

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting  
Tuesday, October 19, 2021 6:30 p.m.**

**3 WAYS TO ATTEND: IN-PERSON, ONLINE, AND BY PHONE**

<b>In-Person:</b> <b>Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium, 119 Gorman Road, Brooklyn, CT</b> <b>All attending in person are required to wear masks.</b>	
<b>Online:</b> <b>Click link below:</b> <a href="https://townofbrooklyn.my.webex.com/townofbrooklyn.my/j.php?MTID=m06601768d9f69b94af83afa453a07780">https://townofbrooklyn.my.webex.com/townofbrooklyn.my/j.php?MTID=m06601768d9f69b94af83afa453a07780</a>	<b>Go to <a href="http://www.webex.com">www.webex.com</a>, click Sign In</b> <b>OR</b> <b>On the top right, click Join a Meeting</b> <b>Enter meeting ID: 126 613 4783</b> <b>Enter meeting password: Second</b>
<b>Phone: Dial 1-415-655-0001</b> <b>Enter meeting number: 126 613 4783</b> <b>Enter meeting password: 732663</b> <b>You can bypass attendee number by pressing #</b>	

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order** – Michelle Sigfridson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:37 p.m.

**II. Roll Call** – Michelle Sigfridson, Carlene Kelleher, Austin Tanner, Earl Starks, Allen Fitzgerald, John Haefele (all present in person).  
Charles Sczuroski was absent with notice. Seth Pember and J.R. Thayer were absent.

**Staff Present** (in person): Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development.

**Also Present** (in person): Norm Thibeault, Killingly Engineering Associates; Greg Fedus, Fedus Engineering/COPAR

**Present Via Webex/Call-In Users:** Nicholas Mancuso; Scott Hesketh; Brennan Hynes; Lisa Vickers; Diane Wimmer; Justin Kirkconnell; Dan Scotto; L. Donovan; Marie; Tom; Zach; Alicia; Adam; Cheri; Mooney; Bob; Joe Voccio; Lisa Lindia; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.

**III. Seating of Alternates**

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to seat Alternate J. Haefele as a Voting Member for this meeting.  
Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-0).

**IV. Adoption of Minutes:** Regular Meeting October 6, 2021

Motion was made by A. Tanner to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 6, 2021.  
Second by J. Haefele.

Discussion:

C. Kelleher and J. Roberson noted the following correction:

- Page 5, second motion, first condition, delete the word “vinyl.”

Mr. Tanner rescinded his motion as he had not attended the meeting.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of October 6, 2021.  
Second by J. Haefele.

Discussion:

Motion to include the following correction:

- Page 5, second motion, first condition, delete the word “vinyl.”

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (6-0-0).

**V. Public Commentary – None.**

**VI. Unfinished Business:**

a. **Reading of Legal Notices:** None.

b. **New Public Hearings:** None.

c. **Continued Public Hearings:**

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.

**Norm Thibeault**, Killingly Engineering Associates, represented the Applicant. Mr. Thibeault stated that many of the comments from the Reviewing Engineers had been addressed, but not all, and he will also go through those this evening. There had been two site walks scheduled, but both had been cancelled (the first due to weather and the second because it was not advertised properly). He anticipates that this public hearing will be continued again for site walk purposes and to give them the opportunity to continue to address the review comments.

Mr. Thibeault gave his presentation (plans/maps were displayed as discussed):

- Traffic Study by Hesketh & Associates which was reviewed by KWH (the Town’s reviewing engineer). Mr. Thibeault has the response from Hesketh & Associates stating that all recommendations/suggestions made by KWH have been incorporated:
  - Hesketh & Associates did some additional traffic counts to determine traffic volumes.
  - The Report was adjusted regarding trips per day based upon single-family housing vs multi-family (which generates less traffic). Intersection of Gorman Road and Louise Berry Drive was analyzed during peak hours of dismissal/parent pick-up and compared it to anticipated trip generation numbers for a.m. and p.m. hours. It was determined that the single-family use had the highest trip generation, therefore, the development is now projected to generate a total of 25 trips during the peak morning hour and 16 trips during the afternoon school peak hour. The actual peak hour for people returning back home occurs after the school afternoon peak hour (32 trips). Hesketh & Associates concurs with KWH that the proposed residential use would not be considered a major traffic generator.
  - Mr. Thibeault explained level of service rated A through F (A=shortest amount of delay/free-flowing traffic and F=the worst meaning substantial delays). Level C would be the worst anticipated during the 15-minute to half-hour period when school is being let out and parents are picking up students. It is described as stable flow (you could expect delays at the intersection of Louise Berry Drive and Gorman Road of 16 to 18 seconds before you could pull out).
  - Impact on schools. Traffic volumes are relatively low on Louise Berry Drive.

They don't anticipate any conflicts with site access.

There are faculty parking spaces located directly across from the proposed site entrance. Although that could potentially be a conflict point, teachers are typically there after the students leave, so the potential for conflict is very low.

- Mr. Thibeault had a telephone conversation with Patricia Buell, Superintendent of Schools regarding the potential access for students who may live in the development, in the future, and providing a means for them to walk to the school. He said that the plans have been revised showing a small section of sidewalk coming out of the development, a crosswalk that extends to school property and then an extension of sidewalk that connects to an existing sidewalk on the school grounds. He said they had an informative discussion and that is the solution that they came up with.
- On-site circulation. They looked at the Town's road ordinance which requires a 20-foot radius on all of the intersecting streets. This would be the driveway going into the proposed development and also the side roads that they are proposing on-site. All of the road radii within the development have been adjusted to achieve that 20-foot road radius to allow for turning of larger vehicles.
- Summary of Hesketh & Associates' professional opinion regarding the Traffic Study is that the proposed development will not significantly impact operations on local roadways. The approach to the intersection of both Louise Berry Drive and Gorman Road are acceptable at Level of Service "C" during peak hours. Mr. Thibeault added that they are both Level of Service "A" during non-peak hours.
- Comments from the Fire Marshal or Fire Chief regarding on-site traffic:
  - Suggests that a 75-foot radius would be necessary for the cul de sac. Mr. Thibeault referred to Section D.103 of the Fire Code which states that minimum specifications for an access road with a hydrant calls for a 96-foot diameter cul de sac which is 48 feet. They are proposing 50 feet which is what the Town's ordinance calls for, so they are in compliance with the Town's Road Ordinance and with standard practice. A 75-foot radius would result in over 17,000 more square feet of paved surface which they do not feel is necessary. He researched and said that there is no precedence for a 75-foot cul de sac within the Town or anywhere else that he has seen in the past. Mr. Thibeault spoke of other options for the turn-around (Y or hammerhead T or 120-foot hammerhead) which he does not feel are appropriate for a residential development.
  - Suggestion that a third hydrant may be needed. The original review by the fire Fire Marshal stated that two were needed, but it would not be a problem to put in a third if necessary.
- Architectural Plans:
  - Revised Architectural Plans were submitted with the Title Block and all of the elements that the Commission requested (types of finishes and what they are going to look like, some elevations).
  - Mr. Thibeault described the floor plans levels while indicating on the plans (Commission Members had been provided copies). Some have three bedrooms and some will have two bedrooms and an office.
  - Mr. Thibeault described exterior elevations and finishes. There will be some landscaping between the units (where the driveways step-up along the terrain) which is not shown of the Architectural Plans.
  - Mr. Thibeault described rear elevations (cross section/side view).

- Mr. Thibeault described detail for firewall between the units. He explained the building code. The units will be constructed with a combination of one-hour and two-hour firewalls to meet the fire code.
- Regarding the question of qualified professional/licensed architect to provide the plans. These plans were done by NTH Design, LLC out of Brooklyn, CT. He explained that the person who put these plans together (Mark Skana) has 35 years of experience in architectural design and is very familiar with building code. Mr. Thibeault stated that, in his opinion, Mr. Skana is qualified.
- Number of stories (2 story vs 3 story structures):
  - Mr. Thibeault referred to page 29 of the Definitions of the Regulations and he provided copies of a sketch (to Commission Members) that he put together which he believes meets the intent of the Regulations.
- Regarding concerns about property values/affordable housing.
  - Mr. Thibeault explained that this is not affordable housing and there is no intent to do affordable housing here. There are a lot of criteria that would have to be met that this development does not meet. He had contacted Jared Meehan, a broker with REMAX Bell Park Realty, who provided a letter offering his professional opinion and expertise regarding possible impact of this development to surrounding properties. Mr. Thibeault read the letter aloud into the record, in which, Mr. Meehan gives his opinion that this development should not have a negative impact on surrounding properties and he also states that, in his opinion, the Project could help increase the values of surrounding homes. Mr. Meehan offered his cell phone number (508)561-0249 and his e-mail address [jaredmeehan@remax.net](mailto:jaredmeehan@remax.net) to answer questions or concerns. Mr. Thibeault submitted the letter for the record.
  - Mr. Thibeault displayed a sketch regarding property values and an aerial photo (he provided copies to Commission Members). The closest residence to any of the proposed units is Linda Atsales at approx. 300 feet. From the east, is Kurt R. Houseman is 118 feet from the nearest ADA accessible unit. Limits of clearing from the property on Franklin Drive is approximately 250 feet away.
- Mr. Thibeault addressed concerns regarding habitat and the presence of possible protected or endangered species. He referred to the Natural Diversity Database for the Brooklyn area dated June 2021, which shows that there are no critical habitat or species of concern associated with the site.
- Mr. Thibeault addressed comments/recommendations by landscape architect, LADA, P.C., as outlined in their letter dated September 13, 2021 (included in packets to Commission Members).
  - Provided a site proximity plan with aerial overlay with respect to the surrounding properties.
  - The property is identified as a moderate critical resource area in the POCD because of the wetland resource on the property and because of the access to the trails. Habitat and the presence of possible protected or endangered species was discussed above.
  - The moderate critical resource area does not demonstrate any unique or cultural features. It has been historically utilized for agricultural and logging purposes and has been previously disturbed. This project will provide a variety of housing types and densities. The on-site wetlands will be preserved. It is not in an aquifer-protection area, a conservation corridor or in an area of key agricultural land.

- They believe this development will offer opportunities for young professionals, first-time homebuyers and critical sectors of the workforce.
- Radii on the roads are compliant with the Town's Regulations. They believe that the 50-foot cul de sac also complies. Per the suggestion of the Fire Marshal and per the Fire Code which recommends a 26-foot wide road width at the hydrants they will make an adjustment to either make the entire road 26 feet wide or a portion of the road 26 feet wide.
- The front doors for the units have been addressed on the Architectural Plans.
- Locations of existing hydrants are identified on the plans (base mapping).
- They received detailed information on traffic patterns for the school and it has been reviewed by the Traffic Engineer and they concluded that they do not believe that there will significant impacts to the pick-up and drop-off schedule for the school. The a.m. and p.m. peaks for this development do not occur at the same that the peak for the school occurs.
- Length of right-of-way: Louise Berry Drive ends 243.74 feet along the property frontage. Justification was provided to J. Roberson. It is based upon the amount of roadway funding that the Town receives from the State. At the end of the public right-of-way, it becomes the school's property.
- A 20-foot radius has been provided on all of the streets within the Project and a 50-foot radius on the cul de sac. All have been adjusted and labeled accordingly on the Plans.
- Access to the recreation area: They have made an adjustment to the Plan within the recreation area showing a playscape (he indicated a 40' x 60' area). They will construct a gravel path that will lead to the playscape as well as to the easement area connecting to the existing trail system. Per discussion that he had with Ms. Roberson, whether this can be considered a trailhead would need to be determined, but it would be an access point to the trail. Mr. Thibeault's opinion is that he feels it would be more of an access just for the people of this development.
- Regarding general landscaping compliance:  
Mr. Thibeault noted that the existing vegetative coverage is not only damaged due to recent storms, but also due to the property being heavily logged before the Applicant purchased the property, so it is difficult to access at this point.  
Regarding screening between units especially on the north side of the site: A row of evergreen plantings (Arborvitae) will screen the back decks and keep headlights out of the buildings. Street trees will be at 40-50-foot intervals all the way around the cul de sac.  
Dead, damaged and invasive vegetation will be removed from the proposed clearing limits to the wetlands boundary (noted on the plan).
- Lighting: Plans show 10-foot high, Colonial, lantern-style, full cut-off lights which will provide safety on the site without creating bright-sky conditions.  
Lights on the Buildings: Full cut-off sconce lights above garage doors and front lights. Low-level lighting pointed downward. There will be no lighting that shines outward from the site.  
He feels this will keep the dark-sky here that people are accustomed to seeing.
- Energy Conservation: He explained that, whenever possible, they are trying to keep the long access of the buildings for a southern or at least an eastern exposure to allow for radiant heating or sunlight in the buildings.

- Regulated areas shown on all plans (175-foot offset from the centerline of the stream and the 100-foot offset from the edge of the wetlands).
- Provided a legend on the Planting Plan showing the number of proposed plants.
- Regarding the conflict between the parking and garage numbers listed: Mr. Thibeault explained that there is going to be a two-car garage in the place questioned. He said the numbers on the Parking Plan are correct and accurate. There are three spaces per unit (two garage and one driveway) and there are 13 additional spaces throughout the site. They are well in excess of that requirement.
- Mr. Thibeault addressed the remaining questions regarding Syl Pauley's review:
  - Page 7, Comment #13 – Information from CT Water regarding the two hydrants was re-forwarded to Staff earlier in the day (55 psi and over 1,200 gallons per minute – well above the minimum of 750 gpm).
  - Page 14, Comment #5 – Detail for flared end section – They switched from concrete to high-density polyethylene.
  - Page 15, Comment #9 – Mr. Trinkaus does not concur with Mr. Pauley's comment that 4-foot sumps and hoods on all catch basins are required. The last catch basin is the only one for which Mr. Trinkaus would recommend that. Mr. Thibeault explained that it is easier to keep track of, clean and maintain if only on one.
  - Page 18, Comment #12 – Sidewalk is shown as a 5-inch thick sidewalk with Portland concrete cement and is specified in the Construction Detail.
  - Page 19, Comment #4 – Parking exceeds the regulatory requirements so, additional on-street parking is not required or prudent because of the grades.
  - Page 20, Comment #25 – Regarding a Wetlands Biologist Report - The Project has been approved by the IWWC. The original Wetlands Report and Evaluation was done by Joseph Theroux, Soil Scientist, who delineated the wetlands. Per the DEEP National Diversity Database, there are no species of concern on this property.
  - Page 21, Comment #7 – Mr. Thibeault explained that they disagree with Mr. Pauley's comment regarding the plans being schematic in nature and require a lot of guesswork.
  - Page 22, Comment #11 – Architectural Plans have been provided.
  - Page 23, Comment #3 – Mr. Thibeault explained that, based upon the Regulations and the Statutory requirements, they do not believe that the Application is incomplete. He agreed that there are still some things that need to be addressed, but completeness is defined in the Regulations regarding what submissions are required with the Application, which they have provided.
  - Page 23, Comment #4 – Test pits were witnessed by Mr. Thibeault who stated that he has been reading test pits and doing profiles for more than 30 years and he feels that he is qualified to do so.
  - Page 24, Comment #7 – They acknowledge that the registration of the CT DEEP General Permit for the discharge of storm water associated with construction activities is required for this Project. They concur that the registration needs to be filed 60 days before the start of construction. He explained that this is not an application, it is a registration and Connecticut actually holds this permit as a general permit which they renew on a five-year basis. For projects under 100 acres, the Applicant just needs to register that blanket permit that the State holds.

- Mr. Thibeault agreed with Mr. Pauley's comment that an as-built plan is required by the Regulations.
- Mr. Thibeault addressed comments from Trinkaus Engineering regarding storm water:
  - Mr. Thibeault explained that the last set of revised plans provided show a phasing plan: The road would be constructed in its entirety; residences will be constructed from the top, down (so that people can start moving into them and they won't have to go through a construction site to get to their homes); the binder course of pavement won't be installed until the Project is completed in its entirety. Installation of the binder course allows emergency vehicles to access the site, if necessary, and to turn around all the way at the end if they need to.
  - Regarding the method to determine the infiltration rate: double-ring infiltrometer (very expensive to buy - \$3,000) vs. percolation testing vs. soil sample.  
Options: Find a place a soil-testing facility with an infiltrometer and have them do the test; ask Mr. Trinkaus if he knows someone who has one; ask Mr. Trinkaus if there is another method he would find acceptable.  
Mr. Thibeault explained that this information is needed for the rest of the design.

#### **QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM COMMISSION MEMBERS and STAFF:**

- **A. Tanner** asked about the right-of-way funding that the Town gets from the State.  
**J. Roberson** explained that the Town Clerk researched the status and length of Louise Berry Drive (formerly School Street). She explained that the State relies on Towns to accurately document the length of their town roads. The Town of Brooklyn has claimed to the State that it is a Town road and the length has been verified by the Town Clerk. Ms. Roberson stated that she can testify that the Applicant does have the amount of frontage that they claim to have. She offered that she can provide further documentation.  
**Mr. Tanner** asked whether a survey had been done on the school property. He would like to see a definite delineation.  
Mr. Thibeault explained their survey plan, prepared by Archer Surveying (not on file), shows the 243.74 feet of frontage on Louise Berry Drive and he referred to a note on the plan stating that it was done by a Boundary Line Agreement dated December 11, 2019.  
Mr. Thibeault stated that his partner, Greg Glaude, Licensed Surveyor, had forwarded information to Ms. Roberson regarding his determination of where the limit of the Town road (Louise Berry Drive) ends.  
**Mr. Tanner** stated that he is satisfied.
- **J. Haefele** asked about qualified architect signing off on the plans.  
Mr. Thibeault stated that he is not a licensed architect and noted that the Regulations say a "qualified professional."  
**Mr. Haefele** noted that the normal interpretation is a licensed architect.
- **J. Roberson** explained about the process for this stage of the public hearing and the documents received. She explained that the consultants have not yet had a chance to review/respond to the changes since they have been submitted. If the public hearing is continued, more information may be received as well as comments from the public (verbal or written) up until the public hearing is closed.
- **A. Fitzgerald** asked about import/export.

Mr. Thibeault explained that there is a little bit of export. (1,500 to 1,800 yards).

**Mr. Fitzgerald** said that the sketch defining story doesn't work on Units 1, 2, 3, 46 and 48 due to slopes.

Mr. Thibeault explained that Units 1, 2 and 3 are the ADA accessible units (single-level units). He will provide detail for those.

Mr. Thibeault explained that Units 46 and 48 are walk-outs. He will provide detail for these also.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** asked how long the Project will take.

Mr. Thibeault explained that it is a five-phase project and it would probably be a five-year build-out depending on market sales (ten units per year). The road will take about three-to-four months to construct.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** asked if there would be any detail provided for the road (run-off, maintenance) during the five years. Binding doesn't bring you to the catch basins.

Mr. Thibeault stated that he will address that with the phasing plan. He only has the layout at this point.

**Mr. Fitzgerald** asked about bonding.

**Ms. Roberson** explained that a performance bond can be required to guarantee that the work gets completed appropriately. She clarified that it would be an interior access drive. The consultants will have an opportunity to comment.

- **C. Kelleher** would like to know the reason why the Fire Marshal requested a 75-foot radius. She also mentioned that she would like follow-up to the comments made by a member of the Fire Department who had spoken about rear access to the buildings.

**Ms. Roberson** stated that she is expecting to receive comments from Chief Breen (Mortlake Fire Department) as she had asked him to review the Project and confer with the Fire Marshal and to provide recommendations if different from what has been submitted. She said that verbal testimony had been received, at the last public hearing, from the Assistant Chief of Mortlake Fire Department and written comments had been received from the Fire Marshal.

#### **QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

- **Pamela Nichols**, 130 Gorman Road, commented about the traffic study done by KWH Enterprises. She read aloud a statement made six years ago on September 22, 2015, during an interview on WINY Radio by May Lyons, Chairman of the BOE for Brooklyn, regarding traffic congestion at the school. Ms. Nichols said that traffic congestion has increased tremendously with the pandemic and that a 16-18 second delay is grossly understated. Ms. Nichols asked that Ms. Lyons' comments/concerns be made part of the record. Ms. Nichols stated that she would consider 8:30 to be the AM peak on Gorman Road. She said that traffic generation is a major concern and that it has been considered a major congestion area for many years.
- **Diane Hostman** submitted a photo, for the record, of cars parked by the school on Louise Berry Drive. She asked if an old-fashioned traffic counter had been used to count traffic.

Mr. Thibeault explained that the counts were hand counts by someone who was out there recording information during peak hours, which is how a traffic analysis is typically done. School peak hours are from 8:15 – 8:45 a.m. and from 3:15 – 3:45 p.m.



**Ms. Hostman** submitted another photo, for the record, showing what is seen now from her deck (near the ADA units) as opposed to what will be seen after the Project is completed. She said it will be close to her property line. **Ms. Hostman** submitted a third photo, for the record, of a hawk that she said they see every year. She was not sure, but she feels that hawks may be an endangered species.

**Ms. Hostman** stated, for the record, that she does not want the Application to be approved.

Ms. Roberson asked that call-in users eliminate background noise so that all would be able to hear.

#### **QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC continued:**

- **Bill Purcell**, 179 Gorman Road, stated that he does not feel that there is enough outside parking. He is concerned that people may not park inside the garages.

**Mr. Purcell** questioned and asked to see what was presented for the story levels and how it matches up with the 35-foot maximum height.

Mr. Thibeault explained that it would be from the lowest level to the midpoint of the roof, as defined by the Regulations (32-feet high).

**Mr. Purcell** commented regarding that, to the east of the Hostman property where the logger removed a lot of trees, he does not feel that there is adequate screening between the ADA Units and the Hostman property. He referred to Section 7 of the Regulations and also the LADA Report and he said that he would like to go on the site walk to show the area where he feels buffering is needed. He also does not recommend arborvitae as it gets damaged by deer.

Ms. Roberson stated that everything that has been submitted into the record is available in her office for public review and will also be on the website.

M. Sigfridson stated that they intend to reschedule the site walk and she explained that discussion is discouraged on site walks. The public hearing, on the record, is the appropriate place for discussion. She thanked Mr. Purcell for his comments and said that they will look at what he suggested during the site walk.

#### **QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC (ONLINE AND CALL-IN USERS):**

- **Marie** commented (via Chat) that the Traffic Study does not include the five-year build and asked if the traffic flow during construction is being considered in the “unrealistic Study.”

Mr. Thibeault explained how peak hours are determined.

Mr. Fitzgerald commented that he feels that the property owners do not agree with the peak hours as determined by the Study for Gorman Road and the School. They feel that there is more traffic after 4 p.m.

At this time, it was discovered that there were technical difficulties with the audio for those online and calling in.

Scott Hesketh, Traffic Engineer, addressed the comments regarding peak hours and construction traffic. He stated from 7 a.m. – 9 a.m. and from 2:30 p.m. – 4:15 p.m. and he believes those hours coincide with the pick-up and

drop-off hours at the School. Using the turning movements observed at the intersection of Gorman Road and Louise Berry Drive and the CT DOT traffic volume counts (conducted pre-COVID during 2019). They are reflecting the higher volumes from Gorman Road and from the School. He explained that he believes that they are reflecting the appropriate hours of analysis.

- **Linda Musen** (Call-in User), Gorman Road, explained a situation that she had encountered several houses down from the School (between 3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.) which made her late for an appointment.  
Mr. Hesketh agreed that it is busy around the School at pick-up times, but he stated that the difficulties in the area are related to the School and parents picking-up and dropping-off students, not due to residential traffic. He said that difficulties should be addressed by the School, not neighboring property owners. Mr. Hesketh stated that it was difficult for the online participants to hear what was said earlier during the hearing.
- Regarding **Marie's** concern for traffic caused during the construction phase, Mr. Hesketh said that there would likely be more construction traffic than residential traffic upon completion of the Project, which is a temporary situation. He explained that the construction traffic is not often reviewed during traffic-impact studies since it is temporary.
- **Justin Kirkconnell** asked about the size of the construction vehicles as he is an avid bike rider and is concerned about the width of Gorman Road.  
Mr. Hesketh explained about the heavy construction equipment that will remain on site and will be taken off-site at the end of the construction period. He explained that day-to-day traffic to and from the construction site will be typically pick-up trucks/passenger vehicles of people going to work at the site and, occasionally, deliveries of equipment/materials. He reiterated what Mr. Thibeault had said about the site being nearly balanced.  
Mr. Hesketh said that the last three traffic volume counts conducted by the CT DOT have shown a decrease in traffic volumes on Gorman Road since 2010 (from 2,300 vehicles per day in 2010 to 2,000 vehicles per day in 2019). He said that the traffic volumes in the Report should be sufficient for a five-year build-out period.  
**Mr. Kirkconnell** asked about the number of parking spaces to be sure that the traffic study is based on the correct number.
- **Marie (via Chat)**, asked about guest parking for the Condos.  
Mr. Thibeault explained that there are 13 additional spaces on the site and that each Unit has two garage spaces and one driveway space. There would need to be policing by the Homeowners' Association to make sure that people don't park where they shouldn't.

Ms. Roberson gave her contact information.

- **Linda Musen**, spoke of her concern for wildlife habitat.  
Mr. Thibeault explained that this is a contiguous parcel with a lot of other open space. The actual corridor where the wildlife travel is going to be left intact (wetland corridor). The portions of the site that are proposed for development are already disturbed (treed heavily/invasives/stumps/treetops).  
**Ms. Musen** disagreed with Mr. Thibeault and stated that she has photos and videos of wildlife behind her house. She said this is the reason she moved to Brooklyn a year ago. She commented that she could not hear most of the meeting and suggested that better equipment be purchased.

**Ms. Musen** voiced concern about noise and safety and commented how she saw an Amazon truck mirror get clipped because the road is so narrow. She is concerned for children. She said that she is going to move.

- **L. Donovan** (via Chat), asked if they would be putting in an additional entry/exit road on Franklin Drive.  
Ms. Roberson answered “No.”
- **Marie (via Chat)**, asked if there is a projected unit selling price.  
Mr. Thibeault stated that they will be somewhere in the \$300,000 range.

There were no further questions or comments.

There was discussion regarding the date to continue the public hearing.

Motion was made by A. Tanner to continue **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, to the November 16, 2021 meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Second by C. Kelleher.

Discussion:

Location to be the Clifford B. Green Meeting Center, Suite 24, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT, at 6:30 p.m.

C. Kelleher seconded the amendment to the motion.

Discussion Continued:

A. Tanner amended his Motion to change the location from the Clifford B. Green Meeting Center to the Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium, 119 Gorman Road, Brooklyn, CT.

C. Kelleher seconded the second amendment to the original motion.

Motion, as Amended, carried unanimously by voice vote (6-0-0).

d. **Other Unfinished Business:**

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. **\*Reschedule site walk only\***

There was discussion and there was a consensus to reschedule the site walk to Tuesday, October 26, 2021, from 5p.m. – 5:30 p.m.

2. **ZRC 21-001: Request to change Zoning Regulations concerning Conservation Subdivisions**, Applicant: David Held. **\*No discussion – Public Hearing scheduled for November 3\***

Ms. Roberson stated that the full text is in packets to Commission Members and also on the Town website and in the Town Clerk’s Office as well as the Land Use Office.

3. **SRC 21-001: Request to change Subdivision Regulations concerning Conservation Subdivisions**, Applicant: David Held. **\*No discussion – Public Hearing scheduled for November 3\***

Ms. Roberson stated that the full text is in packets to Commission Members and also on the Town website and in the Town Clerk’s Office as well as the Land Use Office.

4. **SPG 19-002 mod: Gravel Special Permit – Brooklyn Sand & Gravel, LLC**, 64+- acres, 530 Wauregan Road (Assessor’s Map 30, Lots 97, 97-1, 97-2), Removal of

approximately 218,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel. **\*Modification of Gravel Special Permit by order of the court\***

M. Sigfridson recused herself, turned the position of Chair over to C. Kelleher, and stepped away from the table.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald that the Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission, acting in accordance with the Memorandum of Decision in the matter of Brooklyn Sand & Gravel, LLC et al v. Planning and Zoning Commission of Brooklyn, hereby approves the Special Permit as previously approved deleting the former Condition 4 which has been declared by the Court to be void, and adding the following Condition 4:

- The quantity of imported material may not exceed mined material in accordance with the Brooklyn Zoning Regulations as measured by truckloads and converted to cubic yards. Material excavated on-site will be counted in the year that it is excavated. Imported material will be counted in the year that it is brought on site. Stockpiled material shall not be counted towards the excavation or importation volume.

This permit has an effective date of April 21, 2021 and shall expire one year from its effective date on April 20, 2022.

Second by J. Haefele. No discussion.

Motion carried by voice vote (5-0-0). M. Sigfridson had recused herself.

M. Sigfridson returned to the table and resumed the position of Chair.

## **VII. New Business:**

a. **Applications:** None.

b. **Other New Business:**

1. Preliminary Discussion with Greg Fedus, P.E. for COPAR re: gravel excavation.

Greg Fedus, Fedus Engineering/COPAR gave a presentation:

- The current access point through the Grandpa's Cabin, LLC property (off of Day Street to the east) would no longer be used.
- A map was displayed and he orientated the property and indicated the current access and six potential access points.
- He asked for feedback from the Commission as to what they would be looking for in the end product.
- He said the approval was for 100,000 c.y. (10-25 trucks per day), but they would be looking for more than that to make it worthwhile.
- Their plan is to purchase it and operate it themselves.
- Close to 300 acres.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that any application to remove earth materials would be subject to a public hearing and they have to be careful not to predetermine any project. She said they are always looking to minimize impacts.

Ms. Roberson said that the current approval will not transfer to a future owner and it is up for renewal shortly. She explained that there is a deed restriction limiting the access just to Fred Green. Ms. Roberson stated that potential access does not mean that it is a viable access. COPAR's challenge is to find an entry point.

Ms. Sigfridson clarified that the permit would not expire upon transfer, it is just that the new owner would be bound by the conditions of that permit which only allows access via a route that would presumably no longer be available.

Mr. Fedus stated that if they found another access, they would have to get that access permitted to get to the already permitted gravel excavation. Ms. Roberson stated that the question is whether a completely different access point is an acceptable modification of an existing permit.

Ms. Kelleher commented that she had recused herself from the last hearing regarding this gravel bank, but she did attend and she said that there was discussion regarding the Church Street access and a number of people had expressed opposition to that access. Mr. Fitzgerald suggested not using Day Street or Church Street. Discussion continued.

There was discussion regarding wetlands. Ms. Roberson explained about how the accesses would be to the western side of Longbrook.

There was discussion regarding a right-of-way through Walmart. Ms. Roberson explained that they could possibly use a portion of it with permission of the property owner.

There was discussion regarding Brickyard Road.

Mr. Fedus stated that they will look at all of the options. Ms. Sigfridson noted that it is a heavily residential area of Town. Ms. Roberson spoke about reclamation, revegetation and proposed future uses (which is part of an application). Discussion continued. Mr. Fedus stated that, if he had to speculate, he feels that they would want to give something back to the Town, possibly a natural park. He spoke about phases. Ms. Roberson spoke about wildlife corridor and indicated where the property had been clear-cut.

2. Filing Extensions for SD 21-003 and SD 21-004 and to approve such extension for an additional 90 days.

Ms. Roberson stated that these are the Almada Paradise Subdivision and the Day Street Subdivision.

Motion was made by J. Haefe to amend the agenda to add the following item under Other New Business VII.b.2 Filing Extensions for SD 21-003 and SD 21-004 and to approve such extension for an additional 90 days

Second by A. Tanner. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (6-0-0).

**VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees:** None.

**IX. Public Commentary** – None.

**X. Adjourn**

M. Sigfridson adjourned the meeting at 9:41p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault  
Recording Secretary