

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting (WEBEX)
Wednesday, June 2, 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

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 6:35 p.m.
- II. Roll Call** – Carlene Kelleher, Earl Starks, Allen Fitzgerald, Charles Sczuroski, John Haefele, Jimmy Thayer, Michelle Sigfridson. Austin Tanner (arrived at 6:45 p.m.) was present, but not voting as he was simultaneously virtually attending another meeting. Seth Pember was absent.

Staff Present: Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development, Richard Ives, First Selectman and ex officio Member of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Also Present: Bruce Woodis, KWP Associates; Dan Sullivan; Paul Archer, Archer Surveying; Robert Deluca, CLA Engineers; Judith Burke; WINY Radio; Jessica Solls; Sharon Hawes; Lou Brodeur; Sandy Brodeur; NTH Design.

III. Seating of Alternates

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to seat Alternates John Haefele and J.R. Thayer as Voting Members for this meeting. Second by E. Starks. No discussion.
Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

IV. Adoption of Minutes: Regular Meeting May 5, 2021

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of May 5, 2021. Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.
Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

V. Public Commentary - None.

VI. Unfinished Business:

- a. **Reading of Legal Notice:** Read aloud by J. Roberson for **SP 21-001**.

b. **New Public Hearings:**

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

Chair, M. Sigfridson opened the public hearing.

Bruce Woodis, KWP Associates, represented the Applicant/Owner, Dan Sullivan, who was also present. Mr. Woodis gave an overview:

- The Application is for a total of 38 new additional storage units to be added to the 146-unit existing permitted facility approved in 2015 as an agricultural re-use.
- They propose to replace an open area with formal storage units of a modern style.
- They also propose to add storage units on either side of an existing building in the middle of the storage facility complex.
- Traffic patterns, parking, hours of operation and manner of operation all to remain the same as they are now.

Ms. Roberson displayed the plan (included in packets to Commission Members) for viewing as Mr. Woodis orientated and explained the following:

- The two units on either side of the existing building would be mostly blocked from view from the road by the existing larger building in the front.
- The older open-air, lean-to type building in the back row would be replaced with regular storage units.
- Proposing to put a light on each side of the building to assist people after dark. To be either cut-off or night-sky type lighting. No additional light pollution.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

C. Kelleher commented that the original intent of the Regulation was only to allow existing agricultural buildings no longer being used for uses listed in the Regulations. No expansion of existing buildings is mentioned. Ms. Kelleher apologized for not reviewing this earlier.

Ms. Roberson agreed that it is not covered in the Regulations and she explained that her understanding, after discussion that it was originally approved as and adaptive re-use of an agricultural building, was that successful businesses would have a tendency to expand. She said that her interpretation was that she could proceed as it would be by special permit.

Ms. Kelleher stated that it seems clear that it applies to existing buildings and if the intent was to allow expansion, it would have been provided for. She expressed that she feels that the Commission should follow its own Regulations.

At this time there were technical difficulties (a lot of echoing) making it impossible for speakers to be understood. Bruce Woodis and Dan Sullivan both stated that they have no objection to tabling the public hearing to June 15, 2021, if needed, due to technical difficulties. Thereafter, the problem was identified and resolved and the meeting continued.

Mr. Ives commented that he recalled that, in 2015, expansion had come up and it was clear to him that the Regulation did not allow it.

There was discussion as to whether this could be considered as a different type of use other than adaptive re-use. Ms. Roberson explained that she had informally discussed this with the Commission prior to the Applicant submitting an application. She suggested that, since she had instructed the Applicant to proceed with a special permit application, perhaps the Applicant could be allowed to withdraw and receive the application fee back.

A. Fitzgerald asked if there were any avenue to proceed if the Applicant were to keep the buildings in context with what is there currently. Mr. Sullivan described what the buildings would look like and the materials that would be used.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Jim Adams, Allen Hill, (abutter) stated that he did not think that the addition would be allowed and he questioned/commented on the following:

- The west fence being moved back.
- They were never informed that there would be yard sales.
- Traffic is horrendous and he puts saw horses out to keep people from their parking cars on his front lawn. He said that this is bothering the neighbors.
- He questioned the intended use of the facility. He said that he thought everything was to be inside, but there is outside storage.

Mr. Sullivan stated that he understood that customers are not allowed to store anything outside the storage units. He explained that there were vehicles parked there before (storage trailers). He said that when he purchased the facility, the storage trailers were removed and people are parking RV's in their place. He said that, if that is considered outside storage, then what Mr. Adams said is true.

Ms. Roberson stated that the location of the fence was noted on the plans approved in 2015. But, when they installed it, they moved it 10 or 20 feet off the back of the rear-most building. She explained they are allowed to put the fence there now (previously approved). She said she is unaware of tag sales there.

Mr. Sullivan explained that they moved the fence closer to the building to accommodate someone who was growing corn in the back.

Mr. Sullivan stated that there should not be anyone parking in the outside the facility ever. He said that this can be remedied easily with signs and that there is plenty of room inside the gate.

Mr. Sullivan stated that, periodically, when units get abandoned, they sell the contents. He said that this is the first time that it has been brought to his attention. J.R. Thayer verified that people park in the street and understands the neighbors' point of view. He explained that on weekends "tag sale" signs do get posted on Allen Hill. Mr. Thayer stated that some loose material does collect near the fence line and looks unkempt.

Mr. Sullivan stated that they are constantly bringing dumpsters in there and cleaning the place up.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

M. Sigfridson asked about the RV's.

Mr. Sullivan stated that there are seven or eight of them and that they are where the two new buildings are now.

A.Fitzgerald stated that, if the RV storage is an issue, he will need to recuse himself because his RV is parked there. Ms. Sigfridson responded that she was not sure if the RV parking is directly relevant to the agricultural re-use issue, but if in doubt, the safe thing to do is recuse yourself.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Jim Adams requested that the Commission review the original plan and what is said (some of what Mr. Adams said was inaudible due to echoing).

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS:

J.R. Thayer stated that he feels the Applicant should be allowed to withdraw the application and the fee be refunded.

Ms. Roberson commented that the Regulation does not explicitly authorize or prohibit expansion.

C. Kelleher expressed disagreement because the Regulation clearly states that it applies to buildings that existed on that date. She believes that existing buildings can be renovated as she recalls a time that she thinks it may have been allowed before (adaptive re-use on Woodward Road using the same footprint as the existing building).

Ms. Roberson explained that, in the case of the lean-to (which is a 3-sided structure with a roof), building is a stretch.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that expansion of a use could mean a lot of different things. She commented that once an adaptive re-use is approved, an applicant could come back before the PZC to propose using that building in different ways such as to put a porch on it or a shed roof off the side which may be an expansion that the Commission would allow under circumstances like this. However, she stated that she agrees with Ms. Kelleher in this case because building discreet new buildings does not seem like an appropriate use of this Regulation.

Bruce Woodis commented that it does not seem to be a stretch that a successful agricultural re-use operation might require or desire some modifications or additions at some point. He asked if a text amendment would be order or allow for that. He gave an example of if an office was needed which he feels is not unreasonable.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that sometimes expanding your business means you have to move and that businesses outgrow their locations. She stated that this Regulation is already permitting businesses in zones where they, otherwise, would not be allowed. This is in a residential zone and some issues that can arise are being illustrated tonight when you have businesses right next door to residences. She stated that this could be discussed explicitly by the Commission.

Ms. Roberson commented that individuals can submit applications for zoning regulation text change and zone changes to the PZC.

C. Sczuroski commented that the standards in the Adaptive Re-Use of an Agricultural Building Regulation states that it cannot create a conflict that will affect the surrounding residential uses. He feels that if this business were to expand, the complaints would get worse.

Ms. Sigfridson asked if any Members of the Commission were leaning towards approving the Application at this time. There was no response.

Ms. Sigfridson asked if the Commission would be denying the Application or following Ms. Roberson's suggestion of apologizing and refunding the application fee. She acknowledged that there were preparation costs far beyond the application fee.

Mr. Sczuroski – Stated that he has no problem with refunding the application fee as the Applicant was relying on what they thought was direction from the PZC.

Ms. Kelleher agreed.

Ms. Sigfridson stated agreement.

Ms. Roberson apologized and explained that she did not mean to create a conflict/misunderstanding.

Ms. Kelleher commented, in Ms. Roberson's defense, that she had not reviewed the Regulation when it had been called to the attention of the Commission.

Mr. Thayer stated agreement with Ms. Kelleher.

There were no further comments.

Motion was made by C. Sczuroski to close the public hearing for 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 J. Haefele.

No discussion.

Roll Call Vote: C. Kelleher – yes; E. Starks – yes; A. Fitzgerald – abs.; C. Sczuroski – yes; J. Haefele – yes; J.R. Thayer – yes; M. Sigfridson – yes.

Motion carried (6-0-1). A. Fitzgerald abstained.

c. Continued Public Hearings: None.

d. Other Unfinished Business:

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

Motion was made by J.R. Thayer to decline the Application and refund the permit fee for 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 and to start the discussion to look at the language of the Regulation moving forward.

Second by E. Starks.

Discussion:

- Mr. Ives noted that, since the public hearing has been closed, there can be no further discussion regarding the language of the Regulation.
- Mr. Thayer stated that his motion is to just refund the application fee.
- Ms. Roberson advised that the Commission does not have authority to not take action. The actions that could be taken are: approve, modify and approve; and deny. She stated that the Applicant could voluntarily withdraw the Application. If the Application were withdrawn, then the Application fee could be refunded.
- Mr. Sullivan stated that he withdraws his Application since the language of the Regulation does not accommodate or prohibit expansion.

J.R. Thayer rescinded his motion.

E. Starks rescinded his second.

VII. New Business:

a. Applications:

1. **SP 21-002:** Special Permit Application for Multi-Family Development (51 Condominium units) on south side of Louise Berry Drive (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 19), 13.5 acres, R-30 Zone, Applicant: Shane Pollack.

J. Roberson explained that although the Application is accepted tonight (per State Statute) – no vote required, the Application is not complete due to the following required items not having been submitted:

- Architectural Drawings
- Traffic Report

Ms. Roberson noted that no one was present to represent the Applicant. She stated that it is important to have preliminary discussion regarding determining whether supplemental help (consultants) would be needed to provide expertise in reviewing the Application. She advised that it should be posted to get a quote for services as soon as possible. Fees to be borne by the Applicant. Types of consultants named in the Regulation (although others may be identified by the PZC):

- Architect
- Landscape Architect
- Environmental Professional
- Professional Land Use Planner
- Civil Engineer
- Traffic Engineer

Ms. Roberson advised that she feels that a Traffic Engineer would be needed for this Application. She recommended that the Commission make a finding that a Traffic Engineer and any other outside consultants the Commission feels are necessary will be needed in reviewing and understanding the Application which is 51 residential units on a dead-end road which also functions as the School driveway. She explained the timeline for opening the public hearing and recommended that the Commission refrain from scheduling the public hearing tonight because the Architectural Drawings and Traffic Report have not yet been received.

- There was discussion regarding a Hydrogeologist and whether the water quality could be affected.
- There was discussion regarding NECCOG's recommendation for a Hydrologist and a Wetland Biologist. Mr. Haefele noted that Syl Pauley's Engineering Review has a list of 30 items, of which, all have not been met. Ms. Roberson read aloud from the Special Permit Regulations regarding Architectural Design Data - she said this info has not been received. Ms. Roberson read aloud regarding Environmental Impact Statement - she said that they submitted a pretty detailed Environmental Report, but she is not certain if it meets the criteria for an Environmental Impact Analysis, but that the Commission could request it of the Applicant or could hire its own Environmental Professional Consultant to review it and charge the Applicant the fee.

Ms. Roberson read aloud regarding Traffic Impact Analysis Report, noting that this Application would generate more than 200 vehicle trips per day.

Ms. Roberson explained that although not accepting the Application is not an option for the Commission, they could deny the Application for incompleteness. Mr. Haefele referred to the Engineering Review and noted a number of the items on the list that have not been submitted/completed. Ms. Roberson stated that a few of those items have been resolved. Ms. Sigfridson stated that she does not recall ever having taken the action of denying for incompleteness. She said they usually try to work with the Applicant. She stated that, although it is important to have a complete application before opening a public hearing, she is not inclined to deny for incompleteness.

There was discussion regarding new legislation regarding affordable housing. It was determined that this Application would not be impacted. Mr. Ives will look into it.

Ms. Roberson stated that IWWC approval has been received (in packets to Commission Members).

Ms. Sigfridson stated that she is in agreement with hiring experts needed to provide information that is relevant to the Application in the decisions that the PZC needs to make.

- There was discussion regarding a Wetland Biologist.
Ms. Roberson explained that the IWWC has specific authority over impacts of that kind. She described her concern regarding the drainage issue. She suggested that the PZC may want to examine whether the retention basin that they designed is appropriate to contain the flow to avoid impacts down the street. She suggests a Professional Engineer that is a Specialist in Drainage Design.
- Ms. Roberson also explained her concern regarding traffic. She strongly recommends a Traffic Engineer.

Mr. Thayer stated agreement with Ms. Roberson on both issues. He does not want to cause undue financial burden on the Applicant.

Ms. Sigfridson also stated agreement.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the traffic issue is huge. He suggested consulting with Syl Pauley regarding hiring the right professionals. He feels that we need to do what is right for the Town and the community around the School (cost is not our concern).

Mr. Thayer agreed and explained that it is not a wetlands thing, it is a drainage thing. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed.

Ms. Kelleher voiced concern regarding it being a one access road. She asked that safety/emergency experts be consulted to be sure that emergency vehicles won't have problems. There was discussion.

Ms. Roberson stated that they would tie into both water and sewer and have received permission to do so from both agencies.

Mr. Sczuroski commented regarding no sidewalks.

Ms. Sigfridson reminded the Commission that the Applicant would have an opportunity to respond to these concerns during the public hearing. She summarized the professionals that the Commission has discussed as possibly needing to hire: Traffic Engineer; Hydrologist or Engineer with expertise in drainage; Emergency Expert (Fire Chief/Fire Marshal) – Ms. Roberson will coordinate and review the plans with local Fire Chiefs/Fire Marshal regarding turning radius and appropriate surfaces).

Mr. Haefele asked about water pressure being adequate (referred to page 39 of the Engineer's Report, Item #'s 10 & 14).

Ms. Roberson will instruct the Applicant to work with CT Water (she referred to page 33 of the packet).

Mr. Haefele noted that there had been a mistake in the calculations.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that if it is determined during the public hearing process that more experts are needed, additional experts/resources can be hired. Ms. Roberson explained that it takes time.

There was discussion regarding timeline and when to schedule the public hearing. The traffic analysis timing may be difficult regarding getting accurate counts due to school letting out for the summer.

Ms. Sigfridson suggested possibly adding Landscape Architect to the list of experts to hire. Mr. Fitzgerald agreed and asked about an Environmental Impact Study. Ms. Roberson explained that an Environmental Impact Statement is identified as an application requirement in the Regulations if the Commission determines that one is needed. She explained that the Commission could also hire a third-party consultant to work for the Town as a Wildlife Biologist. Ms. Roberson stated that they had submitted a detailed Environmental Report (included in packets).

There was discussion regarding a nature trail which is on School property.
There was discussion regarding that the IWWC had discussed a need for fencing along the drainage area.

There was discussion regarding that the IWWC had also discussed temporarily moving the fence which would block an easement.

Ms. Sigfridson reminded the Commission that these questions could be addressed by the Applicant during the public hearing.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that the Commission cannot act upon findings of endangered species noted in an Environmental Report (cannot put conditions on or deny an application). She does not recommend requiring this as it would not provide information that the PZC can use. Ms. Kelleher stated agreement. Ms. Roberson stated that this site does not have any known endangered species on it and it did not stand out to her as a major concern.

Motion was made by J. Haefele in accordance with Brooklyn Town Ordinance 20-1.3.B and Zoning Regulations Section 9.I.5.2, that the Commission finds that the nature and intensity of the proposal will require expertise beyond that of staff and that supplemental consultants in traffic engineering, drainage and a landscape architect will be required to review the proposed addition of 51 dwelling units on Louise Berry Drive at the applicant's expense.

Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.

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

Motion carried unanimously (7-0-0).

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule a public hearing for **SP 21-002**: Special Permit Application for Multi-Family Development (51 Condominium units) on south side of Louise Berry Drive (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 19), 13.5 acres, R-30 Zone, Applicant: Shane Pollack, for Wednesday, August 4, 2021, location to be determined (as it may need to be held in a larger venue).

Second by J. Haefele. No discussion.

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

Motion carried unanimously (7-0-0).

2. **SD 21-002**: Subdivision Application to create two buildings lots at 53 Proulx Street (Assessor's Map 41, Lot 85), 1 acre, R-10 Zone, Applicant: A. Kausch & Sons.

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, representing the Applicant. Robert Deluca, CLA Engineers, was also present. Mr. Archer stated that there is a neighbor that has requested a public hearing for this Application and, although he and Mr. Deluca are ready to do a presentation, they do not have a problem with a public hearing being scheduled if the Commission so chooses.

Mr. Archer stated that they will be proposing fee-in-lieu of open space. He explained that there is an existing house and there is not a lot of land to give. Mr. Archer proposed using the Vision (Town's) appraisal of the land. He said that Ms. Roberson will be forwarding it to the Conservation Commission for their input.

Judith Burke, neighbor who requested a public hearing (via written correspondence), was present. She stated that she would be willing to listen to a presentation tonight. Ms. Sigfridson explained that Ms. Burke's ability to respond may be limited. Ms. Burke decided that it would be best to wait for a public hearing.

There was discussion regarding the questions of whether the Vision appraisal would be acceptable or if an appraisal would be required. Ms. Sigfridson stated that she prefers that a new appraisal be done. Ms. Roberson explained that the Vision appraisal is CAMA (computer-aided mass appraisal) and is used as a basis for taxes. She explained that it is not appropriate for this kind of application.

Mr. Archer stated that they will have an appraisal done to be ready for the public hearing. They would like to use Platt Associates. There were no objections by the Commission.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule a public hearing for SD 21-002: Subdivision Application to create two buildings lots at 53 Proulx Street (Assessor's Map 41, Lot 85), 1 acre, R-10 Zone, Applicant: A. Kausch & Sons. Appraisal to be done by a third-party appraiser (Platt Associates).

Second by J. Haeefe.

Discussion: The date of the public hearing was set for Wednesday, July 7, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via Webex and in-person at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Center 69 South Main Street Brooklyn, CT. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

3. **SD 21-003:** Subdivision Application to create four building lots at 111 Day Street (Assessor's Map 42, Lot 32), 6 acres, R-30 Zone, Applicant: CNG Holding, LLC.

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, represented the Applicant. Mr. Archer explained that this property has been cut many times into many different pieces. He has been working with Ms. Roberson as to what would be the best way to handle it. He said that it was part of a conservation subdivision for agricultural purposes. He feels that it is best to be treated as a re-subdivision to protect everyone. They are in favor of scheduling a public hearing and he said that they would get an appraisal for fee-in-lieu of open space.

Motion was made by J. Haeefe to schedule a public hearing on SD 21-003 – Resubdivision Application to create four building lots at 111 Day Street (Assessor's Map 42, Lot 32), 6 acres, R-30 Zone, Applicant: CNG Holding, LLC for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on July 7, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via Webex and in-person at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Center 69 South Main Street Brooklyn, CT.

Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

4. **SD 21-004:** Resubdivision Application to create two building lots at Almada Drive and Paradise Drive (Assessor's Map 21, Lot 6), 104 acres, RA Zone, Applicant: Paul Lehto.

Robert Deluca, CLA Engineers, stated that Paul Archer did the survey for this Application. Mr. Deluca stated that this Application is a resubdivision and will need a public hearing. Mr. Deluca gave an overview:

- Mr. Lehto will be cutting two lots out of the 104-acre parcel: one 5-acre lot with proposed access off of Paradise Drive; one 10-acre lot with proposed access off of Almada Drive.
- He asked if the Commission prefers 2.25 acres of open space or fee-in-lieu of open space.

Ms. Roberson stated that the Conservation Commission will be looking at this Application on June 7, 2021. Mr. Fitzgerald commented that he doesn't know if land in that area would be beneficial to anybody. Ms. Roberson explained open space dedication vs. fee-in-lieu and the importance of analyzing each property for its individual quality.

It was decided that the Commission will decide at its meeting of June 15, 2021, whether an appraisal is needed (open space vs. fee-in-lieu).

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule a public hearing on SD 21-004 – Resubdivision Application to create two building lots at Almada Drive and Paradise Drive (Assessor's Map 21, Lot 6), 104 acres, RA Zone, Applicant: Paul Lehto for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on July 7, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via Webex meeting and in-person at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Center 69 South Main Street Brooklyn, CT.

Second by E. Starks. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

Motion was made by J. Haeefe to add item **VII.b.1** to the agenda as:

Filing Extension for SD 21-001 – Four lot subdivision on Tripp Hollow Road.

Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

b. Other New Business:

1. Filing Extension for SD 21-001 – Four-lot subdivision on Tripp Hollow Road.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to extend the filing deadline an additional 90 days for SD 21-001 – Four lot subdivision on Tripp Hollow Road.

Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees:

a. Staff Reports

J. Roberson stated that Margaret Washburn's Report was included in packets to Commission Members.

b. Budget Update

Ms. Roberson stated that the Budget Report was included in packets to Commission Members.

There was discussion regarding the required training for PZC Members. Ms. Roberson explained that she believes it will be online training.

c. Correspondence – None.

d. Chairman's Report – None.

IX. Public Commentary

Ms. Sigfridson asked if there was anyone wanting to discuss additional consultants for SP 21-002. There were no comments. Ms. Sigfridson stated that written correspondence would be accepted as well.

Ms. Roberson stated that she had unmuted all remaining participants to give everyone a chance to speak if they chose to, but there were no comments made.

X. Adjourn

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to adjourn at 9:36 p.m. Second by J. Haefele. No discussion. Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Secretary