

**TOWN OF MANCHESTER
MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION/INLAND WETLANDS
AND WATERCOURSES AGENCY
FOR THE MEETING OF
JUNE 1, 2026**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

In Person: Michael Stebe, Chairperson
Daniela Luna, Secretary
Teresa Ike
Robert Shanbaum
Zachary Reichelt
Electronically: Patrick Kennedy, Vice Chairperson
Eric Prause
Chris Schoeneberger

ALTERNATE MEMBERS SITTING:

In Person: Maliha Ahsan

ALTERNATES PRESENT:

In Person: Margaret Brewer

ABSENT:

Arianna Larson
Sara Van Buren

ALSO PRESENT:

In Person: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning & Economic
Development
Renata Bertotti, Deputy Director of Planning
David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner/Wetlands
Agent
Electronically: Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

ROSEMARIE P. CHIRICO – Proposed zoning regulation amendment at Art. II, Sec. 5.1 and Art. II, Sec. 7 to add Processing and Sale of Firewood as a permitted accessory use in the Rural Residence zone. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (REG-0027-2026)

Attorney Dorian Reiser, Kahan, Kerensky & Capossela, introduced herself, stating that she is representing the applicant, Rosemarie Chirico, who lives at 571 Porter Street. Ms. Chirico operates a business, Rock and Rose Ranch, where she processes and sells firewood from her property. A question arose about whether her business is permitted in the zone where her property is located, the AA zone.

Another issue was raised about whether the proposed firewood processing and sale falls within the definition of agriculture or home occupation in the regulations. A notice of violation was issued by Zoning Enforcement Officer Jim Davis in January, stating that her use was violating the provisions of the home occupation regulation, primarily because it is not conducted within a building and involves wholesale and retail sales. An appeal of the notice of violation was taken before the Zoning Board of Appeals, which is pending.

Attorney Reiser stated that, in discussions with Town staff and during a preliminary hearing with this Commission, she felt that working together may be best to clearly address the use on the property. It is evident from the notice of violation why it doesn't squarely fit under the home occupation regulations. However, a number of the criteria for home occupation can be satisfied: the occupant is the owner of the premises and resides there, and there is a limit on the number of employees and things of that nature.

The issue of why it doesn't fall squarely under agriculture is because staff had a concern that agriculture would apply to timber harvesting and forestry if the product was grown on the property. Attorney Reiser reported that her client has cut and seasoned firewood trees from her own property but that is a limited supply, and she supplements it primarily by bringing in local wood from off site.

Attorney Reiser commented that she suggested tailoring a use that is specific to this use and gives the Commission some control over it so the business can be conducted with minimal effect on the surrounding area. The proposal is that it is permitted only in the Rural Residence (RR) zone. It could possibly be applicable in other residential zones, but they believed it would be appropriate to start small and limit it to the most restrictive of the residential zones.

Attorney Reiser offered:

- The regulation being proposed would be an accessory use in the RR zone and the applicant must reside on the parcel.
- The regulation proposes a minimum lot size of two or more acres, preventing an overly dense operation.
- The regulation provides that there will be no additional curb cuts to service the operation. This would prevent it from appearing as a commercial property.
- Adequate sight lines.
- Area to facilitate loading, turnaround and exiting the property.
- The proposed setbacks are 50 ft. from the property line for processing operations, and front, rear, and side setbacks for storage of equipment and supplies.
- The operations must be conducted by the resident of the property, making it accessory to the residential use of the property.
- The operation shall comply with the Manchester noise ordinance.
- This would be subject to review and approval of a plan and a narrative submitted to the ZEO to ensure all the criteria is addressed.

Attorney Reiser stated that her client is open to all reasonable restrictions.

The criteria were taken from other accessory uses that are currently allowed, remarked Attorney Reiser. Some of the proposals come from the home occupation section, the ADU sections, and the agritourism sections. They want to ensure controls on the operation, so it doesn't become too

large, doesn't get out of control, and doesn't have an overbearing impact on the surrounding neighbors.

Attorney Reiser stated that her client has no plans to expand and has no plans to change access to Hickory Lane. Ms. Chirico only wants to continue the operations she has had for the past 15 years. She pointed out the various operations in the RR zone that are similar to this business.

The statutes require the Commission to consider consistency with the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) when amending the regulations. Additionally, the Community Character and Design Recommendations, #3 encourages the Commission to explore ways to further support traditional and urban farming while maintaining good neighbor relations. The POCD defines urban farming as growing, producing and distributing food in urban areas where large tracts of agricultural land may be unavailable. It states that growing food locally creates a sense of community and provides low-cost and accessible healthy foods and reduces carbon emissions by reducing transportation costs. The applicant believes the same holds for firewood sales. The applicant's business will provide a reusable product from wood that is removed after storm events. Keeping the wood local reduces the risk of spreading invasive species, insects and diseases.

Attorney Reiser states that there is good reason to allow this type of use within the property. It is in the RR zone, the least dense, most rural, most agricultural and natural zone under the regulations.

Mr. Prause asked whether consideration has been given to buffering of the operation in relation to neighboring properties for visual screening purposes. Noise ordinances go to the extent of the property and he suggested adding an additional buffer for the log splitting process.

Attorney Reiser responded that, in Item F, the proposed text states that there will be no processing operations within 50 feet of a property line.

Mr. Prause asked whether that would be specifically in the rear of the property.

Attorney Reiser stated that, based on the specific property where they wish to continue the operation, 571 Porter Street, it is to the rear of the barn on the property. It doesn't specify in the regulations that it must be behind the principal structure. All the processing operations are behind the house and the barn. There is no requirement built in other than the 50 ft. for processing operations and compliance with no storage in the required yards. She suggested adding criteria that all processing operations and storage must be to the rear of the principal residence, which her client would have no objection to. She noted that they are not proposing to change the farm stand regulation.

Mr. Prause reported that there is a process that the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) has which requires a self-issued firewood transportation certificate. He speculated whether that should be included in the regulation. The wood could contain emerald ash borer or Asian longhorn beetle infestations.

Attorney Reiser suggested a requirement that any off-site wood be deemed local and compliant with DEEP regulations, or even a radius of 30 miles from the site.

Ms. Rosemarie Chirico introduced herself. She stated that firewood cannot be transported from out of state. Therefore, most of their wood is within a 30-mile radius.

Attorney Reiser proposed that all DEEP regulations regarding deliveries and shipments would be complied with.

Mr. Prause reiterated that DEEP requires that every transport of firewood contain a self-issued firewood transportation certification form.

Ms. Chirico stated that she is not transporting the wood in and the tree companies provide the self-reporting certificate.

Mr. Prause clarified that out-of-state firewood can be imported but it must be treated for Asian longhorn beetles. He stated that is an additional barrier that should be required in the regulations. The best practice for firewood is that it does not move. It should be sourced locally to where it will be burned, such as when camping. He suggested inserting a very tight radius or specifically specifying no out-of-state wood.

Attorney Reiser commented that her client would have no objection to those requirements.

Ms. Luna asked for a definition of processing and what machinery would be used on the property.

Ms. Chirico detailed the machinery and process used in her operation.

After a question from Mr. Schoeneberger, Ms. Bertotti responded that she does not know exactly the number of lots, but the RR zone is, by area, the largest zoning district in town.

Attorney Reiser stated that she does not know specifically how many lots would be able to operate under the proposed restrictions. She remarked that the RR lots are usually oversized, many of them two acres or more. She commented that there are no restrictions on how many parcels in the RR zone can operate nurseries, farms or Christmas tree sales.

Mr. Schoeneberger clarified that he is thinking about where there might be RR lots that are in close proximity to much smaller lots and greater density houses.

Attorney Reiser stated that she has looked into where the farms are in town and whether they abut Residence AA (AA) zones. She noted that there are not many farms in town. The farm at 534 Keeney Street is in the RR zone, directly abutting AA properties. The Aussakita Farm on Lydall Street is in RR and backs up to AA. All RR zones eventually abut an AA zone.

Mr. Stebe remarked that, because the applicant is importing the source material, it is not by definition an accessory use of an agricultural operation. The examples are all primary uses. In this case, firewood processing is the primary use and this is an industrial business accessory to the fact that the house happens to be there. When clearing the land for use, it makes sense that you sell the wood.

Attorney Reiser acknowledged that agriculture and nurseries are primary uses. She suggested that it is an accessory use, as they are requiring that it is not on a vacant lot. The owner/operator must live there and engage in the business. It is accessory as it is similar to home occupations,

business operations that are being conducted by the resident out of their property. This is a home operation that is primarily outside the dwelling but is conducted by the resident.

After a question from Ms. Luna, Ms. Chirico acknowledged that there is a young man who helps with bagging wood.

Attorney Reiser remarked that Ms. Chirico does the deliveries and would be willing to entertain reasonable restrictions on dates and hours of operation. Ms. Chirico described the vehicle she uses for transportation.

Ms. Luna assumed that customers could pick up firewood from the farm stand. She asked to see on a map where the farm stand is located, which was provided and described by Attorney Reiser.

After a question from Ms. Luna, Attorney Reiser stated that customer pickups are not heavily driven.

Ms. Chirico explained the delivery process.

Mr. Shanbaum asked whether there have been any noise measurements along the property lines and Attorney Reiser responded that it has not been done. He stated that his understanding is that individuals bring these coins on their trucks to this property.

Ms. Chirico explained the types of trucks that deliver, which Mr. Michaelangelo Chirico detailed. He noted that, on a rare occurrence, a small log truck will deliver.

After a question from Ms. Luna, Attorney Reiser specified the hours for the noise ordinance.

Ms. Luna asked whether the applicant would be amenable to a further restriction on the hours.

Attorney Reiser and Ms. Chirico detailed the current hours.

Ms. Chirico reported that her son can make the machine mufflers quieter, as well as the chainsaw muffler.

Mr. Nicholas Chirico, 641 Porter Street, introduced himself. He stated that they can also work on the process, using less chainsaws. They do have a different type of wood processor that does not utilize a standard two-stroke chainsaw.

Mr. Reichelt questioned Mr. Chirico about whether the wood could be chain sawed off site and returned.

Mr. Chirico responded that his mother owns many lots, almost 20 acres. The whole operation is done on an acre and a half. It could be positioned better, but it is a small operation area-wise. He acknowledged that it could be chain sawed off-site if requested.

After a question from Mr. Reichelt, Mr. Chirico stated that the log trucks come at least once a week, sometimes more.

Ms. Ike noted that, in the meeting in April, it was indicated that it was going to have seasonal use from October to March, which she does not see in the proposal.

Attorney Reiser acknowledged that seasonal use was discussed. It was her impression that the seasonal restriction was not critical.

Ms. Chirico noted that it was heavily seasonal, but now many people want wood for campfires in their yard. She currently makes deliveries once every two weeks or so off season.

Attorney Reiser stated that the bulk of the season is the fall and winter.

Ms. Ike reported that there was additional landscape buffer in the prior proposal, and she read from the prior minutes.

Attorney Reiser responded that it now states that no storage of materials, equipment, and supplies shall be located within the front yard, except the farm stand, or within the required rear or side yard. She remarked that, if there was something better in the prior proposal, it can be added back in. The existing site has established vegetation around the rear and side yards. As this will be applicable to all RR, having a minimum screen could be added back in.

Ms. Bertotti shared the prior proposal.

Attorney Reiser reported that they can add that back in.

Mr. Stebe reiterated that this would apply to any property in the RR zone. There is a huge number of properties that abut the AA zone. He asked, if the Commission changes this, how it fits the Plan of Conservation and Development or Manchester NEXT. He speculated how the insertion of an operation such as this, which is inherently noisy, fits in with the POCD supporting urban farming but also maintaining good neighbor relations.

Attorney Reiser commented that they have tried to address the good neighborly relations with the setback for the processing operations and limit the hours of operation. They are willing to put restrictions on when deliveries are made. They are willing to set reasonable limits on the operations.

Mr. Shanbaum recalled Mr. Prause stating that it is possible to have a farm stand in any zone but it is specifically designated as seasonal. He noted the comments about the size of the property and areas away from the AA zone. When looking at the map, he was struck by the fact that 599 Porter Street was sliced in two but it made some sense. The density is increasing going north and it isolated anything that might happen in an RR zone without the regulation changes. Mr. Shanbaum speculated why, if there is all this space where the process could be performed, why not isolate it further away from a denser neighborhood? He stated that he is uncomfortable with the Commission bending over backwards trying to make it possible for one particular lot to do something that the property owner wants to do.

Ms. Chirico clarified that her total acreage is 12.95 acres. She has a barn with horses, a ring for the horses, and a pasture for the horses in the front and the back. The house is in the RR zone, and the barn is in the AA zone. To access that side of the property, a road would have to be built through Hickory Lane for access and to move the operation further away.

Attorney Reiser stated that to get this use allowed is a regulation amendment for any RR. Much of RR abuts AA and they want to create these criteria that will minimize any impact. The reason

it is located where it is is because there is a zone line that goes through 599 Porter Street with the house on RR and the barn is on AA, the horse area. When her client began to use the property for her business, she didn't want it in front of her house. She wanted it behind her house, but it was already dedicated to the horses. That is why the concrete pad for seasoning is driving the location of the operation.

Attorney Reiser recognized that they are trying to make this work for an individual who has been operational for a long period of time. When they were before the Commission in April, there was a feeling of "what's the problem with selling firewood?" The dialogue seemed much more positive. Therefore, to make staff comfortable, because it doesn't clearly fall within agriculture, they decided to create this category, limiting it as much as possible and having a minimal amount of neighborhood issues. The only way to protect the use being up against a more dense area is to build in screening requirements, setback requirements, and potentially operational requirements to minimize any negative impacts.

Attorney Reiser commented that, if this was an active farm that grew their own product, there would be none of those restrictions. They could operate in a residential zone with no restrictions. In order to be a good neighbor, they are offering a number of conditions that will help improve the current situation.

Mr. Shanbaum noted that this is a proposed accessory use and asked whether this could be made a special exception. He felt that it may be something that might be appropriate in a zone, but not just anywhere in the zone.

Ms. Bertotti stated that would be something the Commission should be considering. In her memo, she put in a definition of an accessory use. In the regulation, an accessory use is defined as "a use that is clearly incidental to and customarily found in connection with and located on the same zoning lot as the principal use and clearly subordinate to the principal use." Qualifiers should be considered, such as the number of employees and whether that is good enough to restrict this use to what should be an accessory use. When trying to understand whether something is an accessory use, the scale of it should be considered. If the impact of that proposed use exceeds what is within these customarily accessory considerations, the next step is whether the use is appropriate for the zoning district but not appropriate for every location in that zoning district. If that is the case, that is the special exception/special permit situation.

Mr. Shanbaum commented that, if the Commission is going to do this at all, it should not be permitted as of right because there will be places where it does not make sense.

Town of Manchester residents who spoke in favor of the application:

1. Theresa Parla, 55 Bruce Road
2. Nicholas Chirico, 641 Porter Street
3. Dave Azevedo, 57 Barnwood Road
4. Colin McNamara, 47 Grandview Street
5. Veronica O'Leary, 599 Porter Street
6. Michelle Kenton, 63 Princeton Street
7. Vincent Chirico, 74 Lakewood Circle North
8. Michaelangelo Chirico, 571 Porter Street

9. Mary McNamara, 104 Lakewood Circle North

Town of Manchester residents who spoke against the application:

1. Virginia Street, 626 Porter Street
2. Jeffrey Pearce, 84 Butternut Road
3. Jim McCandless, 118 Butternut Road
4. Richard Borden, 646 Porter Street
5. Melinda Haddock, 24 Hickory Lane
6. Sheila Flanagan, 102 Butternut Road
7. Karen Poirior, 117 Butternut Road
8. Susan Shanbaum, 67 Butternut Road
9. Erika Schulten, 60 Butternut Road
10. Rusty Schulten, 60 Butternut Road
11. Kim Gorman, 56 E. Maple Street, 691 Porter Street

A discussion was held between Mr. Stebe and Mr. Reichelt regarding Mr. Chirico's involvement in the application.

Ms. Bertotti reported that she has shared all public correspondence as well as petitions with the Commission. She remarked that petitions bear no legal significance.

Mr. Stebe acknowledged the public correspondence and did not recall anything that has not been stated at this meeting.

Attorney Reiser acknowledged the large number of comments, most of which were site specific regarding the existing operation at the existing location. She speculated whether adding the sale and processing of wood is something that the Town wants to allow. Attorney Reiser reiterated that this is akin to a home occupation. She asked whether this would be a use that the Town would deem appropriate as accessory to residential uses.

Ms. Chirico has lived there for many years and will continue to live at that location, stated Attorney Reiser. The primary use of the property is as a residence. The business is secondary. She speculated whether it is customarily incidental, something associated with the primary use. Attorney Reiser remarked that it is no different than other home occupations which may not be normal and customary to be expected for all residents to have. They are a business that an owner/occupant of the house chooses to engage in. Perhaps this does not fall squarely within agricultural uses, but there is no question that she is cutting and harvesting her own wood. There is no difference in the noise created by cutting her own wood vs. imported wood.

Attorney Reiser proposed that the Commission must think about whether this is a permitted use or whether it is a special exception use to be looked at on a case-by-case basis. She noted that there are other permitted uses in the RR zone that do not require a special exception. Ms. Chirico is willing to find a path forward by compromise and is willing to accept additional conditions. She would like to continue the business that supports herself and her family.

Attorney Reiser stated that the Commission needs to determine whether the proposed regulation amendment is the path forward. She commented that there may be no point in getting to the zone change application until this application has been acted upon. The Commission can address these

site-specific complaints with modifications to the operation and allowing the processing and sale of firewood in the RR zone.

Acknowledging a comment, Attorney Reiser stated that she does not find it scary for this business to operate in a Rural Residential neighborhood. However, if 40% of the town is zoned RR, it may be overwhelming to think that 40% can have firewood processing. The applicant is interested in finding a solution to this problem and is willing to take that next step and rezone to RR, and then submit for a permit and approval showing all the precautions being taken to avoid adverse impacts on the neighbors.

Mr. Stebe and Attorney Reiser held a discussion about where the language will be inserted into the regulation. Attorney Reiser detailed the changes and insertions to the language in the regulation.

Ms. Bertotti recommended the Commission pause until they have, in a written form at the next meeting, an actual written regulation with anything the applicant would consider rather than amending this on the fly.

Attorney Reiser stated that she would be happy to make revisions and resubmit the proposed changes for the Commission's review.

Mr. Stebe requested that the members of the Commission provide feedback on this matter.

Mr. Kennedy assumed Ms. Bertotti was suggesting that the Commission continue the public hearing and the applicant will come back with a revised plan.

Mr. Stebe remarked that would be if the applicant desires to make more than a cosmetic change to what is currently in the text.

Mr. Reichelt stated that it would be a good idea to continue the public hearing.

Mr. Shanbaum commented that the Commission is a long way from having anything to put forward. The applicant has stated that they are willing to do whatever they can, but the Commission must inform the applicant what they want.

Ms. Luna agreed with the comments from her fellow Commissioners. She suggested the applicant reconsider the days and hours they split the wood.

Attorney Reiser noted that, when talking about limiting hours, it would be equipment processing.

Ms. Ike sought clarification from Ms. Bertotti that she is considering this an accessory use.

Ms. Bertotti responded that is one of the things to be considered in this application. She stated that the Commission has options: deny, approve, or approve and modify. If there is a modify and approve mindset, she would recommend continuing the public hearing. She recommended that the text is first discussed by the Commission, written and presented before a vote is made.

Mr. Anderson asked how the second public hearing should be handled. He assumed the second hearing would not be opened tonight and would be moved to the next meeting.

Mr. Prause asked whether there will be staff comments on this application.

Ms. Bertotti reported that her comments are in her memo. There is a question about whether this is an accessory use. She noted that she shared the definition of accessory use and questioned what this would be an accessory use to. When the Commission considers applications for regulatory amendments, it should always refer to the Plan of Conservation and Development. In Manchester's POCD, there is nothing that directly references operations such as a sawmills or wood processing. She showed a zoning definition of agriculture. There has been testimony about what is and is not agriculture, she said, and if the Commission sees this use as agricultural then there is language in the POCD referring to instances in which urban farming should be encouraged.

Another requirement to consider, remarked Ms. Bertotti, is to keep in mind that this applies to the entire RR district, minus the qualifiers currently in front of the Commission. The Commission should consider whether this is an appropriate accessory use for that zoning district, which is defined in the regulations as a zone intended to preserve the rural character and natural landscape of the area, and to protect open spaces and environmentally sensitive areas while allowing for a wide range of primarily residential, agricultural and institutional uses. One consideration would be the scale of the operation and whether that fits the accessory definition and what that accessory belongs to, agricultural vs. residential, etc.

Mr. Prause asked whether Ms. Bertotti was talking about this site or in general, that it would be hard to find firewood sales as an accessory use.

Ms. Bertotti responded that she is talking about in general. If looking at this use as proposed as an accessory use with the qualifiers that are listed, is that sufficient to make it a limited scale accessory use on a RR property? Is it clear from how it is written what it is an accessory to?

Mr. Prause referred to the pre-application review where they spoke about the existing use of selling firewood produced onsite and whether that could be considered a farm stand, as it was not necessarily seasonal. Would it be covered as agricultural produce which can be in a farm stand?

Ms. Bertotti was unable to answer that question. If a residential property has a tree that falls and the wood is displayed in front of the property in the form of a farm stand, that would probably be allowed as an accessory farm stand use.

Attorney Reiser stated that, in her opinion, the sale of firewood grown and treated on the property would constitute a permissible use as an accessory use. Harvested wood is clearly contemplated in the definition of farming and agriculture. The real question is whether the wood is from onsite or offsite.

Mr. Schoeneberger noted that this is not indigenous wood being grown on the property and being processed. This is a transfer station, in his opinion.

Mr. Stebe responded that it is akin to the actual application and does change the equation.

Attorney Reiser stated that is exactly why the regulation amendment is being proposed, because the wood is from offsite. It does not clearly fall under the definition of farming. She assumed that, if it was onsite wood, there would be no need for a regulation change because there could be a zone change to RR and it would be an agricultural permitted use.

Ms. Luna asked whether there is another town that permits a similar business under the label of agriculture.

Ms. Bertotti stated that she did look into it. There are some rural towns that allow some, but it is generally related to having a number of acres of forested land on a property. Trees fall down and then those trees are taken out. There are some towns that allow sawmills under special exception with restrictions on setbacks.

Mr. Reichelt asked whether this could be done under special exception to prevent residents using this regulation on a small lot.

Mr. Kennedy stated that a regulation change would still be required, adding that it would be a special exception rather than a permitted use. The Commission can write the regulations the way they want.

After a question from Mr. Shanbaum, Attorney Reiser explained that the definition of a farm is interchangeable with agriculture. She stated that there is no minimum lot size for a farm. There is a very broad definition in state statute for agriculture.

Ms. Bertotti, responding to a question from Ms. Luna, stated that the cleanest way is to discuss everything and get all questions out, and it is up to the Chair to get a sense of where the Commission is leaning. She suggested that the hearing be kept open until everything is discussed and answered.

Mr. Stebe added that the public hearing is the side to air questions and bring in the information, not necessarily to provide opinion. If there are items to be sorted out, he stated, he will entertain whatever members want to put forward.

Mr. Kennedy felt that the items have been brought up for the applicant to work on.

Mr. Prause commented that he would like to see the presentation from this meeting to review prior to the next meeting. He was unclear what the Commission is asking the applicant to revise and if they have clear direction from the Commission.

Attorney Reiser felt she has an understanding of what the Commission is requesting.

Mr. Shanbaum requested that Town staff speak with the Zoning Enforcement Officer about how practical this would be to enforce.

Ms. Bertotti stated that some of the qualifiers are difficult to enforce. The noise ordinance is enforced by the Police Department, and she was unsure if the Commission can require something that is enforced by a different agency in town. The ZEO does not work on Saturdays and would not have the ability to collect the facts.

Zoning Regulation Amendment (REG-0027-2026)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to continue the public hearing to June 15, 2026. Mr. Reichelt seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

A discussion was held about whether to hold the second item at this meeting or whether it should be held over to June 15.

ROSEMARIE P. CHIRICO – Zone change from Residence AA Zone to Rural Residence zone at 571 and 599 Porter Street. – Zone Change (ZC -0006-2026)

Zone Change (ZC-0006-2026)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to continue the public hearing to June 15, 2026. Mr. Schoeneberger seconded the motion. Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Ahsan, Mr. Schoeneberger, Mr. Reichelt, Mr. Shanbaum, Ms. Luna, Ms. Ike and Mr. Stebe voted to continue the public hearing to June 15, 2026. Mr. Prause voted against the motion. The motion passed eight to one.

The Public Hearing was closed at 10:40 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

June 15, 2026
Date

Michael Stebe, Chairperson

NOTICE: A DIGITAL RECORDING OF THIS PUBLIC HEARING CAN BE HEARD IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT.