. She showed them the site plan so they could see where the easement would be. It is a temporary easement which will be there for a few years. Once the pole is relocated, the easement will be removed.

**** MR. ROINA MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2024-29 8-24 Referral – Department of Public Works – Conveyance of a +/- 72sf temporary

construction easement for the purposes of installing a temporary guy anchor in Veteran's Park be **APPROVED**.

Mr. Williams seconded.

Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Galen Wells; Richard Roina; Darius Williams; Tammy Langalis approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

b. #2024-18 SPR/MV – TMC Properties Ltd. LLC – 599 West Avenue & 5 Merwin Street (District 1, Block 24, Lot 1 & 1B) – Change in ownership for motor vehicle license – Report & recommended action.

Mr. Schulman introduced the application. Atty Liz Suchy began the presentation by explaining that the application was a change in ownership in motor vehicle licensing. An application had also been filed with the state of Connecticut which required an approval by the Planning & Zoning Commission. She then noted the location of the property, as well as the process that the application had been through thus far. She noted the current conditions on the property which included two structures and parking on the site. Currie's Tires for Less had existed for nearly 100 years. There would be no change in the number of employees or hours of operation. There was a curb cut that the applicant would like to see re-installed on Merwin Street. The permit request had not been granted. Atty Suchy noted that two parking spaces would be impacted.

Dean Martin, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation with a discussion of the site plan.

There was a discussion about why the curb cut should be re-installed. Currently the area seemed to be used for storage. Mr. Martin said the materials would be removed and moved to a different location. Atty Suchy said that the curb cut would provide another means of egress. They had a site plan with the curb cut on it which included landscaping. It would help with the traffic flow in the area.

There was then a discussion as to why the curb cut was closed and why Transit, Mobility and Parking (TMP) is not allowing it to be re-installed. Atty Suchy said that it had been closed in 2018. She believed that it had been closed to allow for two more parking spaces in this neighborhood. It was noted that these are two paid parking spaces that the city would lose if the curb cut is re-installed. There was a discussion about adding the curb cut to another part of the street. Atty Suchy noted that there is paid parking along that side of the street.

There was a discussion about the company becoming a towing business. There was also a discussion as to whether there would be auto body repairs on the site. The applicant replied that there would not be auto body work.

Jim Travers, Director of TMP, continued the presentation, acknowledging that they are income generating spaces for the city as well as assisting with economic development in the area. He noted that pedestrian movement is hampered when there are too many curb cuts.

There was then a discussion about the site becoming a cut through which Mr. Travers did acknowledge was a concern. There was also a discussion about removing a different curb cut and then reinstalling the one requested by the applicant.

Matt Popp, the landscape architect, continued the presentation by showing the commissioners the landscape plan and describing the various plantings which they were proposing to use.

Tim Currie noted that they had considered an electronic gate on the driveway so that drivers cannot circumvent the signal light. He also noted that the business has been in the neighborhood for 95 years and that they had the curb cut for many of those years.

Ms. Langalis made some suggestions about landscaping and curb cuts, similar to the nearby European Auto Center. Mr. Schulman noted that the materials that are on the site currently would be removed. Atty Suchy said that the applicant would be open to Ms. Langalis' suggestions. There was a discussion as to why the curb cut was removed. Mr. Travers said that he was not with TMP at the time so he did not know. Ms. Langalis inferred that it had to do with the development of Waypoint. Mr. Travers believed that the parking lot was further down on the street. Mr. Schulman noted that the closing of the curb cut does not appear to have harmed their business.

At this point, Mr. Currie gave a brief explanation of why the curb cut was closed. He noted the city wanted part of the property for a sidewalk but that did not happen. He also said that they never received paperwork or compensation for it.

There was a discussion about whether the commission could override a recommendation of TMP. Mr. Kleppin said that it might not be something the commission could do. Atty Suchy noted that this is a site plan review and was asking for the curb cut to be re-installed. She also said that the applicant was willing to compromise, make changes to the curb cuts on West Avenue to having the curb cut re-

installed on Merwin Street. She believed that if they received the blessing of the commission, the Department of Public Works would re-issue the permit for the curb cut.

At this point, the commissioners reviewed the staff's draft resolution. There was a change to several of the conditions about the curb cut on Merwin Street.

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED: THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that application #2024 – 18 SPR MV – TMC Properties Ltd., LLC – 599 West Avenue & 5 Merwin Street – Change in ownership for motor vehicle license be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:

1. That the building and site will be developed in accordance with the following plans:
 - a. Per Zoning Location Survey dated 1/16/2024 revised thru 4/4/2024 prepared by Grumman Engineering LLC and as revised by City Staff comments; and
 - b. Per planting plan dated 1/25/2024 revised thru 4/5/2024 prepared by Environmental Land Solutions and revised by City Staff comments; and
2. That all department sign-offs are obtained prior to issuance of any zoning permits; and
3. That the applicant obtains a zoning permit prior to occupancy; and
4. That any modifications to the approved plan be reviewed and approved by City Staff prior to implementing; and
5. That any and all conditions from WPCA are applied to this approval; and
6. That any and all conditions from DPW are applied to this approval; and
7. That any and all conditions from TMP are applied to this approval; and
8. That all motor vehicle repairs be conducted within the building; and
9. That the applicant maintains the landscaping and striping in accordance with the staff approved plan; and
10. That there be no outdoor storage of parts or auto carcasses; and
11. That there shall be no on-street parking of repaired vehicles or vehicles pending repair; and
12. That there shall be parking only in the designated parking spaces; and

13. Should any building façade material become damaged or deteriorated, the applicant and future owners shall repair the damage or deterioration within thirty (30) days' notice from the City; and

14. That all signage, existing, and proposed, be in compliance with the zoning regulations; and

15. That the applicant's lighting be fully shielded from neighboring property; and

16. That the applicant collaborate with the staff and TMP to narrow the existing curb cuts on West Avenue with a planting island; and

17. That the applicant collaborate with the staff and TMP with the curb cut on Merwin Street; and

18. That the applicant install rooftop solar panels on the entire building to the greatest extent possible and solar covered parking to the greatest extent possible. If solar cannot be installed the applicant shall provide Planning and Zoning Commission Staff with a feasibility report, indicating why solar panels could not be installed, prior to obtaining COZC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this proposal complies with all applicable sections of the Building Zone Regulations for the City of Norwalk; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the effective date of this approval shall be April 26th, 2024.

You must obtain a zoning approval and a building permit prior to occupancy of the site. A building permit must be obtained within one year of the effective date or this Special Permit approval automatically becomes null and void.

Ms. Jordan-Byron seconded.

Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron; Galen Wells; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis; Darius Williams approved.

No one opposed.

No one abstained.

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

a. #2024-11 SP/CAM – TR Sono Partners LLC – 25 & 31-35 South Main Street (District 2, Block 45, Lots 12 & 13) – Proposed construction of new extended stay hotel with 100 rooms (eight stories, 85 feet +/- in height, building footprint of +/- 12,000 square feet)

Planning & Zoning Commission - Minutes

April 17, 2024

Page 5 of 14

Mr. Schulman opened the public hearing, explaining how it would work and how the public could comment. However, he also explained that he would allow Atty Adam Blank to speak first during the public comment time, since Atty Blank had filed a Notice of Intervention on this matter. He asked the public to keep their comments brief and not repeat what others had said.

Atty Suchy began the presentation with an introduction of the project team. She then advised that the certified, return receipt cards, evidencing notice of the public hearing to the neighbors was delivered to the Planning and Zoning Department. She gave a brief description of the property. She also noted that a previous approval had been granted in 2023 on this property for an addition. She said that the owner had been aware of every step of the process. However, a deal with the Residence Inn never materialized and the current proposal is to demolish the structure at 31-15 South Main Street, along with 25 South Main Street to construct a new hotel, unrelated to the Residence Inn. She described this new hotel in detail to the commission, including the number of rooms, rooftop bar, solar panels, guest parking spaces and valet parking. The applicant requested a waiver of some parking spaces. She described the parking loop and entrance. She said that there would be less cars on South Main Street. She explained that under the new zoning regulations, the number of floors would be reduced, making it economically infeasible to build. She explained the economic benefits to South Norwalk with this new hotel, including hotel taxes to be received by the city as well as hotel jobs. She then discussed the sign-offs that the applicant had received as well as comments from TMP and other city departments.

Colin Grotheer, the architect on the project, continued the presentation by showing the site plans to the commission. He started with orienting the commissioners as to the location of the property including the Residence Inn. He showed them the exterior renderings, noting the materials to be used and how it would complement the nearby buildings. He also showed them different views of the exterior. He discussed the rear of the building and how they would engage the train passengers. He then discussed the number of rooms, amenity space, lobby, the outdoor pool, etc. He showed them the proposed curb cuts on South Main Street. He also showed them the detailed plans for each floor as well as the exterior elevations. He then discussed the valet parking floors.

Michael Devonshire, the historical consultant, continued the presentation. He discussed his report, by noting that one of the buildings had not been maintained since approximately the 1980s. This has caused deterioration to the front facade. He discussed his analysis with a structural engineer which indicated that much of the brick would be destroyed when they tried to remove it. He said they also discussed whether a part of the building could be re-used on a new building. Restoring the building could

lead to its destruction. For the second building, there had been maintenance done to it. He discussed that a new stucco system had been applied to the original. The windows had been replaced and are now rotting. He said that he had compared pictures of the original building to what was there today. He did say that one part of the building, the sheet metal cornice, could be reused.

There was a discussion about the intervenor's position in this application. Mr. Devonshire explained what he was requested to review. He was asked about what was original and what was worthy to keep. He noted that the only thing that was original to the building was the massing. He then gave a description of his background and expertise. The architectural firm that he works for specializes in historical buildings.

Len D'Andrea, the engineer on the project, continued the presentation by noting that the current two lots would be consolidated to one lot, if the application were to be approved. He also noted the impervious surfaces. He also showed them the current driveway. He then discussed the proposed drainage system, as well as discussing the new sidewalks, and utilities. He noted that there would not be a loss of parking in front of the building since there is none. There are good sight lines. He said that they had received comments from the city which they had addressed, along with revised plans. There was a discussion about the solar panels on the roof.

Nick Havan, the traffic engineer for the project, continued the presentation by discussing how the traffic impact study was conducted. He also discussed the number of trips to be generated and levels of service. He also discussed ingress and egress from the site. With the valet parking, the site will be safer for pedestrians and vehicles.

Tom Rich, the developer, continued the presentation by noting that his company had developed the Residence Inn. The buildings that were on the site were part of the same district that these buildings are. Despite others thinking it was a risky move putting a hotel in the area, it had done well. He also mentioned that they had sold it to the group that was now opposing this application. He said that they had to get the plans approved to demolish the building and have the buildings connected. However, the applicant is no longer in a position to develop the hotel. He also said they will be getting a demolition permit for 35 South Main Street. He said that this is about a hotel owner who does not want competition. He also said that Mr. Devonshire had explained that the buildings are not worth saving. He said that there were more benefits to constructing a hotel than saving the buildings. He also mentioned that they had received many letters of support. He also discussed the single entrance on the north side of the project which would use valets and a car elevator. Although the entrance is similar to the Residence Inn, it is awkward. He believed this system was an improvement on that one.

Frank Fish, the peer review consultant, continued the presentation by noting that they had provided a report to the commission. There had also been a meeting with the Redevelopment Agency and TMP the previous day. Based on that meeting, they had provided an updated memo to the commission. He noted that the building should have one entrance and exit at the north side, based on the design guidelines which stated that curb cuts should be limited. He believed the two way valet system could work well. He also discussed widening the entrance for garbage trucks, as well as how the entrance would work for Ubers and taxis. He also had comments on the horizontal design of the building, the windows on the second floor and the revolving door. He noted that a second pedestrian egress could be added to the southern portion of the building. He said that there should be a partition wall or fence between the proposed hotel and the current one. He also noted that the fiber cement panels are not a good choice and that there is a better choice for materials. He said that they did not think a southern garage opening was necessary.

There was a discussion about the use of the cornice from the current building which Mr. Fish said it might be possible on the southern portion of the proposed building. There was a discussion about whether vehicles would need to back up to leave the property. He noted that this was a low volume hotel so there would not be a lot of vehicles arriving at the same time.

At this point, Mr. Schulman said that they would open the meeting to the public for comments. As a reminder to everyone, Mr. Schulman said that Atty Adam Blank would speak first. Mr. Kleppin explained how it worked for those that were dialed into the meeting as well as anyone watching virtually.

Atty Adam Blank, attorney for the Residence Inn, began his presentation by noting that there would be a lengthy presentation by himself and his team. He said that this project would negatively financially impact the Residence Inn. He then began his presentation by briefly explaining why the project does not comply with Norwalk's regulations which he would go into greater detail. He then introduced the project team.

The first item Atty Blank discussed were the traffic counts which he claimed were dated because they were done during COVID and were done on a Friday. He explained that according to the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), they should not be done on Friday. The city's peer review consultant requested that they be done on a Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday. He also discussed where traffic would be coming from as well as the failure to consider future developments in the area. He reviewed the applicant's plan which showed poor sight lines as vehicles exited from the building. He believed that the applicant would have vendors, FedEx, etc. park in front of

the Residence Inn. He also discussed TMP's and DPW's comments on this application. He discussed the violation of the ADA parking spaces which he said required four spaces, but the applicant was providing two. He noted that there was no queuing study to show how the valet would work on a peak Saturday morning hour. He also noted that they had not shown why they need a waiver of the parking requirements. He also believed that the applicant would request elevators for the parking on this application and then return to the commission for a modification of the plan for no elevators because it is cost prohibitive.

Atty Blank continued by noting that they had applied under the old special permit regulations but that the application failed to meet the criteria, including meeting the purpose and intent of the design district guidelines, as well as stable traffic flow. He then discussed the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) and how it relates to the historic preservation of South Norwalk.

The next item that Atty Blank discussed was the intervention notice which allowed them to intervene for historic preservation. He said that they would have to demonstrate that the applicant's conduct would destroy the public's trust in historic landmarks. This has been done because the applicant planned to demolish the buildings. He also noted that there are economically viable uses for the two buildings. He noted that there is a letter from Preservation Connecticut opposing the demolition of the buildings. He believed this was an historic district and that the buildings should be preserved, otherwise, it could be the end of the district.

At 8:57 pm, the commissioners took a break until 9:10 pm.

Wes Haynes, an historic preservation professional, continued the presentation with a brief description of his 45 year long career in historic preservation. He then clarified what the National Register District is. He noted that these two buildings are contributing to the district. He then gave a brief history of the two buildings. He then discussed Mr. Devonshire's report. He said that removing the buildings should not be done lightly.

David Goslin, the architect for the intervenor, continued the presentation with a description of his career in adaptive re-use and historic preservation. He then spoke about the adaptive re-use possibilities for these two buildings. Although the upper floors of these buildings had been used as offices, with the downturn in the office space market, he suggested that they could be used for apartments. He noted that he had been in 31 South Main Street and it seemed to be in good condition. During his career, he had been involved with restorations of buildings in worse condition. The buildings are eligible for state and Federal tax credits.

Tod Bryant continued the presentation with a brief description of his career, including rewards that he had received. He said that he would explain how to pay for the restoration. He said that there were four grants available, two of which are in Norwalk, one being from the Economic and Community Development and the other from the Redevelopment Agency. Another one was available from the state and the fourth would be from a Federal agency.

Atty Blank concluded the intervenor's presentation by noting that if there are significant changes to the applicant's plans they would like to review them, as well as the public.

Atty Suchy reminded the commission that Atty Blank and the other speakers were at the meeting as members of the public and could not be advising them about making their decision.

Ms. Andrzejewski then advised the public about how they could comment on this application. However, Mr. Kleppin noted that Jim Travers, Director of TMP, was on the call and asked whether he would like to make comments to the commission.

Mr. Travers discussed the traffic and operational issues that they had asked for clarification from the applicant. One issue was the dual driveways which could cause safety concerns for pedestrians. He said that there should be a marked crosswalk on the southside of the development. There have been accidents with pedestrians in this area. He said that they are not prioritizing the operations of the hotel, but rather, prioritizing the pedestrians. They are also focusing on Complete Streets plans as well as a Vision Zero Plan. He said they still need some data to avoid queuing issues.

Ms. Andrzejewski once again advised the public about how they could comment on this application.

Lisa Britain, 19 Shorefront Park, said she liked the design of this hotel. She did not think the traffic was bad in this area, but rather, on Water Street which she traveled on several times a day. She believed that the Residence Inn did not want competition, but thought it would be a good thing to bring more hotel guests to the area.

Dana Laird, 214 Highland Avenue, said she was not happy that historic districts are going away.

There was one member of the public who could not access the meeting. It was suggested that he submit his comments through email.

Atty Suchy then began her rebuttal by noting that there were over 50 letters of support for the application, three of which she read into the record.

Len D'Andrea continued the presentation with a discussion of the sight lines, looking north under the railroad bridge, as well as looking south and the project met the sight line requirements.

Nick Havan, the traffic engineer for the project, noted that the traffic counts were done in September of 2022 and not dated as Atty Blank had mentioned. He also said that traffic counts are valid for up to 3 years. He also said that ITE required that traffic counts be taken during the week. He also noted that most people check into a hotel on a Friday. He also said that many clients will be coming from the train station or will be taking an Uber. He did not think that the future developments in the area would impact this project. He also spoke about the COVID traffic counts. He discussed the width of the driveways, as well as the valet system and drop-off zone.

Colin Grotheer, the architect on the project, believed that they had defined the building with a bottom, middle and top section. The third facade was to blend with the other hotel building and are using new materials, like the fiber cement, that are being used in other developments. He described the horizontal and vertical features on the facade.

Michael Devonshire continued with a discussion of the lintels by explaining that they would have to be replaced or repaired. He said the bricks would be destroyed. He also explained that the Ulman building had not been properly maintained.

Kristen Sokich, Pro Park Mobility, continued with a discussion of the parking system to be implemented at the hotel. He explained that since this is a hotel, they would know when people are coming and going because they would work with management to receive that information. Retrieval times for vehicles would be quick. He thought the parking lot planned made sense.

Todd Lindvall, regional manager of the Marriott Stamford and the Residence Inn, continued the presentation by discussing the utilization rates of the parking garages at these hotels. He also noted that at the Stamford hotel there isn't a second exit so they attempted to purchase the property next door to add one. He also said that he disagreed with most of Frank Fish's comments about hotel operations and stressed the importance of a second exit on this property to eliminate traffic and everyone's safety.

Tom Rich asked to address the commissioners one more time. He reminded them that the first thing Atty Blank said was that the intervenor does not want competition. He said he had been a steward for historic preservation on Washington Street for 16 years. He said he would not come back later to ask for a modification on the elevators. He said that the Residence Inn is a fully operational valet garage. He said that they were able to put in ramps because the site was larger. He also said that they need to add commercial development so people would come to the area.

Atty Suchy addressed some of the public's comments and then the intervenor's petition in her rebuttal. She began by addressing the comments in the memos of the city's consultant, including one received earlier that day. She said she had submitted a response to it which should be in the file. She also discussed the design guidelines which she said made suggestions as to how the design could look. She spoke about the fact that there is only one way in and out, so that there could be problems.

Atty Suchy also noted that Atty Blank had said that the intervenor does not want competition which should not be a reason for the commission to approve or deny the application. She said that Atty Blank's discussion of a peer review was irrelevant since it was from another property. She noted that the loading space is available to any business on that street, not just the Residence Inn. She also asked that the commissioners only rely on information provided in the intervenor's traffic report and not Atty Blank, since he is not an expert. She noted that a waiver for parking had been provided. Any discussion about the historic preservation of 31-35 South Main Street should be moot since it was closed last year. She reminded them that they are mandated to follow the zoning regulations, not the POCD. She also said that last year the intervenor had supported this application and now only wants to stop the competition from another hotel. She discussed the additional curb cut that they are requesting and suggested that it should not be problematic.

At this point, Atty Suchy continued by discussing the petition of intervention. She explained that the intervenor, with the help of the developer on this project, received an approval to expand the Residence Inn last year, and was aware that 31-35 South Main Street would be demolished to accomplish it. She also explained that since the deal had fallen through, the intervenor seemed to care about historic preservation. She then stated why the proposal would not adversely affect the public trust. She noted that the approval for the demolition permit is still valid. She said that the state historical preservation office closed its investigation so they could move forward with the demolition permit. She noted that the buildings met all zoning requirements and there are no zoning violations on the property.

There was a discussion about the ADA number of parking spaces, as well as whether the cornice could be integrated into the architectural design of the building. Mr. Bryce asked if it could be added to the front of the building so residents could see it.

Mr. Schulman noted that the public hearing would not be closed at this time, since the Redevelopment Agency had not commented on the project. He noted that the applicant had additional time to work through issues with TMP. He confirmed that the public comment portion of the hearing is closed.

V. DISCUSSION

a. Discussion of Residential Parking Permits

Mr. Schulman asked the commissioners whether they should have Mr. Travers speak now or return to the next meeting, since it was late in the evening. Mr. Travers said he could come back but also gave a quick review of the ordinance. He said it currently does not allow the parking authority to do a residential parking zone, as well as not allowing enforcement beyond parking meters. There are discussions with the parking authority board and city administration to create an ordinance that would give the parking authority the ability to do it. Once they have the authority, they could create the residential parking permit program. Changes would be given to the ordinance committee to revise the current ordinance to allow city-wide enforcement. He then discussed the application process, which was researched by Brian Lutz, to allow for the residential parking permit programs on different streets.

There was a discussion as to whether residential parking permits were the purview of the Planning & Zoning Commission. Ms. Tabachneck said it was a key component of the East Norwalk TOD Plan. Mr. Schulman and Ms. Wells believed it was a city council and parking authority matter. Mr. Travers explained how these residential parking zones are created. He also said that they are making a plan to move it to the ordinance committee so that they can enact it.

There was also a discussion about vehicles parking in neighborhoods that don't reside in those neighborhoods, i.e., near a train station to catch the train every day. Mr. Travers said they would have to develop a plan city-wide, not just in certain neighborhoods.

b. Discussion of Daycare Uses in Residential Zones

This item was tabled until the next Planning & Zoning meeting.

c. Discussion of Planning & Zoning Capital Budget Ordinance changes

This item was tabled until the next Planning & Zoning meeting.

VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: April 3, 2024

**** MS. LANGALIS MOVED to approve the April 3, 2024 minutes.
Ms. Tabachneck seconded.**

However, Mr. Schulman said that it did not seem like they had enough votes so this item was tabled until their next meeting.

VII. COMMENTS OF DIRECTOR

Mr. Kleppin had no comments.

VIII. COMMENTS OF COMMISSIONERS

Mr. Schulman reminded everyone that the next meeting would be on May 8, 2024 and not May 1, 2024.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

**Ms. Tabachneck made a Motion to Adjourn.
Mr. Bryce seconded.
Louis Schulman; Ana Tabachneck; Chapin Bryce; Jacquen Jordan-Byron;
Galen Wells; Richard Roina; Tammy Langalis approved.
No one opposed.
No one abstained.**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diana Palmentiero