

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, September 7, 2022 6:30 p.m.**

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

Clifford B. Green Community Center, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT		
Click link below: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87925438541	or	Go to https://www.zoom.us/join Enter meeting ID: 879 2543 8541
Dial: 1-646-558-8656		
Enter meeting number: 879 2543 8541, then press #, Press # again to enter meeting		

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order** – Michelle Sigfridson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.
- II. Roll Call** – Michelle Sigfridson, Carlene Kelleher, Allen Fitzgerald, Lisa Herring, and Brian Simmons (all were present in person). Sara Deshaies was present via Zoom. John Haefele and Gill Maiato were absent with notice. Seth Pember and J.R. Thayer were absent.

Staff Present (in person): Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development; Austin Tanner, First Selectman (joined the meeting, via Zoom, at approximately 7:45 p.m.)

Also Present in Person: Keith Parent, CHA; Lori Corriveau, Little Dipper Farm; Sara Mooney, Little Dipper Farm; Jesse Trinqué; Mrs. Trinqué; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.

There were 10 additional people in the audience.

Present via Zoom: WINY Radio; Bob; Jackie; Marie & Scott; Ed Homonoff; Sharon Loughlin; Galaxy AIOe.

III. Seating of Alternates

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to seat Brian Simmons as a Regular Member for this meeting (September 7, 2022).

Second by L. Herring. No discussion.

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

IV. Adoption of Minutes: Meeting August 16, 2022

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to accept the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 16, 2022, as presented.

Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (5-0-1). S. Deshaies abstained as she did not attend that meeting.

V. Public Commentary – None.

VI. Unfinished Business:

a. Reading of Legal Notices:

J. Roberson read aloud the Legal Notice for ZRC 22-006 and ZC 22-001 (published in the *Turnpike Buyer* on August 24, 2022 and August 31, 2022).

b. **Continued Public Hearings:**

c. **New Public Hearings:**

1. **ZRC 22-006:** Revision to the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone Sec. 5.F.4.1.1 to except uses that are determined by the Commission to present no threat to groundwater.

J. Roberson gave a brief presentation:

- The proposal is to add the following language to Section 5.F.4.1 New Uses Prohibited, “except when such above-ground hazardous material is determined by Commission to present no threat to groundwater.”

Ms. Roberson stated that there has been interest in storage of liquid propane as a primary use. She explained that liquid propane is known to not be a threat to groundwater. She entered into the record an 8-page document from Texan A&M Agrilife Extension, entitled “Reducing the Risk of Ground Water Contamination by Improving Petroleum Product Storage.” She referred to, and read from, the fifth paragraph of page one of the document. She displayed the Zoning Map and explained about the boundary. She explained that the spatial extent of the Zone is directly from page 54 of the 2011 POCD (stratified drift deposits) which identifies potential groundwater resources as a map.

There were no comments from the Commission.

There were no comments from the public.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to close the public hearing for ZRC 22-006: Revision to the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone Sec. 5.F.4.1.1 to except uses that are determined by the Commission to present no threat to groundwater.

Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.

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

2. **ZC 22-001:** Proposal to rezone 5.5 acres from PC (Planned Commercial) to R-10 in the vicinity of 538 Providence Road (Map 41, Lot 16), Applicant: Townsend Development Associates, LLC.

M. Sigfridson opened the public hearing.

Keith Parent, Professional Engineer with CHA, represented the Applicant and gave an overview:

- He gave a brief history of the development as a result of a previous approval which included development of 13,000 s.f. of commercial space behind the spa and medical office in the area of CVS.
- Over the past decade, Mr. Townsend has pursued various tenants/options for that space to no avail. Current trends indicate a need for housing. There is a residential zone (R-10) directly behind the property and they are proposing that the R-10 Zone be extended to include this property to allow for a townhouse-style, multi-family housing development targeted toward young professionals. He noted that it would be by special permit.
- He displayed, and referred to, a conceptual drawing. A courtyard system of two-story, townhouse units with two or three bedrooms per unit, and

two or three units per building. Total of approximately 24 units/50 bedrooms (conceptual at this point).

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC:

The following members of the public voiced their concerns:

- **Richard DiCarlo**, an abutter to the property, stated concern for the number of units, what the rent would be, the construction loan, what if they can't fill all of the apartments, they could put Section 8 in there, he asked if there is a need for this, he stated concern for his privacy, for kids getting caught in the gulley. He stated that he is not in favor.

Mr. Parent explained that, from his conversations with Mr. Townsend, the people would own the inside of their units and there would be an association, similar to condos, that would maintain the grounds. He explained that there is a need in the area.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that just the Zone Change Application is before the Commission tonight, not the housing project.

C. Kelleher explained that if the zone change is approved, then there would be a separate application for whatever Mr. Townsend proposes for the property and it would require a public hearing on the actual plan for the project, not just a conceptual plan, and the public will have the opportunity to comment specific to that project.

- **Maureen Finnegan**, 30 Plaza Street, stated that she has the same concerns as Mr. DiCarlo. She also stated concern for property values and that she is not in favor.
- **Dawn Merchant**, 33 Plaza Street, explained that she is concerned about the water because her backyard gets to be like a swimming pool. There is a drainage easement that is not properly maintained by the Town.
- **Theresa Ross**, Plaza Street, stated that they are encroaching more and more into their yards. She is concerned about kids not having a place to play. She does not feel that there is enough room for families and kids. She said that the kids in the development behind Johnny's play in the parking lot. She said that Putnam does not have housing in their business district, but there is a problem in Killingly because there is housing in their business district.
- **Kerri Garcia**, 39 Westview Drive, stated that she agrees with everything that has been said and that she does not support it.
- **Mike Veit** stated concern regarding not having a police department in Town, he does not see a demand for this, he feels that it will decrease the value of homes and create safety and transportation issues and will attract homelessness. He is also concerned about where children will play. He feels that businesses should be there which he feels would generate more tax money. He asked that the Commission deny the proposal.
- **A woman from the audience** spoke of homelessness in this area of Town.
- **Robert Ross**, Plaza Street, explained that his biggest concern is the amount of water that will accumulate and go into the swamp at the end of the street where the Town of Brooklyn has a drainage easement that the Town is supposed to maintain. He feels that it would not be in the

Town's best interest to put any kind of a building on the property. He said that the zone change doesn't fit the area. He feels that if the zone change is approved, Mr. Townsend will sell the property.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM STAFF:

J. Roberson commented that the Commission needs to determine if the proposal is consistent with the POCD. Relevant points for the record:

- The PCZ is identified in the POCD as a priority location for commercial development. Specifies non-residential development.
- Areas with water and sewer are also identified in the POCD as appropriate locations for higher density residential development. She referred to, and read aloud from, the Section on Housing. She referred to the Brooklyn Housing Plan (which may be adopted as an amendment to the POCD) which identifies the most sustainable locations for housing development (areas, specifically, with water and sewer service, are transit accessible and walkable areas). According to the Brooklyn Housing Plan, the PZC meets these criteria, so the PZC would be able to consider the need for housing in both the PDZ and the Village Center Zone.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION:

- A. Fitzgerald asked about why the residents would prefer businesses over residential.

A woman from the audience stated that businesses close at 9 or 10 p.m. and there would not be a bunch of kids playing because she is concerned about them playing in the parking lot.

There was discussion regarding water run-off.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that, due to the number of people/abutters present, he is leaning toward not voting to approve.

Ms. Sigfridson reiterated Mr. Fitzgerald's concern: He is trying to reconcile how the concerns that we are hearing from the public tonight are different from the concerns that would come up with a proposed commercial development.

L. Herring explained that she has the same kind of concerns as Mr. Fitzgerald, but also recognizes that a commercial developer could come before the Commission and propose a hotel which would be a lot more traffic and they don't close at night.

Mr. Parent, again, explained about the previously approved 13,600 s.f. of commercial space and that any residential proposal would represent reduction and intensity of the use. There would be more pervious area in a residential development than in a commercial development. He explained the history of the drainage to the Quinebaug River and about the water quality, serpentine swale (behind the Bank and adjacent to the Baker's Dozen lot). He also explained about the easement/swale that is supposed to be maintained by the Town. He explained that there was an agreement that the development on this property was given the right to only have to treat the flow from their development for water quality and not for peak flow attenuation. He explained about an underground scroll chamber that is sized to treat all of the impervious areas currently approved and a little bit more. Nothing would change from the drainage standpoint from what was previously approved for commercial

development except that they would be providing more pervious area in a residential design than they would be in a commercial design. Therefore, increase in water run-off from this property would be less from a residential design than from a commercial design.

To address play areas, Mr. Parent he referred to the common area/green spaces in between the buildings. If more green space is needed, it could be discussed with the Commission at the public hearing for the actual application.

Brian Simmons expressed concern for mixing business and residential. He feels that it should just be a business area. He expressed concern regarding traffic going onto Route 6. He said that there is an accident there, on Route 6, every day and this would be an additional 100 cars to what is currently there. He sees this as a problem. He said that he is not in favor.

Ms. Sigfridson commented that, to determine whether change is appropriate, the question for the Commission is to compare the possibility of 50 residential units to 13,000 s.f. of commercial space.

Robert Ross asked if the infiltration for this project would fall under the new Regulations. He also asked if the new sewer pump station on Plaza Street is designed to take 50 bedrooms.

Mr. Parent explained that there is a recorded deed on the land records that states that this property is only required to treat the water quality, not peak flow attenuation. He does not know if the new MS-4 Regulations would have an impact on that. This does not impact the zone change discussion. He explained that the 50 bedrooms would be a slight increase in total gallons per day, but it would be a decrease in peak flow. This would need to be discussed with the WPCA. He believes that the pump station would be able to handle what they would be asking for.

Regarding the MS-4 Standards, Ms. Roberson explained that, in 2019, we adopted new storm water management guidelines in accordance with MS-4 and she read aloud from Section 7.H of the Brooklyn Zoning Regulations. She is not sure how it would affect previous approvals.

Robert Ross also asked about the cost to send high school students to schools in other towns and if the tax base would be able to handle that. C. Kelleher explained that the Commission cannot take issues such as an increase in the number of children in Town into account in making a decision.

There was discussion regarding one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom units and rentals vs. townhouses.

Mr. Parent, again, explained that if the zone change is approved, they would come back before the Commission with a full design plan, architectural, and a clearer path of what would actually be built.

There was more discussion with the public regarding commercial vs. residential.

There was discussion regarding mixed-use and Ms. Roberson explained that this does not meet that definition and that they are not proposing mixed-occupancy.

There was discussion with the public as to whether they prefer commercial or residential.

Trevor Cardinal commented that he would prefer residential.

Mike Veit does not feel that a hotel would go there because the demand is not there. He feels that residential would be a nightmare. He feels that whatever infrastructure goes there will not be supported no matter what it is. He feels that safety concerns are greater if it is residential. We are not a university town, so we don't need apartments.

Richard DiCarlo expressed concerns about traffic.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that the Commission is bound by certain standards and laws and cannot substitute our opinions on topics like property values and traffic and our suspicions on those things, for facts or expert opinion. Furthermore, when we vote on this particular Application, we need to keep in mind that what we are being asked to vote on is simply a proposal to change the zone boundary and not on any particular application. Our discretion is limited to what is given to us statutorily. We are not permitted to consider economic feasibility for a project this isn't even proposed yet.

There were no comments or questions from the public via Zoom.

Ms. Kelleher commented that the difficult thing is to separate what may happen in the future from what we are being asked to consider now, which is to move the boundary because we already have that piece surrounded by residential property in back of it and once you get to Day Street, it is residential throughout there as well. She said that it is very difficult to address a lot of the comments when just focusing on the zone change. She said that a lot of the questions and concerns would be appropriate for a hearing regarding any application for something there. We could address traffic, water and drainage concerns once we have a proposal. She spoke of how the property owner has tried over the years to have commercial enterprise there, but has been unsuccessful.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that traffic and run-off can be considered, but only in conceptual, generalized ways. We know to be the case that, in general, R-10 development is not inherently more impacted by water and traffic than commercial. She would like to see something done with the property rather than sitting empty. The Commission needs to think about what ideally they would like to see happen with that parcel vs. realistically what can happen with that parcel.

There were no comments or questions from the public via Zoom.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

Robert Ross commented that if it is changed to R-10, it minimizes your opportunity to make more business district. He does not feel that it should be there.

L. Herring asked how much of our commercial zone is not being used currently. Ms. Roberson explained that she does not have figures readily available but that she is aware of the land area that is undeveloped at this time as well as the wetlands. She will provide that information in a quantitative form. Ms. Herring stated that we still have plenty of commercial area. Ms. Sigfridson commented that we had done a build-out a few year ago.

Ken Cardinal commented that from NAPA to Day Street there are about twelve nice commercial parcels that nobody is nibbling on.

Ms. Sigfridson suggested that it may be appropriate to leave the public hearing open if there is interest in getting information about the status of development or looking at the build-out.

Mr. Parent stated that he had nothing further to add.

Lori Corriveau asked if information is available regarding whether people are actively looking for housing in Brooklyn at different income levels. She said that there isn't a lack of commercial space, but there is a lack of housing.

Ms. Roberson referred to the Housing Plan (which is on the Town website) that has been adopted which has a lot of that information in it. She said that she has spoken with people who are looking for housing in Brooklyn, but there is nothing to be had. She said that there is a severe lack of housing in this very competitive housing market right now. Ms. Sigfridson stated agreement.

There was discussion regarding whether the public hearing should be continued and what additional information the Commission would like to see/review. Ms. Herring stated that she would like more information. Ms. Kelleher stated that she is okay with keeping the public hearing open.

Brian Simmons asked if the Regulations require open space for playgrounds.

Ms. Roberson stated that if a multi-family housing special permit application were proposed, there is a requirement of 150 s.f. of recreation and open space to be provided per dwelling unit.

There was more discussion regarding storm water run-off. Mr. Parent, again, referred to the deed. He said that the agreement was signed by the First Selectman at the time. Mr. Fitzgerald asked if the new statute requirements supersede that or if it is grandfathered. Ms. Roberson stated that she would need to look into it. Mr. Parent stated that if they are required to provide peak-flow attenuation, they would be able to do that.

Ms. Sigfridson asked, if no motion is made to close the public hearing, what information would need to be provided for the next meeting.

Ms. Roberson will research the following for the next meeting:

- How much developed/undeveloped land there is in the PCZ
- Did the WPCA account for the 13,000 s.f. of commercial in the sewer capacity. Difference in cost for Commercial vs. Residential.

M. Sigfridson tabled the public hearing to the next regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, September 20, 2022. If unable to attend either in person or via Zoom, public comments can be mailed or e-mailed to J. Roberson.

d. **Other Unfinished Business:**

1. **ZRC 22-006:** Revision to the Groundwater Protection Overlay Zone Sec. 5.F.4.1.1 to except uses that are determined by the Commission to present no threat to groundwater.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to approve the proposal to change Sec. 5.F.4.1.1 of the Zoning Regulations to except uses that are determined by the Commission to present no threat to groundwater with the finding that the changes will aid in the protection of public health, safety, welfare, and property values and are consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development and the intent of the Zoning Regulations. The regulations shall become effective 15 days from the date of publication. Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.

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

2. **ZC 22-001:** Proposal to rezone 5.5 acres from PC (Planned Commercial) to R-10 in the vicinity of 538 Providence Road (Map 41, Lot 16), Applicant: Townsend Development Associates, LLC. – **Tabled to Tuesday, September 20, 2022, 6:30 p.m., at 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.**
3. Plan of Conservation and Development Update – Housing Chapter. ***Public hearing October 18, 2022***

VII. New Business:

a. **Applications:**

1. **ZRC 22-007:** Revisions to the Residential-Agricultural Zone to allow Glamping as a Special Permit Use with specific standards, including Section 2.B Definitions, Section 3.C.2.4. Permitted Uses in the RA Zone, and Section 6.T Standards for Glamping. ***Public hearing to be tentatively scheduled for October 5, 2022***

Lori Corriveau and Sara Mooney were present in the audience.

There was discussion regarding scheduling the public hearing. Ms. Roberson will confirm whether the Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium will be available on either October 5th or October 18th and she will reserve it. The Commission will then schedule the public hearing at its September 20th meeting. Ms. Roberson will send notification to NECCOG tomorrow to meet the requirement. The published notice can be placed in the *Norwich Bulletin* to meet that requirement.

Ms. Roberson explained that the whole proposal is in packets to Commission Members. It includes a narrative, prepared by an Agent for the Applicant, which explains the proposal and the reasoning behind the amendment.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to add the following new applications to the agenda as items VII.a.2 and VII.a.3:

- **SP 22-003:** Special Permit for Accessory Apartment at 57 LaSalette Drive, Applicant: Craig and Sandra Dunlop.
- **SP 22-004:** Special Permit for Accessory Apartment at 330 Day Street, Applicant: Jesse Trinke.

Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.

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

2. **SP 22-003:** Special Permit for Accessory Apartment at 57 LaSalette Drive, Applicant: Craig and Sandra Dunlop.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule the public hearing for **SP 22-003:** Special Permit for Accessory Apartment at 57 LaSalette Drive, Applicant: Craig and Sandra Dunlop for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on October 5, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. in the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.

Second by B. Simmons.

Discussion: M. Sigfridson explained that applications are usually added to the agenda as they come in. Ms. Roberson explained that the Commission can change the order.

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

3. **SP 22-004:** Special Permit for Accessory Apartment at 330 Day Street, Applicant: Jesse Trinke.

Mr. and Mrs. Trinke were present in the audience.

Ms. Roberson explained that the Trinkes had been before the Commission earlier this year and were approved for a special permit for adaptive re-use of agricultural buildings. There is a garage on the property which approved, at that time, for business uses. They now want that to be a detached accessory dwelling unit which is a special permit under the Regulations. She said that they recently applied for a special permit, but a doing zero site work. Ms. Roberson referred to, and read aloud from the Regulations regarding how, under some conditions, an approved special permit may be amended or modified without another public hearing. Ms. Roberson asked the Commission to consider if what the Trinkes are proposing now would be considered to be minor or a substantial change from their previously approved special permit.

C. Kelleher stated that she feels this is a good idea. A. Fitzgerald stated that he feels it is minor.

Mr. Trinke explained that he feels that this fits better into the zone. This is a downgrade from what has already been approved. Mr. Trinke stated that they have NDDH approval. Ms. Sigfridson commented that it is suggested that residential uses are less intensive than commercial uses.

Ms. Roberson stated that a plan showing existing conditions, signed by a licensed surveyor and professional engineer, had been recorded at the time of the prior approval (February). Ms. Roberson stated that this fulfills the professionally prepared plans requirement. Mr. Trinke explained that he took that professional

plan, kept it to scale, added what they are now proposing and submitted it to Staff. Ms. Roberson explained that if the Commission sees it as minor, it would be handled as a special permit modification and legal notices would not need to be prepared and abutters would not need to be notified.

Ms. Sigfridson asked if any of the Commission Members see it as not minor. There were no comments from the Commission. Consensus of the Commission was that the modification is minor.

This item will be on the September 20th agenda.

It was explained that it would require the special permit process should the Trinqués decide to revert back to the original special permit approval. Mr. Trinqué stated that he understands.

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

VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees:

a. **Staff Reports**

Margaret Washburn's Report dated September 1, 2022, was included in packets to Commission Members.

There was discussion regarding Margaret Washburn's Memo dated August 18, 2022 (provided to Commission Members at the meeting), containing her suggested changes to Zoning Regulations Section 9.A.1.1.a and Section 2.8, which addresses the issue of clearing in preparation for construction. Ms. Roberson asked if the Commission would like to address this issue with clarifying language/better terminology.

Mr. Fitzgerald stated that the existing language, "no site development shall commence except for agricultural purposes or maintenance of existing landscape" He said that he is not opposed to clarifying some things, but it is pretty well defined and self-explanatory. There was discussion.

M. Sigfridson suggested defining site development. Ms. Roberson stated that she would cross reference with the *Developer's Dictionary* and that she would seek guidance from her colleagues. She will further examine Ms. Washburn's suggestions. Mr. Fitzgerald suggested doing a percentage of the property. He suggested the following, "Clearing and/or disturbance of the land not to exceed a percentage of the property" (e.g. ½ acre). Discussion continued. Ms. Sigfridson suggested the following, "No site development, including clearing or disturbance of land, shall commence..."

Ms. Roberson will work with Ms. Washburn to draft language.

b. **Budget Update** (included in packets to Commission Members).

c. **Correspondence**

There was discussion about an anonymous letter, received by mail, regarding 49 Pomfret Road with copy of the Certificate of Occupancy for the in-law apartment (issued June 22, 2022), were included in packets to Commission Members. Mr. Fitzgerald asked about the parking. Ms. Roberson stated that she would need to review it. Discussion continued.

There was discussion regarding a proposal for the Membership Ordinance, regarding vacancies and alternate members, to be discussed at the next meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission.

d. Chairman's Report – None.

IX. Public Commentary

Sharon Loughlin, via Zoom, asked about the scheduling of the public hearing for Agenda Item VII.7.a.1. ZRC 22-007. Ms. Sigfridson explained that the public hearing will be scheduled at the September 20th meeting of the PZC.

C. Kelleher commented that we should get information regarding the sewage capacity in Killingly because of the pending applications to come before the PZC. Ms. Roberson explained that she has directed all of the potential developers to contact the WPCA and Al Carpenter who is their Engineer. Discussion continued.

X. Adjourn

M. Sigfridson adjourned the meeting at 9:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Secretary

Margaret's Report 9/1/2022

Zoning Permits issued:

190 Wolf Den Road – J.P. & Stephanie Rimoczy. New 24' round above-ground swimming pool with 12' x 16' deck.

499 Wolf Den Road – Little Dipper Farm. After-the-fact renovation of greenhouse.

188 Gorman Road – Dorothy and Danny Morgan. New addition consisting of a 10' x 10' breezeway and a 24' x 24' garage.

379 Tripp Hollow Road - Square One Builders. New single-family dwelling with attached garage and rear deck.

188 Gorman Road – Dorothy and Danny Morgan. New addition of 10' x 10' breezeway and 24' x 24' garage.

214A Providence Road – Northeast Onsite Services. Change of Use in a Non-Residential Building. Drug, alcohol, and DNA testing samples are collected at off-site locations. Donors also will come to this office.

625 Wolf Den Road – Janet Booth. New 8.5-ft x 18.5-ft screened porch on the south side of the existing house.

268 Tripp Hollow Road – Jason Dorigi. Replace existing 4' x 8' deck. New, enlarged deck will be 10' x 24' with stairs.

42 Hyde Road – Joe and Kelly Bellevance. New free-standing sign.

26 Herrick Road – Michael Bunning. New 1,150 square foot in-law apartment with kitchen, 2 bedrooms and 1 bathroom, above a garage in an existing building. The Special Permit has been recorded on the Land Records.

364 Church Street – Jacob Fortin. After-the-fact 10' x 12' shed.

63 Ventura Drive – Christina Brown. New SFD 3000 sq foot 4 bedroom, 2 1/2 baths on main level with attached 24' x 30' garage, with walk out decks from the kitchen and master bedroom. In-law apartment 902 sq feet 1 bed 1 bath with kitchenette. This house replaces the house previously destroyed in a fire.

47 Westview Drive – Brian Wright. New 12' x 24' pre-fabricated storage shed on a crushed stone base.

Final Certificates of Zoning Compliance:

223 South Street – Shendet Ferraj. New single-family dwelling with attached garage, front porch and rear deck.

29 Beecher Road – VBL Properties. New single-family dwelling with attached garage, front and side wrap-around porch, and rear deck.

Home Office Permits Issued: None.

Sign Permits issued:

214A Providence Road – Northeast Onsite Services. New wall sign and new freestanding sign under existing kiosk.

13 Canterbury Road – Bank Hometown. Two new portable signs.

538 Wolf Den Road – Lori Corriveau. Sign above restaurant door changed from Hillandale Farms to Little Dipper Farm.

42 Hyde Road – Joe and Kelly Bellevance. New free-standing sign.

ZBA Variances Granted: None.