

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, December 5, 2018
Clifford B. Green Meeting Center
69 South Main Street
6:30 p.m.**

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order** – M. Sigfridson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:36 p.m.
- II. Roll Call** – Michelle Sigfridson, Carleen Kelleher, Aaron Kerouac, Jules D’Agostino, Austin Tanner, Earl Starks.
- III. Seating of Alternates** – None.
- IV. Adoption of Minutes:** Regular Meeting Minutes November 7, 2018

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 7, 2018. Second by E. Starks.

Discussion:

Correction Noted by A. Tanner:

- Page 13, Third set of bullet items – Second bullet to read as follows, “He stated that the gravel bank on Day Street is short-term (5 years).”

Motion carried unanimously with the noted correction (6-0-0).

- V. Public Commentary** – None.

VI. Unfinished Business:

- a. Reading of Legal Notice** – Read by J. Roberson. Published in the Villager Newspaper on Friday, November 23, 2018, and Friday, November 30, 2018.
- b. Continued Public Hearings:** None.
- c. New Public Hearings:**
- 1. SD-18-003 Resubdivision of Grand View Acres** – Brooklyn Builders, LLC and Charlotte Larrow, Trustee, 8.22 acres, westerly end of Grand View Terrace (Assessor’s Map 33, Lot 36-1 through 36-6), Proposed reduction from 6 to 3 lots.

Paul Terwilleger, Licensed Surveyor, represented the Applicant and gave an overview:

- The property is an 8-acre parcel located at the end of Grand View Terrace which was part of an 11-lot subdivision that had been approved in 2007. An extension of Grand View Terrace with a cul-de-sac with six lots accessing from it had been proposed at that time. The six lots and the cul-de-sac were never built and the Town expired the subdivision.
- They are now proposing a common driveway on a 50-foot access strip with three lots accessing from it at the end of Grand View Terrace.
- In the R-30 Zone.
- One lot just over 2 acres, one lot almost 2.5 acres, and one lot over 3 acres.
- Soil testing was done on the original subdivision and they were able to utilize those results to determine the suitability for the septic systems. They all require engineer-designed septic systems.
- There is a high water table in that area (ground water 26 to 18 inches).
- He explained the proposed conceptual lot development: three houses; septic areas; the access (16-foot wide common driveway); drainage to come down along the driveway to a breaker strip at the low point in the driveway (which is a trench filled with stone to catch and slow down water runoff from the site); topography (he indicated the slopes – starts at 6 percent and it gets much steeper toward the open-space lot 15-20 percent and goes to a wetlands area at the bottom).
- Utilities: The proposal shows them to be served underground along the driveway (off of Grand View Terrace). However, CL&P has an easement to the east of the property. It is CL&P’s choice.

- He indicated a circular area where they are proposing to grant an easement to the Town which would enable the Town to make the cul-de-sac larger in the future. He explained that the current cul-de-sac, which is on a neighboring property for which an easement had been granted in the 1960's, is adequate, but smaller than what would be designed today. This proposed easement would extend onto the upper portion of the open-space lot (1/3 of the turn-around area).

J. Roberson displayed aerial photos and orientated the area.

- She explained that the subdivision had expired and that this proposal is a considerably smaller footprint and the density is much less. She explained that the open-space parcel and the road parcel had been conveyed to the Town after the subdivision had been previously approved and the Town still owns the open-space parcel, however, the parcel for the road had been conveyed back to the property owner. She explained that the open space has already been dedicated and that there is no reason for the Commission to revisit it. It is in excess of what is required by the Regulations and the Applicant has no interest in reclaiming any portion of it.
- She explained that drainage calculations had been done as part of the original subdivision. She indicated where a detention pond had been intended to be constructed at the bottom of the hill and she explained that, per Tom Rukstella (the Road Foreman), the Town never had any interest in owning the detention pond. The proposed development is significantly different to the point where the detention area is not necessary. She consulted with Syl Pauley, Town Engineer, and he does not feel that drainage calculations are needed for the current proposal unless the common driveway is paved. She noted that if the Owner chooses not to pave it at this time, it could be paved at some time in the future.
- She indicated where snow is currently plowed which is near where the proposed driveway is. She indicated that the snowmelt goes in a southwesterly direction down the slope. The Applicant has responded to Mr. Pauley's comments by extending the length of the paved apron from 30 feet to 80 feet at the longest point. Mr. Terwilleger clarified that they provided a 50-foot extension and that they have also provided a six-foot snow shelf on that side of the driveway (which would be on the Town's open space). Mr. Rukstella and Mr. Pauley visited the site and both have confirmed that this is a suitable and appropriate method of dealing with snow.
There was discussion and Ms. Roberson will research the language to see if the open space was conveyed with restrictive covenants to be permanently protected from development. Mr. Terwilleger made the lot line adjustment to make sure that the part containing the potential future cul-de-sac area would be all on one lot. The driveway would be owned by Lot #2. Ms. Roberson explained how the breaker strip works and she stated that the common driveway is close to the top of a very steep slope, the bottom of which is a wetlands system. She has discussed with Mr. Pauley who recommends extending the breaker strip approximately another 40 feet to the south to match the 220 contour to be sure that the breaker strip is completely along the low point of the driveway. She stated that there would be grading and silt fence and that there would be inspections throughout construction until the site is stabilized/re-vegetated.
- There is a width of 25 feet for vehicles to pass each other in the common driveway. Ms. Roberson indicated where another 6-foot snow shelf was added earlier in the day to the westerly side of the bend in the driveway.
- There is a need to keep sediment out of the breaker strip. She suggested that either the breaker strip be installed last or filter fabric could be placed over the top until the site is stabilized. Mr. Terwilleger stated that they can do something for this situation.

Mr. Terwilleger indicated the wetlands area and there was discussion regarding the flow of water. Ms. Roberson referred to the letter from Mr. Pauley dated December 5, 2018 (which had been provided to Commission Members). Mr. Terwilleger stated that it is more sheet flow.

Mark Souza, 97 Clearview Drive, asked for an explanation regarding the requirement of extending the road with catch basin, utilities and curbs to a common driveway. Mr. Terwilleger explained that it is because the Regulations allow for three lots off of one driveway.

Mark Duquette, 111 Clearview Drive, is concerned regarding the size of the lots and septic/wells. Mr. Terwilleger explained and indicated on the plan. The lots are roughly twice the size of the lots in the original subdivision. Mr. Duquette asked for a copy of the proposed plan. Ms. Roberson will provide a copy to him.

Amy Gottesdiener, Waterford, CT, who represented the owners of 134 Clearview Drive, voiced concern regarding snow placement. She stated that a drainage test should be done as if the driveway were paved. She questioned whether this is a new subdivision or is it being viewed as an existing subdivision that has expired.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that if the public hearing is closed tonight, it could be voted upon at this meeting. She explained that the original subdivision has expired and that the Commission had approved the application with six lots previously. Ms. Roberson explained that the Owner has the right to re-apply and the whole piece of land had been analyzed as part of that previous development proposal and the Commission is looking at it in the context of a development plan that never happened and the open space is carrying over. It was clarified that this is a new subdivision.

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, stated that he is in favor. He stated that only a portion of the subdivision was expired. Ms. Roberson explained that it was originally approved as an 11-lot subdivision, six of which were on a proposed road extension. Five of the lots were developed and at the time that the subdivision expired and there were six undeveloped lots left (which are the six lots in this Application).

A. Kerouac asked about utilities. There was discussion. They will be underground and Ms. Roberson explained that Mr. Terwilleger made an adjustment so that a trench would not have to be cut through the existing cul-de-sac. Mr. Terwilleger indicated where the utilities were originally to come in from the north side of the driveway apron. CL&P may require another pole.

Josh Wojcik, 131 Grand View Terrace, voiced concern regarding lines in front of his house (there are none there now). He asked if the developer would be required to cover the expense of the trench to put the utilities underground. Ms. Roberson explained that the Commission is not allowed to require it off the site of the subdivision. The Regulations only apply to the land owned by the Applicants.

Amy Gottesdiener asked if the five lots from the original subdivision that have houses on them would have anything to do with being able to stop a pole going in. Ms. Roberson stated that it does not relate.

J. D'Agostino noted that four of the people who would be affected by this development were either present or represented. He asked if they feel that this development would add value to their homes. One person was concerned about wells, another said she can't think of a reason why it would raise the value, another stated that it depends on what type of houses are built. Ms. Sigfridson pointed out that impact on property values is not something that weighs into the decision of the PZC.

There was discussion regarding the water table. Mr. Terwilleger explained that they will be standard engineered systems.

There was discussion regarding the turn-around. Ms. Roberson explained that a hammerhead turn-around does not comply with the Town's public improvement specifications and that making changes would require action by the Board of Selectmen. She stated that the PZC could make a recommendation.

Motion was made by J. D'Agostino to close the public hearing for Application **SD-18-003 Resubdivision of Grand View Acres** – Brooklyn Builders, LLC and Charlotte Larrow, Trustee, 8.22 acres, westerly end of Grand View Terrace (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 36-1 through 36-6), Proposed reduction from 6 to 3 lots. Second by A. Tanner. Motion carried unanimously (6-0-0).

d. Other Unfinished Business:

1. **SD-18-003 Resubdivision of Grand View Acres** – Brooklyn Builders, LLC and Charlotte Larrow, Trustee, 8.22 acres, westerly end of Grand View Terrace (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 36-1 through 36-6), Proposed reduction from 6 to 3 lots.

Amy Gottesdiener asked if action could be taken on the Application tonight with open items such as the drainage. Ms. Sigfridson explained that there is no rule that states that the Commission cannot act on the same day that an application is closed.

There was discussion regarding drainage.

Motion was made by A. Tanner to approve Application **SD-18-003 Resubdivision of Grand View Acres** – Brooklyn Builders, LLC and Charlotte Larrow, Trustee, 8.22 acres, westerly end of Grand View Terrace (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 36-1 through 36-6), Proposed reduction from 6 to 3 lots in the R-30 Zone in accordance with all final plans, documents and testimony submitted with the application and including the following conditions:

The following items shall be corrected on the Final Subdivision Plans which will be submitted in paper for checking to the Land Use Office prior to being printed on archival material (mylar):

- The stone breaker strip shall be extended an additional 40' \pm to the south to meet the existing elevation 220 in order to cover the entire low point of the driveway.
- The notes on sheet 4 shall be revised to state that the driveway shall remain unpaved. If a paved surface is proposed, a written drainage report shall be submitted to staff for review to ensure that downhill areas are not impacted by stormwater runoff.
- The "construction sequence" notes on sheet 5 shall be revised to show the installation of the breaker strip after the disturbed areas have been stabilized. If installed earlier, the breaker strip shall be protected with filter fabric to avoid the infiltration of sediment during construction and site stabilization.

Prior to the endorsement by the Commission of the Final Subdivision Plan(s) for filing in the office of the Town Clerk:

- The approval and/or review letters from the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission, the Northeast District Department of Health, and the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be added to the Final Subdivision Plan(s).
- The Common Driveway Use and Maintenance Agreement (in a form acceptable to the Town Attorney) shall be filed simultaneously with the recording of the subdivision mylars in the office of the Town Clerk.
- All boundary pins and monuments shall be set and field verified by the surveyor.

Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Permit on any lot:

- The developer shall notify the Zoning Enforcement Office and Town Planner at least seven days in advance of any site work to schedule a pre-construction meeting.
- Prior to any lots being developed, a driveway permit must be obtained from the Road Foreman in accordance with the adopted policy concerning driveways.

Second by J. D'Agostino.

There was discussion regarding the second bullet point:

- A. Kerouac is okay with the second sentence, but feels the first sentence should be removed. He feels that if it is ever proposed to pave it, a report would need to be submitted to Staff. The downhill parcel is owned by the Town and he feels it could be used for public benefit (e.g. a wildlife pond could be created).
- J. D'Agostino feels that the driveway should be paved because he feels there is a safety issue.
- A. Tanner asked if the Commission can require it to be paved since the Regulations say that it does not have to be paved.
- Ms. Sigfridson offered that unpaved is pervious surface (which is good). She feels that, since the Applicant has not provided drainage calculations for a paved driveway, it is within the Commission's rights to make a condition that the driveway remain unpaved.
- There was discussion regarding the Common Driveway Use and Maintenance Agreement. Lot #2 owns the driveway, but Lots #1 and #3 have some maintenance responsibility. Mr. D'Agostino expressed concern regarding if the driveway becomes unuseable. Ms. Sigfridson explained that the problem would be if runoff were to cause problems on neighboring properties.
- A. Tanner suggested removing the second bullet entirely. He feels that the three lots are large enough that runoff won't be an issue.
- C. Kelleher suggested leaving the first sentence and requiring that the driveway remain unpaved.
- J. Roberson referred to and read from Syl Pauley's letter in which he stated that if the driveway is to be paved, there should be drainage calculations.
- A. Kerouac feels that if there is an issue with drainage, it should have been addressed during the public hearing. He does not feel that it is appropriate for the Commission to specify the type of driveway.

The vote on this motion was tabled to January 2, 2019. (See Below).

Motion was made by A. Tanner to amend his motion to approve Application **SD 18-003 Resubdivision of Grand View Acres** by eliminating the second bullet point:

- The notes on sheet 4 shall be revised to state that the driveway shall remain unpaved. If a paved surface is proposed, a written drainage report shall be submitted to staff for review to ensure that downhill areas are not impacted by stormwater runoff.

Second by A. Kerouac.

There was discussion on the amendment to the original motion:

- C. Kelleher asked, once an application is approved, what kind of changes can be made and still adhere to the approval that was granted? For example, if it is stated that the driveway is not paved is it okay in the future if it is paved? J. Roberson stated that you do not need Town approval to pave your driveway. She explained that, if there were a condition of approval that it be unpaved, it could be enforced until the certificates of occupancy are issued for the houses. It was suggested to include in the maintenance agreement that, if the driveway is to be paved, drainage calculations be submitted and are subject to Town Engineer approval. Discussion continued. J. D'Agostino stated that he agrees with eliminating the first sentence of the second bullet point.

Vote on the amendment: Those in favor – A. Tanner and E. Starks. Those opposed – M Sigfridson, A. Kerouac, J. D'Agostino, and C. Kelleher.

Motion to amend the original motion failed (2-4-0).

Discussion regarding the original motion to approve:

M. Sigfridson stated that she does not agree with Mr. D'Agostino's suggestion to just eliminate the first sentence of the bullet point. She suggested that it be required that the Maintenance Agreement state that, if the driveway is to be paved, the ZEO, after consultation with the Town Engineer, give approval before paving. C. Kelleher suggested that the vote be tabled to allow J. Roberson time to research appropriate language.

The following was suggested by J. D'Agostino:

- Eliminate the first sentence of the second bullet point.
- Second sentence of the second bullet point to read as follows: If a paved surface is proposed, a written drainage report shall be submitted to staff for review and action to ensure that downhill areas are not substantially impacted by stormwater runoff.

Ms. Roberson stated that it is her understanding that just the Maintenance Agreement would be modified, not the plans. Mr. D'Agostino stated that he agrees.

Motion was made by J. D'Agostino to table the vote on **Motion 3**, the original motion to approve Application **SD 18-003 Resubdivision of Grand View Acres**, to the next regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on January 2, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. in the Clifford B. Green Meeting Center, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT. Second by C. Kelleher. Motion carried (5-1-0). A. Tanner was opposed.

2. Zoning Regulation Rewrite – Review of Comments from Public Information Session, text and zone boundary revisions (including the RB zone), etc. – See Below.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to move Agenda Item:

VI. Unfinished Business:

d. Other Unfinished Business:

2. Zoning Regulation Rewrite – Review of Comments from Public Information Session, text and zone boundary revisions (including the RB zone), etc.

to after

VII. New Business:

a. Applications:

1. SD-18-004 One-Lot Resubdivision – Dennis Beausoleil, 90 Creamery Brook Road (Assessor's Map 32, Lot 120).

Second by A. Tanner. Motion carried unanimously (6-0-0).

VII. New Business:

a. Applications:

- 1. SD-18-004 One-lot Resubdivision** – Dennis Beausoleil, 90 Creamery Brook Road (Assessor's Map 32, Lot 120).

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, represented the Applicant and gave an overview. He provided copies of information to the Commission Members (2002 map and approvals of subdivision – mylars had never been filed).

- One lot has a house on it and the other lot is vacant. The deed for the lot with the house states "as per subdivision map."
- Mr. Beausoleil has been paying taxes on both parcels since 2002. (Ms. Roberson stated that the assessments start when the subdivision is granted.)
- They need to get the subdivision approved again with new maps.
- Both lots are in the R-30 Zone.
- The acreage has changed since 2002.
- They have received approval from the Health Department.

There was discussion and Mr. Archer stated that this should be looked at as a new subdivision and he explained that Lots 120-1 and 120-2 are not on the same lot because several different subdivisions had happened previously. Ms. Roberson explained that this meets the definition of a resubdivision and that this is a corrective resubdivision. Extensions had not been requested.

Mr. Archer asked that the Commission waive the open space fee since Mr. Beausoleil has paid taxes since 2002. Ms. Roberson will research whether an open space fee had been paid earlier.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to schedule a public hearing for **SD-18-004 One-lot Resubdivision** – Dennis Beausoleil, 90 Creamery Brook Road (Assessor's Map 32, Lot 120) for the next regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on January 2, 2019, at 6:30 p.m. in the Clifford B. Green Meeting Center, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT. Second by A. Tanner. Motion carried unanimously (6-0-0).

The following was moved from above:

VI. Unfinished Business:

d. Other Unfinished Business:

- 2. Zoning Regulation Rewrite** – Review of Comments from Public Information Session, text and zone boundary revisions (including the RB zone), etc.

Ms. Roberson redistributed copies of comments from J. D'Agostino (dated September 18, 2018).

Ms. Roberson suggested that the Commission discuss:

- Route 169 Zone Boundary
- Affordable Housing

ROUTE 169 OVERLAY ZONE BOUNDARY

Ms. Roberson provided copies of a parcel-based draft map to Commission Members (dated October 24, 2018). The boundaries of the Zone are based on parcels selected because they either have frontage on Route 169 or they are very close. M. Sigfridson expressed that she likes this draft map. J. D'Agostino stated that he does not like the draft map as he feels it is a compromise from the 500 feet and what is visible from the road. Ms. Roberson explained that it would remove the 500 feet and would say, any one of the parcels provided it is visible from the road. There was discussion. Ms. Roberson explained that if you own one of the parcels in the hatched area on the map, and you want to build something and it is visible from Route 169, then it would be subject to the design guidelines of the Zone. She stated that the parcel ID would be known. Discussion continued. Ms. Roberson and Ms. Sigfridson noted that nobody at the Public Information Session expressed opposition. Mr. D'Agostino is no longer opposed and he stated that he has been convinced that it is a lot more fair.

Ms. Sigfridson suggested the following language: Parcels with frontage and in view of the road. Ms. Roberson stated that a couple of parcels on Blackwell Terrace were also included. She said that it can be adjusted.

Ms. Sigfridson asked if the Commission Members were okay with this to move forward. There were no comments made – Consensus to go with the parcel-based map and Ms. Roberson will adjust the text accordingly.

Ms. Sigfridson commented about indoor recreation which had only been added in the VCD. She suggested that it may be appropriate to add it to the RB and PC Zones and that it should be by special permit. There was discussion. Ms. Sigfridson asked if anyone was opposed.

- J. D'Agostino stated that he is okay with it as long as it is not allowed in the RA Zone. However, he feels that Indoor Sports and Recreation should not be allowed in the VCD or any zone where there is a residential aspect.
- C. Kelleher stated that it may not be appropriate to add it to the RB which is supposed to be for limited traffic. She also stated that the one in the VCD was approved in its location, but it doesn't mean that something would be approved in a similar location in that zone.
- A. Kerouac commented that there is one NB parcel that would work.

It was decided for Ms. Roberson will add it to the Draft Regulations as a special permit use in the commercial zones where it would be appropriate. She will look at other use designations across all zones.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

J. Roberson provided copies of the Draft Regulations for Section 6.E – Multi-Family Development (dated July 3, 2018) and another information sheet containing her suggestions for revisions to the Draft.

There was discussion regarding deed restrictions. After researching, Ms. Roberson found that wealthier people will still be able to easily out-compete less wealthy people for these units.

NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONE:

- Multi-families (defined in the Regulations as 3 or more units) had been taken out of a previous Draft because no lots meet the minimum lot size of 5 acres. However, there are many MF's already in the NC Zone (on South Main Street there are 11 properties – total of 46 units), so the current Draft removed the minimum lot size for existing buildings on sewer.

There was discussion regarding reducing the minimum lot size requirement for MF's in the RA Zone. There are different densities based on whether water and sewer are available. Currently, if water and sewer are available, you are allowed 8.6 units per acre, so if you have five acres, you can have 21 units. Ms. Roberson commented that the 5-acre requirement is a serious impediment to creating multi-families and she suggested that if the minimum lot size were reduced to 2.5 acres, it would allow 4 dwelling units per acre – 10 units total.

Ms. Roberson's suggestion is to remove the minimum lot size for MF's in the NC Zone for existing buildings (as of a certain date). The NC Zone has water and sewer throughout. She suggested the following language: Everywhere where there is water and sewer, there is no minimum lot size for MF's. There was discussion regarding where there is water and sewer in the RA Zone.

A. Kerouac expressed discomfort with the suggestion being so specific. He is concerned with two definitions for MF's (PZC's and the Assessor's). He is okay with the 3-4 unit residences in the NC, but he is not in favor of removing the lot size restriction if it would mean large apartment buildings in the NC. Ms. Roberson stated that the biggest lot in the NC is 1.3 acres. There was discussion regarding the different existing buildings in Town that have multi-units. M. Sigfridson suggested keeping the minimum density per dwelling unit on public sewer and water as in the current Regulations regardless of the zone on properties with water and sewer. Discussion continued.

J. Roberson stated that super density is appropriate in some areas and inappropriate in other areas and she suggested looking at the minimum lot size and the density. She stated that it is by special permit.

A. Kerouac is okay with reducing the minimum lot size for 3-4 units, but not for 5-plus MF's. M. Sigfridson suggested that there could be two definitions. A. Kerouac suggested MF Residential and MF Commercial. Ms. Sigfridson suggested 3-5 unit structure be called a MF and that more than 5 units be called an apartment complex or a MF complex (she suggests not using the word commercial because of the way it is used elsewhere in the Regulations).

Mr. Kerouac asked if this is achieving the goals regarding the POCD as he feels this is taking that part of the Town in a completely different direction.

There was discussion regarding the apartment complexes near the Fairgrounds and on Anderson Road. She said that there is a need and that she would like to see 200 units go in the mill that was approved. She does not want to say that we don't need any more apartment buildings in Brooklyn, but she feels that we should be careful about where they would go. C. Kelleher stated that this is her concern also.

Ms. Roberson does not know why the minimum lot size of 5 acres was implemented in the past, but she feels it doesn't make sense today, especially in the NC Zone where the biggest lot is 1.3 acres. M. Sigfridson feels that applying the same standard to all of the different zones does not make sense. Discussion continued. Ms. Roberson suggested that language regarding community wells could be added. Ms. Roberson will look at the term: "Public" water and sewer. Ms. Roberson displayed and explained aerial photos.

Ms. Roberson would like to see what the minimum MF lot size is in comparable local towns. C. Kelleher feels that there is a need for condo housing in Brooklyn also.

There was discussion regarding mandatory set-aside and the suggestion of elimination due to income verification. Who would verify income? Ms. Roberson will make inquiries. Discussion continued. Ms. Roberson had spoken to Joe Voccio, in the past, and he had indicated that there is a need for a few of the larger developments in places with sewer. J. D'Agostino suggested looking at the map and to figure out where it all can fit in Town and then make the Regulations fit that. A. Kerouac agreed with Mr. D'Agostino.

Ms. Roberson will keep working on affordable housing and will make inquiries with agencies to see if there is someone who will do income verification. She thinks the Housing Authority may. There was discussion regarding inmates at the jail being considered residents of Brooklyn for the Affordable Housing Appeals List.

Mr. D'Agostino asked the Commission Members to review the sheet of his concerns (dated September 18, 2018), that had been provided, to be discussed at a future meeting.

b. Other:

1. Review of 2019 Meeting Dates

A. Tanner suggested that all meetings, twice per month, be regular meetings. The second meeting of each month to be a planning meeting. Ms. Roberson will check for room availability to move the July 3rd meeting to either July 2nd, July 9th or July 10th, or to cancel the first meeting and to just have one meeting in July.

The Commission discussed and agreed upon the following 2019 Schedule of Regular Meetings:

- January 2, 2019 and January 15, 2019
- February 6, 2019 and February 19, 2019
- March 6, 2019 and March 19, 2019 (3/19 meeting to be held in the Senior Center due to a conflict with the Board of Finance)
- April 3, 2019 and April 16, 2019
- May 1, 2019 and May 21, 2019
- June 5, 2019 and June 18, 2019
- Date for first meeting in July to be determined and July 16, 2019
- August 7, 2019 and August 20, 2019
- September 4, 2019 and September 17, 2019
- October 2, 2019 and October 15, 2019

- November 6, 2019 and November 19, 2019
- December 4, 2019 and December 17, 2019

VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees:

1. Budget – Included in packets to Commission Members.
2. Correspondence – None.
3. ZEO's Report – Included in packets to Commission Members. Martha Fraenkel may attend in January.
4. Chairman's Report – None.

It was decided not to have a special meeting this month (December 2018). The Public Information Session will be a third meeting in January 2019. Ms. Roberson will notice the Public Information Session after January 1st.

There was discussion regarding the possibility of the EDC disbanding and inviting those remaining three Members to become PZC Members.

IX. Public Commentary

Jo-Ann Perreault, St. Regis Drive, asked that the Commission consider the fact that a lot of people are crossing our borders and that a lot of people feel that we should not even have borders. These people will need affordable housing and they are not going to stay near the border where they crossed into this country. We should be willing to welcome them by providing affordable housing and we should not say, "Not in my backyard."

X. Adjourn

M. Sigfridson adjourned the meeting at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Secretary