

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting  
Wednesday, May 5, 2021  
6:30 p.m.**

**To join this meeting, click link below or follow the below instructions for web or phone:**

<https://townofbrooklyn.my.webex.com/townofbrooklyn.my/j.php?MTID=m03cff485e32a4158afe905fc971a3c27>

**Web**

**Go to [www.webex.com](http://www.webex.com)**

**Click sign in**

**On the top right, click Join a Meeting**

**Enter meeting ID: 126 815 8731**

**Enter meeting password: First**

**Phone**

**Dial 1-415-655-0001**

**Enter meeting number: 126 815 8731**

**Enter meeting password: 34778**

**You can bypass attendee number by pressing #**

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order** – Michelle Sigfridson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

**II. Roll Call** – Carlene Kelleher, Austin Tanner, Earl Starks, Allen Fitzgerald, John Haefele, Seth Pember, Jimmy Thayer, Michelle Sigfridson.  
Charles Sczuroski was absent with notice.

**Staff Present:** Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development.

**Also Present:** Paul Lehto; Richard Klingensmith; Norm Thibeault, Killingly Engineering Associates; David Held, Provost and Rovero; Madilyn Smith, Corporate Counsel for Rawson Materials; Bruce Woodis, KWP Associates.

**III. Seating of Alternates**

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to seat Alternates John Haefele, Seth Pember and Jimmy Thayer as Voting Members for this meeting. Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.  
Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

**IV. Adoption of Minutes:** Regular Meeting April 7, 2021

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 7, 2021.  
Second by J. Haefele. No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: A. Tanner – yes; C. Kelleher – yes; E. Starks – yes; A. Fitzgerald – yes; J. Haefele – yes; S. Pember – yes; J. Thayer – yes; M. Sigfridson – yes.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0-0).

**V. Public Commentary** – None.

**VI. Unfinished Business:**

a. **Reading of Legal Notice:** Read aloud by Jana Roberson. Copy of the Order is available on the Town of Brooklyn website. Noticed on the Town's website on April 12, 2021.

b. **New Public Hearings:**

1. **Enforcement SPG 20-001:** Cease & Desist Order (C&DO) issued to Paul Lehto for violations of the Gravel Special Permit conditions at his property at the eastern end of River Walk Drive (71 acres, Assessor's Map 32, Lot 148), status hearing as per Sec. 9.D.8.5. of the Zoning Regulations.

J. Roberson gave the background:

- A Cease & Desist Order was issued.
- As discussed at the last PZC meeting (April 7, 2021) a contractor working for Mr. Lehto conducted some work on the property prematurely, which was out of compliance with the scope of the permit and also involved wetlands violation. Ms. Roberson asked that Margaret Washburn, ZEO, describe the conditions that were out of scope of the Gravel Special Permit.
- Ms. Roberson gave an overview of the process because this is a fairly unusual event:
  - Public Hearing to discuss the status of the Cease & Desist Order within the context of whether the conditions of the Order have been met or not (list of ten items, as outlined by the ZEO, included in packets to Commission Members).
  - Hear testimony / receive evidence.
  - The respondent is to be given a chance to reply/comment to each of the ten items.
  - Option are to close the Hearing and take action or continue it the Hearing.

Margaret Washburn asked if everyone had received her Revised Cease & Desist Order to remediate. Ms. Sigfridson stated that it had been included in their materials. Ms. Washburn commented on the following Conditions of the Gravel Special Permit:

- Condition #2 was not done – Performance Bond was not submitted. Ms. Washburn stated that Mr. Lehto has a long history of operating at the same site without a bond in place prior to this Application.
- Condition #3: Limits of disturbance were not flagged in the field by a licensed land surveyor; Property lines within 300' of the area of disturbance were not flagged.
- Condition #4 – Ms. Washburn stated that when she and Ms. Roberson went to inspect the site on March 23, 2021, the erosion and sediment control measures were not installed properly.

Ms. Washburn commented on the following Conditions of the Enforcement Order:

- #1 – Ms. Washburn stated that, as far as she can tell, this item has been adhered to. She did an inspection yesterday.
- #2 – Mr. Lehto attended that PZC meeting of April 7, 2021.
- #3 – Performance Bond has not been posted. Ms. Washburn stated that Mr. Lehto failed to take advantage of the very liberal bonding agreement of being able to bond in phases offered by the PZC.
- #4 – Thirty days have passed and no remediation plan has been submitted showing any of the six items required in this Condition.
- #5 – There has been no land surveyor staking reference points in the field showing limits of disturbance shown on the Plan.
- #6 – There has been no land surveyor flagging in the field all property lines within 300' of the area that has been disturbed as of 3/23/2021.
- #7 – There has been no land surveyor staking reference points in the field showing the limits of the 6.7 acres of land where excavation was approved under the Notice of Decision dated 9/28/2020.
- #8 – There has been no land surveyor submit a plan showing the width of the access road on the approved plan in areas where the road was widened without permission.

- #9 – As of yesterday, Mr. Lehto was still trying to re-install erosion and sediment controls, so that was not done in a timely manner.
- #10 – Ms. Washburn stated that, as far as she knows, this was not done.

Ms. Washburn stated that we have not had compliance and the Town was strongly urged that, after this Hearing, if the bond was not posted, the PZC should consider rescinding and revoking the Permit. Ms. Washburn stated that, up until the last week, after Mr. Lehto received the Cease & Desist Order, he told her that she was not allowed to go to the site. She had clarified to him that because he had the Permit, she was allowed to go to the site.

#### **Richard Klingensmith, Operator Comments:**

Mr. Klingensmith explained that when he first met Mr. Lehto (about four months ago), it was not their intention to go behind any Town Official or Regulations. He explained that he feels there was miscommunication between them. He said that when he works at a property, the landowner usually pulls the permit or it has already been done. He referred to the photos from the site inspection with Ms. Roberson and Ms. Washburn (included in packets to Commission Members) and said that the work shown in those photos had been done in early December, before he received paperwork from Ms. Roberson or Mr. Lehto (forwarded from the person that did the site work). Mr. Klingensmith explained that he did find out about the need for a bond (of at least \$10,000 to cover the driveway leading back) until after the ground was already disturbed and he apologized for this. He said that Mr. Lehto assumed that he knew the rules.

Mr. Klingensmith stated that he proposed an idea to Ms. Roberson a couple of months ago to try to resolve the Phase One/Phase Two issue by putting less money up and by doing Phase One first, and then finish Phase Two. He said that Ms. Roberson thought that this may possibly work if the Townspeople approved. He feels that everything can be fixed if we all work together. He feels that he and Mr. Lehto could work on addressing the bond issue and straighten out the phases in the back and the ground being disturbed. He originally thought that Phase Two was Phase One and he suggested revisiting and making Phase Two Phase One since it is all ready to go. He said that he would appreciate having more time to make things right.

#### **Paul Lehto's Comments:**

Mr. Lehto stated that Ms. Washburn's comment that he did not have a bond for a previous gravel operation is wrong. He explained that he still has a cash bond which the Town is holding. He explained that he held the cash bond and Rawson bailed on him and never reclaimed the property. Therefore, he now makes the contractor take the bond out. He said that in his contract with Mr. Klingensmith, it is stated that Mr. Klingensmith is responsible for everything required by the Town and that he is not to do anything that goes against Brooklyn rules or he will be thrown out. He said that he told Mr. Klingensmith not to start yet because he had to get a bond and do all the rules of the Town, but Mr. Lehto did give him permission for the following:

- To do a test pit (correctly and then put the loam back), but he said that Mr. Klingensmith disturbed approximately 10,000 square feet of land just to do a test pit (Phase One). He said that he understands why he cut into the slope because you can't drive a machine down a steep slope and he did get too close to Regis' property. He said that everything Mr. Klingensmith did was wrong.

- Patched asphalt on the entry road coming in. Grade the area to have access to the land.
- To install the silt fence.

Mr. Lehto stated that he did not know that Mr. Klingensmith started in December. He said that he called Mr. Klingensmith immediately when he got the notice and he could not believe what he saw. He said that he is speaking with local contractors to replace Mr. Klingensmith.

Mr. Lehto stated that he fixed the wetlands and then he replaced all of the silt fence that was incorrectly installed by Mr. Klingensmith. Mr. Lehto stated that he would like to straighten this out and get a new contractor who is experienced and who he knows, who will get their own bond and their own surveyor and everything that the PZC requires.

Mr. Lehto stated that he asked Mr. Klingensmith to fix the damages that he caused, but he totally ignores him. Mr. Lehto stated that he understands that he is responsible for the contractor that he hired.

### **Richard Klingensmith**

Mr. Klingensmith stated that he is shocked by Mr. Lehto's comments and that he has an agreement with Mr. Lehto signed at the end of December 2020. Work was done prior to that, there was no hiding of anything and he was being told what to do. Within a day of the last PZC meeting (April 7, 2021) Mr. Lehto told him to stay off of the property. He said that he is trying to move forward by doing the right thing. He explained that because of the heavy rain (which washed out the road), he was trying to protect the wetlands (which disturbed the little crossing). Ms. Washburn told him that he was supposed to contact her first, but he was unaware of that. He said that he learned a lot from Ms. Roberson and Ms. Washburn. He said that he followed Ms. Washburn's Cease & Desist Order. He said that Mr. Lehto asked him to come back and do some work two weeks ago, but he did not.

Mr. Klingensmith stated that Mr. Lehto had told him that the road, near the small culvert, has always been widened out and that he does it every year. Mr. Klingensmith said that he has pictures from before he even went on the property and that any Inland/Wetlands specialist would say that it hasn't been disturbed for many years.

Mr. Klingensmith stated that his character is to do things the right way and that he would like to do more work in the Town of Brooklyn.

Ms. Roberson clarified, for the record, the following:

- On December 7, 2020, via e-mail, she sent Mr. Klingensmith a copy of the Notice of Action which is the certified letter that had been sent to Mr. Lehto in September of 2020. This lists all of the requirements including the reference to the plans and the requirement that there be a bond posted prior to any work being conducted.

Margaret Washburn stated that when she first started working for the Town of Brooklyn about two years ago, she had asked other Staff in the Land Use Office and Staff in the Finance Office if the Town held any bond from previous work Mr. Lehto did down there and was always told "no" by everybody. So, as far as she

knows, the Town has no proof that there is any previous bond held for that property.

**John Haefele** asked why there was no attempt made to comply with the Cease & Desist Order.

**Mr. Lehto responded:**

- He stated that he asked Mr. Klingensmith to help with the wetland crossing and the silt fence since he caused the problem, but he wouldn't help. Mr. Lehto stated that he had previously thrown Mr. Klingensmith off of the property.
- Regarding the other items, Mr. Lehto stated that he has contacted Paul Archer to do the required surveying work.
- Mr. Lehto stated that he does not intend to post the bond. He intends to get another contractor and they will post the bond. He does not want to be stuck with a stripped gravel bank with no recourse other than Court to make them finish to reclaim the property. He said that Rob Joly, who is familiar with the process, is very interested and he feels that it is not that bad and that he can fix everything.
- Mr. Lehto summarized what he would like:
  - To get a new contractor to get it fixed/corrected and to post the bond.
  - He is waiting for Paul Archer, the surveyor, to He said that Mr. Archer is willing to do it, but he is very busy at this time. Mr. Lehto stated that he does not feel that it is an emergency. He said that there is no erosion and everything is stabilized and safe, the road is blocked and nobody is allowed down there. He would like to be given more time to wait for the surveyor to be able to do the work properly.
  - Then, meet with the Town again and have a plan.
  - He feels this would be the best thing for everyone.
- Mr. Lehto stated that he plans to have solar panels coming in in two years, for which, the gravel needs to be level.
- Mr. Lehto stated that he is committed, as part of the bond, to replace all of the asphalt on the road coming in as it is in terrible shape.

**Mr. Klingensmith** stated, for the record, that there is no wording in his December 2020 contract with Mr. Lehto regarding that he or his company was supposed to put up the bond.

**Ms. Sigfridson** reminded Mr. Klingensmith that this Public Hearing is not about the agreement/contract between him and Mr. Lehto. It is regarding the permit that the Town issued to Mr. Lehto, not a forum for the dispute between him and Mr. Lehto. **Mr. Klingensmith responded:**

He asked the Townspeople, if you knew how important the rules and regulations were, why would you say it's okay to bring a bulldozer down and do all of those things?

**Ms. Washburn** disagreed with what Mr. Lehto said regarding that the site is stabilized. She stated that the vast majority of the site is completely unstable including on steep slopes.

**Mr. Lehto responded:**

He said that there is an area that has no vegetation where the logger built a crossing over the brook (he referred to the map). He said that Mr. Klingensmith did not go in that area other than to install the silt fence. He explained that here was no

excavation there and that reason there is no vegetation is that kids go there will bikes and tear up that big hill all summer. He said that he and his helper have properly re-installed the silt fence in all of the areas that were disturbed by Mr. Klingensmith. He said that he had put some logs across the path to try to stop the kids from crossing that way, but he feels that they will find a way around it. He said that he doesn't see where anything is going to go anywhere. He said the site is very stable and he would be there tomorrow to make it more stable if an area where there is any erosion were pointed out by Ms. Washburn.

**Ms. Sigfridson** asked about the statement made at the previous meeting, that they couldn't get a bond for the property. She asked what the problem is.

**Mr. Lehto responded:**

He explained that Mr. Klingensmith was unable to get a bond due to the way it is written up (three companies denied it). Mr. Lehto stated that he would put up a cash bond on the asphalt because the contractor is not responsible for the asphalt, but the contractor would have to cover the rest of the gravel bond.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** asked why Mr. Lehto would not allow Ms. Washburn on the property.

**Mr. Lehto responded:**

Mr. Lehto stated that he only has hearsay of unprofessional conduct.

**Mr. Thayer** asked if there was documented requests to access the property during that timeframe.

**Ms. Washburn responded:**

She stated that has the right to go there by virtue of the permit being in place. An Administrative Search Warrant was published in the newspaper when the IWWC made a decision to uphold their Enforcement Order.

**Mr. Pember** asked Mr. Lehto, if the PZC were to grant a continuance on the permit, what would the timeline be to get into compliance with the ten items listed.

**Mr. Lehto responded:**

He wants a new contractor to get a bond.

He wants to get a surveyor (for which he said he has a schedule).

He said he could get back with the timeline. He said that he believes Joly is ready to go. He said that he cannot put a timetable on Mr. Archer as he does not have control over Mr. Archer's schedule. Mr. Lehto stated that he does not see why it has to be urgent.

**Mr. Haefele** commented, respectfully, that what Mr. Lehto is saying is that he does not know when he can get into compliance, he does not plan on doing any work to bring it into compliance, and the PZC should just hold their breath until he is ready.

**Mr. Lehto** responded that he cannot get Paul Archer there at a certain time because he has a schedule.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to close the public hearing for **Enforcement SPG 20-001: Cease & Desist Order (C&DO)** issued to Paul Lehto for violations of the Gravel Special Permit conditions at his property at the eastern end of River Walk Drive (71 acres, Assessor's Map 32, Lot 148), status hearing as per Sec. 9.D.8.5. of the Zoning Regulations.

Second by E. Starks. No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: C. Kelleher – yes; E. Starks – yes; A. Fitzgerald – yes; J. Haefele – yes; S. Pember – yes; J. Thayer – yes; M. Sigfridson – yes.

Motion carried (7-0-0). Mr. Tanner did not vote and did not state abstention.

c. **Continued Public Hearings: None.**

d. **Other Unfinished Business:**

1. **Enforcement SPG 20-001:** Cease & Desist Order (C&DO) issued to Paul Lehto for violations of the Gravel Special Permit conditions at his property at the eastern end of River Walk Drive (71 acres, Assessor's Map 32, Lot 148), status hearing as per Sec. 9.D.8.5. of the Zoning Regulations.

J. Roberson explained, for the Commission, the options for taking action (rescind or provide an additional time period to achieve the eight of the ten items in the Enforcement Order that have not been met.

Her understanding, at this point, is that Mr. Lehto has failed to meet Conditions 2, 3 and 4 of his Gravel Special Permit as outlined in his Notice of Decision. He has also failed to comply with requirements 3 through 10 of his Cease & Desist Order.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to rescind and revoke Gravel Special Permit SPG 20-001 issued to Paul Lehto on September 15, 2020 for failure to comply with the conditions of the approval as follows:

- Conditions 2, 3 and 4 of his Gravel Special Permit as outlined in his Notice of Decision.
- And for failure to comply with Requirements 3 through 10 of the Enforcement Order issued on March 31, 2021 by the Zoning Enforcement Officer as per Sec. 9.D.8.5 of the Brooklyn Zoning Regulations.

Second by C. Kelleher.

Discussion:

- Ms. Sigfridson noted that she did not hear either of the parties involved attempt to make any claim that they were in compliance with the conditions of either the permit or the Cease & Desist Order. There was a lot of blaming, but there was acknowledgement that the conditions were not met. She feels that revocation is appropriate.
- Mr. Fitzgerald stated that he never voted for the permit approval, history, failure to comply, finger pointing, no plan to remediate the property in the near future.

Roll Call Vote: E. Starks – yes; A. Fitzgerald – yes; J. Haefele – yes; S. Pember – yes; J. Thayer – yes; A. Tanner – yes; C. Kelleher – yes; M. Sigfridson – yes.

Motion carried (8-0-0).

There was discussion regarding steps for remediation of the property. Ms. Washburn explained that Staff can issue citations because the Compliance Order has lapsed. If the citations are not paid, then a Judgement Citation Officer can take it to Superior Court. Ultimately the goal is to ask the Judge to ask the Court to uphold the enforcement and require it. Ms. Roberson stated that it is a simultaneous IWWC Violation Order. Ms. Roberson stated that this reinforces the importance of having the performance bond in place. Ms. Roberson will research to give a better answer to this question. Discussion continued.

2. **GBR 21-001** – Application to renew **SPG 19-001 Gravel Special Permit** - HM & E Co, LLC/Applicant, E. Arters/Owner, 120 acres, 291 Canterbury Road (Assessor's Map 23, Lot 1; Map 22 Lot 1-2; Map 22, Lot 1-4), Phased excavation of approximately 20,000 cubic yards of rock.

Norm Thibeault, Killingly Engineering Associates, represented the Applicant and gave an overview:

- Renewal of permit approved in March 2019.
- Very low-key operation - mine 1,200 to 1,500 tons of rock per year.

- They blast doing a small charge split to separate the rock from the rock face, pull it down with machines. They split the stone by hand, stack it on pallets and it is taken off the site by their buyers.
- The operation, in one form or another, has been in existence since the mid 1950's.
- There was a site walk with Ms. Roberson and Ms. Washburn on April 20<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Harton, the operator, explained the method by which they do the rock excavation. It is a slow process.

Mr. Harton feels that, with the 20,000 cubic yards permitted for under this permit, there is probably 20 years of rock, at the rate that they are going. He has a request to increase his production to do more out there, but this is only one of several projects that he is working on and there is only so much that they can produce out of this quarry. He does not have a desire to do any more than what they do on an annual basis, at this time.

A concern of Ms. Roberson and Ms. Washburn regarding storage and stockpiling of unusable rock – Mr. Harton explained that when they get too large for the site to support them, they truck them off site. They do have a permit to bring in a crusher on an as-needed basis, but Mr. Harton explained that they do not have the time to do that at this time and they would have to find a market for it (something this quarry is not known for).

- Footprint of existing disturbance is approximately one acre.
- Total footprint of the disturbance permitted for is approximately 2.5 acres.
- There was very little activity on the site last year due to COVID. Mr. Thibeault explained that he had contacted Ms. Roberson regarding a situation where they had an overhang of ledge and a blasting permit was issued to remove that dangerous situation from the quarry. There has been no other blasting since then.
- The site is in fairly good condition. The original approval required that they put in a larger pipe at a crossing a little further south on the property, but there was solid ledge in the proposed area. So, instead they cleaned out the channel where the existing pipe was (removing the stuff that was blocking the channel and causing the issues). The existing 24-inch RCP in place there is in very good condition and there is no evidence of overtopping the road at any time.

Ms. Roberson stated that she nor Ms. Washburn had any concerns. It is a well-managed site. Concern about unusable material and where to put it is very typical of rock quarries. The site has a very small footprint and there is nowhere to go. She and Ms. Washburn are satisfied that they are doing the best that they can managing the material that they have. The Regulations provide that a renewal may go up to two years and she recommended renewing the permit for an additional two years.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to renew the existing Gravel Special Permit SPG 19-001 issued on April 3, 2019 and tolled by Executive Order 7JJ by an additional two years. The next permit renewal date is April 3, 2023. The renewal procedure shall be as specified in Section 6.O.7 of the Brooklyn Zoning Regulations.

Second by E. Starks.

No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: A. Fitzgerald – yes; J. Haefele – yes; S. Pember – yes; J. Thayer – yes; A. Tanner – yes; C. Kelleher – yes; E. Starks – yes; M. Sigfridson – yes.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0-0).



## **VII. New Business:**

### **a. Applications:**

1. **GBR 21-002** – Application to renew **SPG 19-003 Gravel Special Permit** – Strategic Commercial Realty, dba Rawson Materials, 30 acres, southeast side of Maynard Road (Assessor's Map 29, Lot 5; Phased excavation of approximately 1.05 million cubic yards of gravel.
2. **GBR 21-003** – Application to renew **SPG 19-00 Gravel Special Permit** – Strategic Commercial Realty, dba Rawson Materials, River Junction Estates, LLC/Owner, 206 acres, southerly of Rukstela Road (Assessor's Map 21, Lot 7; Map 30, Lot 16), Phased excavation of approximately 1.945 million cubic yards of gravel.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that both of the above Applications could be addressed simultaneously.

David Held, Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor with Provost and Rovero, represented the Applicant for both **SPG 19-003** and **SPG 19-004**. Mr. Held stated that Attorney Madilyn Smith, Corporate Counsel for Rawson Materials, was also present.

Mr. Held stated the following regarding both Renewal Applications:

- No work related to the gravel excavation has started on either site. They are just looking for two-year renewals as allowed by the Gravel Regulations.
- There has been some work on the Rukstela Road property related to the Quinebaug Solar Project which is not related to the gravel excavation.

Ms. Sigfridson asked why no work has been done.

Mr. Held responded that it is a matter of the amount of materials that Rawson Materials can run through their plant. He explained that the Canterbury plant, which is where the material would go, is being maxed-out in capacity due to the Quinebaug Solar Project which is where their efforts have been concentrated for the past year.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if Ms. Washburn had been able to inspect the sites. Ms. Roberson stated that one of the sites, you could drive by and see that there is no activity. She stated that the other one (Rukstela Road) is access limited, but Mr. Held has reported and confirmed that the solar farm installation has been started, but that Rawson had not conducted any of the activity related to gravel removal.

Mr. Held stated that he had completed an inspection of that site when the renewal application was submitted. Work had been done relating to the solar installation in the permitted excavation area (eastern and western excavation areas). The eastern area had been previously excavated six or seven years ago and there was a large bowl from that excavation. As part of the solar construction, the bottom of that bowl has been fine graded to create a flat pad and they installed a storm water infiltration basin and they are using that as staging area for construction work. That work is not being done by Rawson Material – it is being done by the solar contractor of that project.

Ms. Roberson stated that the solar project is not under the jurisdiction of the PZC. It is not Rawson's project. Ms. Roberson stated that there are two letters from Mr. Held (as part of the Application).

Ms. Roberson commented regarding that they are looking for a two-year renewal. She said that when the permits were applied for, the Board made it very clear that they wanted a one-year renewal due to the scale of the project and the fact that it was quite large in scope and volume. She explained that while the Regulations do permit a renewal period of up to two years, you may do less. Mr. Thayer voiced agreement with a one-year renewal to be sure everything is in compliance. Ms. Sigfridson also voiced agreement and asked if anyone felt strongly otherwise. There were no comments.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to renew for one year the existing Gravel Special Permit SPG 19-003 and the existing Gravel Special Permit SPG-004, both issued on June 3, 2020 and tolled by Executive Order 7JJ. The next permit renewal date is June 3, 2022. The renewal procedure shall be as specified in Section 6.O.7 of the Brooklyn Zoning Regulations.

Second by J. Haefele.

No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: J. Haefele – yes; S. Pember – yes; J. Thayer – yes; A. Tanner – yes; C. Kelleher – yes; E. Starks – yes; A. Fitzgerald – yes; M. Sigfridson – yes.

Motion carried unanimously (8-0-0).

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to add item **VII.a.3** to the agenda as:

**SP 21-001** - Special Permit Application to replace a building and building additions at 311 Allen Hill Road, Brooklyn Self-Storage, LLC, 10 acres, west side of Allen Hill Road.

Second by E. Starks. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (8-0-0).

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule a public hearing on **SP 21-001 – Special Permit Application** to replace a building and building additions at 311 Allen Hill Road, Brooklyn Self-Storage, LLC, 10 acres, west side of Allen Hill Road for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on June 2, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. via Webex meeting.

Second by E. Starks. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (8-0-0).

Bruce Woodis, KWP Associates, who was in attendance to represent the Applicant, thanked the Commission.

Ms. Roberson stated that when she posts the public hearing notice, she will send information to the Commission Members so they will have it well in advance of the next meeting.

b. **Other New Business:** None.

## **VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees:**

### **a. Staff Reports**

Ms. Washburn's Report (dated May 5, 2021) was included in packets to Commission Members. Ms. Roberson will find out when Ms. Washburn will attend a meeting again. There was discussion.

Ms. Roberson explained that she has a long list of requested changes to the Zoning Regulations (mostly clarifying language) which she will forward for review by the Commission.

Ms. Roberson sent out the draft contract for the POCD and asked for comments. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that he did not see it. Ms. Roberson will re-send and will need feedback. They will be hiring NECCOG. Timeframe - 12 months for the project with an additional 3 months for the approval process. We are getting extensions on both the Plan deadline and the Affordable Housing Grant.

There was discussion regarding a class that Mr. Fitzgerald tried to attend. Ms. Roberson will send the link to the recording to the Commission Members.

- b. Budget Update (included in packets to Commission Members).
- c. Correspondence – None.
- d. Chairman's Report  
Ms. Sigfridson voiced her thankfulness that there is a full Commission.

**IX. Public Commentary – None.**

Ms. Kelleher asked if there is any word on when the Commission will be able to meet in person since things will be changing on May 19th. There was discussion. Ms. Sigfridson will look into it.

Mr. Thayer asked about the Regulations regarding the Adaptive Re-use of an Agricultural Building. J. Roberson gave an explanation and there was discussion. Ms. Roberson will e-mail information.

**X. Adjourn**

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald at 8:51 p.m. Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0). A. Tanner was no longer present.

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault  
Recording Secretary