



**Town of Westport**  
**Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**Town Hall, 110 Myrtle Avenue**  
**Westport, CT 06880**  
Tel: 203-341-1030 Fax: 203-454-6145  
[www.westportct.gov](http://www.westportct.gov)

## **Process Efficiency Subcommittee of the Planning and Zoning Commission**

**Wednesday, Jan. 8, 2020, 12:30 PM**  
**Room 307/309 – Westport Town Hall**

### **Meeting Minutes**

#### P&Z Commissioners in Attendance:

Greg Rutstein, Subcommittee Chair, and P&Z Commission Secretary  
Cathy Walsh, Subcommittee Member, and P&Z Commission Member  
Danielle Dobin, P&Z Commission Chair  
Chip Stephens, P&Z Commission Vice Chair  
Neil Cohn, P&Z Commission Alternate

#### Other Elected or Appointed Officials

Jim Ezzes, Zoning Board of Appeals Chair  
Helen Garten, Selectman's Real Property Committee Member

#### Department Heads and Other Town Staff and Consultants

Sam Arciola, Deputy Police Chief  
Ira Bloom, Town Attorney  
Eileen Lavigne Flug, Assistant Town Attorney  
Alicia Mozian, Conservation Director  
Peter Ratkiewich, Public Works Director  
Keith Wilberg, Town Engineer  
Mary Young, Planning and Zoning Director

#### Public in Attendance

Rick Benson, Westport resident  
Morely Boyd, Westport resident

P&Z Process Efficiency Subcommittee Chairman Greg Rutstein welcomed meeting attendees. He identified hard copies of the meeting agenda, the last subcommittee meeting minutes, and materials under discussion are available, including:

- Action Minutes from last Process Efficiency Subcommittee meeting, dated 12/11/18
- P&Z Process Efficiency Subcommittee Charge/Mission Statement, dated January 2018;
- Draft Explanatory Statement for Text Amendment RE: Process Changes for CAM applications, prepared by M. Young, dated 11/15/19;
- Draft Text Amendment for Process Changes for CAM applications, prepared by M. Young, dated 11/15/19; and
- Draft §8-24 Guidelines, Version #7, prepared by E. Lavigne Flug.

Mr. Rutstein requested meeting attendees address items on the agenda, and save any new business or suggestions for future proposals until the end of the meeting as time permits.

### **1. Annual Review of Subcommittee Mission Statement**

Mr. Rutstein read aloud the language of the current Subcommittee Charge dated January 2018.

Mr. Rutstein described that the subcommittee is where ideas are initially discussed with members of the subcommittee and the public, next these ideas are discussed with the Planning and Zoning Commission at a Work Session, and next if a majority of Commission members see merit, a proposal that requires an amendment to the Zoning or Subdivision Regulations is scheduled for a formal public hearing when public testimony can be received and considered before adoption and implementation.

Mr. Rutstein then recited some of the recent accomplishments by the subcommittee including:

- Changes to P&Z Commission processes for reading resolutions at meetings resulting in time and energy saved by Commission members and the public;
- Changes to §5-2 of the Zoning Regulations pursuant to Amendment #753 in 2018 that modified the Change of Use definition to limit Site Plan approval to only those occasions that generate a demand for a supply provided by the construction of more than three parking spaces (eliminating the requirement to obtain Site Plan approval when surplus parking is available to support the Change of Use); and removing language requiring Site Plan approval to occupy commercial tenant space that has been vacant for more than 1-year.

Mr. Rutstein cited the changes adopted pursuant to Amendment #753 were designed to address the unanticipated consequences that had resulted that deterred some new businesses from occupying existing vacant tenant space in Westport, due to the time constraints associated with waiting for Site Plan approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission at a public hearing that could be sufficiently processed by P&Z Staff as there are no discretionary issues.

Alicia Mozian asked to be recognized and inquired about the difference between Change of Use and abandonment as it relates to Amendment #753. Mr. Rutstein observed Ms. Mozian had previously discussed this issue at an earlier meeting. Mary Young responded to Ms. Mozian by identifying the mere passage of time (as described in Amendment #753), does not equal abandonment; instead intent must be examined. Town Attorney Ira Bloom concurred with Ms. Young.

Rick Benson asked to be recognized. He suggested Mr. Rutstein amend his Subcommittee Charge to add the intent to "improve customer service," at the end of the Mission Statement. Mr. Rutstein replied he believes that intent is already integrated into the Mission Statement, but he would consider adding the language offered by Mr. Benson.

## 2. Potential Process Efficiency Enhancements:

### A. Coastal Site Plan Review Procedures

Review draft Zoning Regulation amendments discussed at last meeting to:

- i. Remove language from §31-10.7.5 requiring a public hearing for Coastal Site Plan Applications; and
- ii. Remove language from §43-5.2 requiring a public hearing for “activities located within the Coastal Boundary;” and replace it with new language requiring a public hearing only for non-residential activities pursuant to §31-10.6 and any Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structure as defined in CGS §22a-109.

Mr. Rutstein described this topic was initially discussed at the 2018 subcommittee meetings about distinguishing between what types of applications require a public hearing versus require action by the Planning and Zoning Commission at a public meeting known as the Work Session component of the Planning and Zoning Commission’s agendas. Mr. Rutstein directed meeting attendees to the handouts distributed at today’s meeting.

Mr. Rutstein proceeded to summarize the contents of the handouts that describe the statutory requirements for action by the Commission, the current requirements listed in the Zoning Regulations that exceed statutory requirements regarding the review process, and the potential benefits of changing the zoning regulations to be more in alignment with statutory requirements. Mr. Rutstein highlighted the proposed changes if implemented will reduce resources spent by applicants, residents, the Commission, and P&Z Staff.

Mr. Rutstein shared the testimony received at the 2018 subcommittee meetings shaped the proposal to distinguish what types of CAM activities the Commission sees as “big deals” warranting a public hearing even though not required by state statutes, versus “small deals” that do not warrant a public hearing. He described commercial CAM activities and Shoreline Flood and Erosion Control Structures (aka sea walls) on residential properties were perceived as “big deals,” versus construction of a residential home in proximity to coastal resources were perceived as a “small deal.”

Cathy Walsh asked to be recognized and shared that in the past, following receipt by Commission members of CAM application materials and analyses by various Town Hall staff, she benefitted from the perspectives offered by her fellow members including Chip Stephens and Al Gratrix prior to rendering a decision and she fears that opportunity will be lost if the change is adopted. *“Sometimes things get missed.”*

Ms. Young responded by clarifying the question raised by Ms. Walsh is how will the process change and the kind of information supplied from the perspective of the P&Z Commission. Ms. Young answered the question by identifying the Commission will continue to receive the same information in written form as they always have from the applicant and Town staff, and the Commission will continue to hear from one another at their meeting when the application is scheduled for their review prior to rendering their decision.

What the Commission will not have is a formal presentation of the afore-mentioned application materials, nor will the Commission receive public testimony at the meeting if the proposed process is adopted. However, Ms. Young qualified, both the applicant as well as any member of the public, including those who will continue to receive written notice of the application submission, as well as those who outside the notice radius, but who want to offer an opinion, will have the opportunity to submit written comments into the record for the Commission's consideration, prior to the Commission rendering their decision.

Ms. Walsh posed a hypothetical situation to discern how it would be handled. She described what if during the Commission's review a question arises for which the answer cannot be found in the record.

Ms. Young shared that she remains hopeful like any other application, Commissioners will review the materials ahead of time and raise their questions with staff prior to a meeting, so staff can attempt to gain answers, so the application doesn't need to be further continued to a second meeting making the process potentially inefficient.

Ms. Walsh inquired what if a question was unknown before the meeting, is raised at the meeting, and there is no available answer to the question.

Ms. Young replied that the matter would be continued to a future meeting to allow time for the answers to be gathered so the Commission has what they need to render their decision. She additionally offered that the decisions must be rendered within 65-days following receipt of the application, unless an extension is granted by the applicant of up to an additional 65-days, and unique to a CAM Site Plan application, if the statutory timeline runs out prior to a decision being rendered, the state statutes identifies lack of action equals a denial, not an automatic approval.

Ms. Walsh identified she was satisfied with that answer.

Ms. Mozian asked to be recognized. She identified she has several topics.

Mr. Rutstein suggested she take them one at a time.

Ms. Mozian initially revisited a topic discussed at a prior meeting originally raised by Peter Cadoux, (Westport resident, professional architect, and frequent applicant) who observed prior to the P&Z Commission conducting their CAM Site Plan reviews, two sometimes more other land use boards (such as FECB and WPLO) had already reviewed the same project raising questions in his mind about inefficiency in the approval process.

Mr. Rutstein reminded Ms. Mozian he had previously addressed this question by identifying that between the State Statutes, various Town Ordinances, and the Zoning Regulations, all reviews and approval cited by Mr. Cadoux are required and could not be avoided by any changes he could promote within the Zoning Regulations.

Ms. Mozian shared she wanted it known by members of the P&Z Commission that some, but not all CAM Site Plans are reviewed by her Commission as some, but not all are located within the Waterway Protection Line Ordinance jurisdiction. She submitted into the record a copy of a GIS Map showing where the WPLO jurisdiction line is located necessitating review by her department and/or Commission versus areas outside the WPLO jurisdiction.

*"There is not always overlapping jurisdiction."* She requested that the P&Z Commission pay extra attention to the environmental issues when her department has no jurisdiction.

Mr. Rutstein replied that the P&Z Commission always has and will continue to be conscious of their role to protect the coastal resources and are aided by Michelle Perillie, Planner with the P&Z Department, who prepares reports for each CAM Site Plan application wherein she lists all relevant coastal resources and includes recommendations for mitigation where warranted for consideration by the P&Z Commission.

Danielle Dobin asked to be recognized and shared that Michelle Perillie just became a Certified Floodplain Manager as qualified by FEMA bringing additional expertise to her CAM Site Plan reviews.

Chip Stephens asked to be recognized. He thanked Mr. Rutstein for qualifying today's discussion is concentrated on proposals not yet endorsed by the full Planning and Zoning Commission. Environmental concerns were expressed by the Conservation Director raising concerns for him. He offered, *"You are creating a solution to something that is not a problem."* He went on to describe that some developers try to push the limits that have resulted in unanticipated consequences. *"We are a proud autonomous Town,"* he described. I'm concerned about references to getting into alignment with the State Statutes or FEMA that don't include certain procedural requirements. *"We have a good system that is now being proposed to change. Eliminating public hearings scares me."* Mr. Stephens went on to describe in his view it's hard enough keeping people in line from for instance dumping toxic elements into our Rivers. He observed there is a system now where the elected officials, be it ZBA or P&Z, hear these things, giving the boards a bite at the apple and visibility to the public, and the opportunity for board members to ask questions and uncover critical information that a developer can quickly address at a public hearing. He offered the elected officials are elected to do their work, they knew what they signed up for, and he takes issue with the idea that for the sake of efficiency there is a proposal to reduce the workload. *"I push back on this."* He concluded with the following summary:

1. *"I don't see a problem; why are we fixing it?"*
2. *In trying to fix it you're going to jeopardize our coastal resources;*
3. *You're going to jeopardize our relationship with the people who elected us and work for us;*
4. *You're taking away the right to say things, and look at things, and this scares the hell out of me, and I'm going to continue to push back on this."*

Mr. Rutstein responded to Mr. Stephens that he agrees that the proposal is under discussion only. He observed the opportunity for public input is initially being offered in this forum, the subcommittee meeting, nothing has been endorsed at this stage. He went on to describe that as previously discussed at this meeting, the Commission will continue to receive reports from Michelle Perillie and feedback from other Town officials to help analyze the applications, and he stated the Commission will not be deprived of this information. He additionally clarified if a Commission member requires more information than is presented, he or she will have the opportunity to suggest a decision be postponed until that information is received, and if a majority of Commissioners present agree, the matter will be postponed until a later date.

Mr. Rutstein offered if a Commissioner needed to receive testimony from an applicant that too can be provided. This offer generated discussion regarding in what forum such testimony could be received and from whom. Questions were raised including would such testimony be limited to being received from just the applicant? What if members of the public also want to offer testimony? How would it be known to anyone whether testimony will be received if the matter is not noticed as a public hearing?

Ms. Dobin offered in her perspective neighbors turn out to offer testimony when a seawall is proposed; not when a single-family home is proposed; therefore, no immediate red flags were raised when she considered Mr. Rutstein's process proposal. She offered she does not believe the public will be circumvented if the changes are adopted based upon her exposure to date of the 40+/- CAM residential site plan applications that have come before the Commission when no neighbors attended to offer testimony.

Ms. Walsh inquired what if an answer can be gained from the applicant who might be present in the audience while the Commission is conducting their review. Can the Commission choose to take testimony during their Work Session to solicit information from the applicant under the proposed process? Ms. Walsh offered that she believes she made a mistake in the past when serving as the P&Z Chair when she agreed to receive testimony from an applicant during a Work Session in response to questions that arose from Commission members, and she doesn't support repeating this practice going forward.

Ms. Dobin suggested that since both the Town Attorney and Assistant Town Attorney are present perhaps, they can weigh-in with recommendations to address a scenario when testimony is desired, but the matter is not noticed as a public hearing?

Ira Bloom responded that in such a scenario "yes" the Commission has the right to gain information if they choose from an application who is present, but that a door has been opened to receive testimony that should be extended to any neighbor who is also present and wants to offer testimony.

Assistant Town Attorney Eileen Lavigne Flug observed that potentially a neighbor didn't attend the meeting believing there was no opportunity to offer testimony.

Attorney Blum replied that's a valid point. He clarified if there is a simple question that an applicant can answer he sees no legal prohibition for the Commission to request that information distinguished from when the Commission may want to have a dialogue with an applicant wherein Attorney Blum recommended the Commission not take testimony at that first meeting, but instead continue the item to a future date allowing for the matter to be noticed as a public hearing wherein the Commission can have a dialogue with the applicant and any others who might be interested in offering testimony.

Ms. Young asked Attorney Bloom if the original statutory timeline would still be in effect (65 days to render a decision following the date of receipt of the application).

Attorney Bloom responded "yes," the original statutory timeline would be controlling; a new timeline would not be created by the Commission's choice to convert an administrative review into a public hearing review.

Mr. Rutstein offered he wants to remind everyone that perfect is the enemy of the good. He offered to Ms. Walsh that if this scenario has occurred once or twice in the past that is not sufficient reason in his opinion to dismiss the proposal currently before the subcommittee. If the other 40 applications didn't solicit the need for testimony, why not consider the proposal.

Ms. Walsh replied it's a conundrum and she agrees that most CAM Site Plan applications don't require receipt of testimony.

Ms. Young summarized the dialogue at today's meeting has yielded an answer supplied by the Town Attorney about how to react if/when a unique scenario occurs wherein a dialogue between an applicant and the Commission is warranted, the matter should be deferred until notice of a public hearing is published and all interested parties can participate.

Mr. Rutstein clarified unless it is a single point of fact wherein the Town Attorney has confirmed the Commission can make allowance for receipt of that fact without the need to re-notice the meeting as a public hearing.

Mr. Benson asked to be recognized. He offered he came to the meeting to endorse the proposals. He shared that from his decades of experience both serving as a member of the Commission as well as in his capacity appearing before the Commission, 99% of the questions are handled at the staff level. All the technical questions are asked and answered before the matter is put in front of the Commission. He observed what Attorney Bloom suggested is what the Commission is already doing; when you don't have what you need you continue the matter to a later date to allow time to get what you need. He stated he looks forward to when at this meeting he can share additional proposals for the subcommittee's consideration.

Mr. Rutstein thanked Mr. Benson for his patience in postponing until the end of the meeting his suggestions for future topics.

Ms. Mozian asked to be recognized. She suggested the Commission does better having the opportunity to always have a dialogue with an applicant and it would be inefficient in her view to need to ask an applicant to return to a second meeting when this dialogue could have occurred at the first meeting had it been noticed as a public hearing. She further suggested that if the proposal is adopted as proposed, she would recommend a pre-application meeting be required of all applicants wherein all potential issues could be fleshed out so all concerns could be addressed to obviate the need to re-notice a meeting. An application checklist could be developed including all potential questions so the applicant could be required to supply the answers to staff in advance of a CAM Site Plan report being prepared by Michelle Perillie.

Mr. Rutstein observed in his experience the P&Z Staff is already very comprehensive in gaining all relevant information, but he appreciates the suggestion.

Mr. Stephens suggested that in the Compo Beach area there is a lot of sensitive issues such as drainage issues and he is concerned that the Commission will be limited in their analysis to their CAM purview preventing the Commission from addressing all concerns raised by neighbors, not just limit their focus on potential impacts to coastal resources.

Ms. Dobin shared that the neighbors Mr. Stephens refers to are not coming to the P&Z meetings in her experience even when they approach her with complaints and she encourages them to attend, and even when they receive personal notices in the mail advertising on the outside of the envelope *“urgent important materials contained inside.”*

Ms. Mozian confirmed Mr. Stephens is right the Compo Beach neighbors have a lot of drainage concerns for which they are seeking relief from Town Hall staff.

Mr. Rutstein replied that dialogue should continue, and his proposal will not prevent that dialogue from continuing.

Mr. Rutstein acknowledged he needs to move on with the meeting agenda in deference to the department heads and other Town staff in the audience who may want to comment, and who may have to leave soon.

#### **B. CGS §8-24, Municipal Improvement, Discuss Draft Guidelines**

Review draft guidelines in anticipation of seeking endorsement by the Planning and Zoning Commission at a future meeting.

Mr. Rutstein introduce the item and reminded meeting attendees of the handout available at the meeting that should be reviewed during the discussion. He advised the guidelines do not represent drastic change per se, and should already be followed. The revisions are intended to update the document originally prepared in 2005 by the P&Z Commission with the intent that it be circulated by the First Selectman to Department Heads and others involved in Municipal Improvement projects to ensure that those projects that require review by the P&Z Commission are brought before the P&Z Commission.

Mr. Rutstein identified the document is in draft form pending further review and approval by the full P&Z Commission.

Mr. Rutstein read aloud what CGS Sec. 8-24 states should be reviewed by the P&Z Commission versus what activities are exempt from P&Z review such as activities involving repairs and maintenance.

Ms. Walsh offered the word “statement” should be substituted for the word “recommendation,” when referring to what department heads should be offering for consideration by the P&Z Director, P&Z Chairman, and Town Attorney.

Ms. Dobin suggested the word “recommendation” is appropriate in her opinion based upon the department head’s professional expertise, but she is agreeable to Ms. Walsh’s suggestion.

Mr. Rutstein shared it doesn’t matter in his opinion; “recommendation” or otherwise.

Ms. Walsh suggested Pete Ratkiewich for example is not likely to ever recommend that an 8-24 review be performed as that could delay implementation of his project.



Ms. Mozian concurred with Ms. Walsh.

The word "Statement" is preferable suggested Ms. Walsh as it is a more neutral word.

Ms. Young offered by using the word "recommendation" it implies the department head has compared his or her project to the language contained in CGS 8-24 necessitating their awareness of CGS 8-24 before offering their conclusion and recommendations regarding whether an 8-24 review by the P&Z Commission is required. By removing the language, it potentially removes the burden from the department head of being aware which is not the intent in her opinion. This topic was raised as requiring attention she reminded Ms. Walsh when she had previously suggested there were some who were unaware and who needed to be reminded of the potential need for review by the P&Z Commission pursuant to CGS 8-24.

Attorney Bloom offered he agreed with Ms. Young regarding the intent to make all department heads aware and accountable for their projects in context with the language contained in CGS 8-24, and he was comfortable with the word "recommendation."

Mr. Rutstein repeated that he's fine substituting the word "statement" for recommendation if it addresses the concerns articulated by Ms. Walsh, and asked to move on with the discussion.

Helen Garten asked to be recognized. She inquired whether it was the intent to have every Town project evaluated pursuant to these guidelines as it may not be efficient to have all improvements written up by department heads and evaluated by the P&Z Director, P&Z Chairman, and Town Attorney. What about projects that were not previously deemed to require an 8-24 review? She offered as an example a DPW project to repave a Town road? Additionally, Ms. Garten inquired whether the guidelines are applicable to non-department heads such as her.

Danielle Dobin initially responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Walsh distinguished maintenance as not needing to follow this process.

Mr. Rutstein clarified the guidelines as currently drafted would require everything be submitted for consideration.

Ms. Flug suggested that may not be practical.

Mr. Rutstein offered he is grateful the draft guidelines are prompting this dialogue; he is not personally advocating that it remain as is.

Ms. Walsh offered that no maintenance projects should have to adhere to these guidelines as she doesn't want to create unnecessary work for Town department heads. Ms. Walsh additionally offered she hereby volunteers to re-write the guidelines to address her concerns.

Attorney Bloom offered that in his experience there really hasn't been a lot of problems over the years, a couple of misses perhaps, but Westport has always been conservative in comparison to other communities in requiring an 8-24 review by the P&Z Commission. Attorney Bloom clarified in his opinion not ALL, but borderline cases should adhere to the guidelines; common sense should play a role in the process.

Mr. Ratkiewich suggested a clear list of exempt activities necessitating 8-24 review should be compiled that could include Helen's road repaving projects for example or maybe the Commission should compile a list of what is critical in their opinion for their review. He offered he is aware that sewer extension projects are one type of project he has become aware is of great interest to the P&Z Commission.

Ms. Dobin concurred with this assessment.

Mr. Ratkiewich agreed with Attorney Bloom that common sense should dictate and he should not have to seek confirmation that repaving equals maintenance.

Mr. Rutstein informed meeting attendees that the fact that today's document is noted as Revision #7 shows that the process to draft the guidelines is not as easy as it seems.

Attorney Flug referenced an earlier version that included "safe harbors" that was deemed inappropriate by some.

Mr. Rutstein and Attorney Bloom agreed a simpler version of the draft guidelines is the goal.

Ms. Walsh offered that the prior Plan Implementation Committee meetings (PIC) were a prior forum where some Commission members were able to give immediate feedback to department heads when considering Town projects.

Ms. Dobin countered that Ms. Walsh previously agreed the PIC meetings would not be re-established until the Plan of Conservation and Development is further amended as suggested by the POCD High Level Review Subcommittee.

Ms. Garten shared that in her opinion 8-24 reviews when before the P&Z Commission should continue to allow for receipt of public testimony.

Mr. Rutstein replied that he agreed and there is no proposal before the subcommittee currently to modify the current practice.

Ms. Walsh suggested there needs to be a consensus among the subcommittee members (that include Cathy Walsh, Greg Rutstein, and Jon Olefson) before any of today's agenda items are elevated for review by the full Commission, and she was not prepared to offer her support for the proposals and Jon Olefson is not present.

Mr. Rutstein inquired whether Attorney Bloom concurred.

Attorney Bloom said yes he agreed with Ms. Walsh any recommendation offered by the subcommittee should represent a majority opinion of the subcommittee members.

Mr. Rutstein summarized that in light of the fact that there were only two subcommittee members present; himself and Ms. Walsh, all matters discussed today will be deferred to a subsequent meeting when Jon Olefson can be present to offer his opinion. He suggested that with respect to the 8-24 guidelines, Ms. Walsh should review Draft Version #7 presented at the meeting and prepare specific modifications that she could support as he had already completed this exercise.

Ms. Walsh agreed.

Mr. Rutstein advised he would work on scheduling another subcommittee meeting and meeting attendees will be informed when a date is scheduled.

*[Editor's note: The next subcommittee meeting was subsequently scheduled for Jan. 16<sup>th</sup> at 7:00pm when Mr. Olefson confirmed he was available, and the meeting notice was shared with all Jan. 8<sup>th</sup> meeting attendees and other prior meeting attendees who provided their contact information.]*

Mr. Benson again asked to be recognized to get on the record suggestions for consideration at a future subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Rutstein said now would be the time.

Mr. Benson shared he has four suggestions:

1. He suggested the subcommittee meet more often than annually, and acknowledged his concerns may not be timely for this meeting. He advised that in 2015 he suggested the Zoning Regulations should be overhauled and simplified, but he withdrew his proposal when he was informed the Commission was working on it.

Ms. Young responded there is a placeholder in the Capital Improvement program to hire a consultant

2. Beach rezoning. Mr. Benson shared that he had also submitted a proposal to create a new zoning district, and again withdrew his proposal when he was informed the Commission was working on it.

Mr. Rutstein confirmed there is a pending application sponsored by the Beach Rezoning subcommittee and Mr. Stephens confirmed the subcommittee remains active.

3. Mr. Benson shared that many applicants and some members of the P&Z Staff believe appointments should again be offered allowing the Zoning Officials to initiate and complete their ZBA staff checks during a single one-hour appointment as the current drop-off process is creating sometimes a 6-8 week delay before applications are scheduled for a public hearing review by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Ms. Young replied that she would follow up with Mr. Benson after conferring with the P&Z Staff as the suggested change does not require action by the subcommittee or Planning and Zoning Commission to implement.

4. Mr. Benson suggested that P&Z staff should be given greater discretion and not all decisions require the attention of the P&Z Commission as the staff is qualified and able to address routine matters.

Mr. Rutstein encouraged Mr. Benson to submit specific suggestions that he would be interested in considering and offered that he agrees with Mr. Benson's observations.

A motion was made by Mr. Rutstein and seconded by Ms. Walsh to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 2:10p.m.

**Respectfully Submitted By:**

Mary Young, Planning & Zoning Director, Jan. 13, 2020