

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, January 17, 2023 6:30 p.m.**

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

MEETING LOCATION:	
Clifford B. Green Meeting Center, Suite 24, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT	
Click link below: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84765564828	or Go to https://www.zoom.us/join Enter meeting ID: 847 6556 4828
Dial: 1-646-558-8656	
Enter meeting number: 847 6556 4828, then press #, Press # again to enter meeting	

MINUTES

- I. Call to Order** – Michelle Sigfridson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.
- II. Roll Call** – M. Sigfridson, Carlene Kelleher, Allen Fitzgerald, Lisa Herring, S. Pember, J. Haeefe; Gil Maiato; (all were present in person).
Sara Deshaies and Brian Simmons and were absent with notice. Karl Avanecean was absent.
- Staff Present:** Jana Roberson, Town Planner and Director of Community Development; Austin Tanner, First Selectman (both present in person).
- Also Present in Person:** Pete Parent, P.E. with CHA; Attorney Kathleen Cerrone, The Northeast Law Center; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.
There were five additional people present in the audience.
- Present via Zoom:** Steve Townsend, Townsend Development; Debbie; Scott & Marie; Jim Doherty; Jackie; Lori Johnson; Amy Fleming; WINY Radio; Mary K; Bob; Norman Berman.
- III. Seating of Alternates** – No Alternates seated.
- IV. Adoption of Minutes:** Meeting January 4, 2023
- Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 4, 2023, as presented.
Second by G. Maiato. No discussion.
Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (7-0-0).
- V. Public Commentary**

Scott Winslow, Herrick Road, stated that he was considering submitting an application for an Alternate Position. He asked about the philosophy of the PZC regarding zoning as he feels zoning regulations should be changed so that it benefits all of the Townspeople rather than sculpting or tailoring the regulations to only benefit a couple of people.

A. Tanner stated that you uphold the Regulations the way they are written and when there are changes, you do it to the best of your ability.

M. Sigfridson explained that everyone on the Commission wants to do something for the Town as a whole. Only a handful of people participated in the re-write of the Regulations.

L. Herring spoke of the difficulty and time spent in making decisions as those decisions change people's lives. She said that she makes her decisions based on what she feels is best for the Town.

A. Fitzgerald stated that he doesn't feel that any of the Commission Members do it for personal gain and, although they don't always agree, they all try to do what is best for the Town.

C. Kelleher explained that the Regulations are fluid and are never finished. She looks at what is before her and sees how it fits in. It is always a balancing act between what is best for the Town and what a person is allowed to do with their personal property.

VI. Unfinished Business:

a. Reading of Legal Notices: None.

b. Continued Public Hearings:

1. **ZRC 22-008:** Revisions to the Planned Commercial Zone to allow self-storage facilities as a Special Permit Use with specific standards, including Sec. 4.D.2.3.19 Permitted Uses in the PC Zone, and Section 6.T Standards for Self-Storage Facilities, Applicant: Townsend Development.

Pete Parent, P.E. with CHA, represented the Applicant. Mr. Townsend was present via Zoom. Mr. Parent reviewed revisions which resulted from discussion at the previous meeting.

- 6.T.2.1 – No change.
- Added 6.T.2.2 – No Outdoor Storage shall be allowed.
- Added 6.T.2.3 – Maximum allowable density for Self-Storage Facilities shall be 4,000 square feet of Gross Building Area per Acre of Lot Area, with no single building greater than 20,000 square feet.

Mr. Parent stated that self-storage is a low-impact use that would be compatible with other allowed uses in the Zone. The revisions would reduce the visual affect.

Mr. Parent displayed a conceptual plan to show the scale of what Mr. Townsend is proposing. He indicated the locations of existing, proposed and previously approved buildings.

Steve Townsend's comments:

- He feels that this mixed-use combination is a great use for this property.
- Commercial development is not simply store-front retail and that he sees this type of development all across the country.
- Route 6 will become vibrant if some of these alternative uses are allowed along the Route 6 Corridor.
- Four sites, including this property, that would potentially impacted by this proposal.
- Low impact with little or no traffic coming off the site, little or no safety issues, little or no noise, height of the building would be less than what is permitted in the Zone.
- Would have a positive impact on the Grand List.
- No direct impact on schools.
- Would create more opportunities for others to develop.
- Self-storage would be complimentary to the 19,000 sq. ft. retail center that he plans to do.
- They are prepared to move on this as he has someone who is interested in doing the self-storage, if approved. They would get started in the spring when weather permits. They would be coming back to the PZC with detailed plans.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

- **J. Haefele** asked about hours of operation.
Mr. Parent explained that hours of operation would be proposed as part of the special permit application process. He stated that there would be no need for 24-hour access and that standard business hours would be typical. Mr. Townsend stated same hours, until 9 p.m., like CVS.
Ms. Roberson stated that suitability to the location would be addressed should this proceed to a special permit application.
- **A. Fitzgerald** asked about whether more directive needs to be added to the proposal regarding a way to include retail space, as discussed at the last meeting, so that the Town doesn't get overwhelmed with storage facilities.
Ms. Roberson stated that she had consulted with the Town Attorney and he feels that co-dependency of uses is probably not appropriate for Zoning Regulations.

- **L. Herring** spoke about her concerns regarding the difficulty in converting the building to another use in the case that self-storage does not work out. Mr. Townsend referred to the conceptual site plan and explained that the building could easily be converted to a retail center. He also explained that, for the 19,000 sq. ft. retail building, they do not do the inside until they have a tenant.

QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

- **Scott Winslow**, Herrick Road, asked if anyone had done a study on Cube Smart in North Windham and another in Chaplin to see what the percentage is of them being filled up, to determine the demand. G. Maiato and A. Fitzgerald stated that they had experienced that there is a need for storage in the area. M. Sigfridson explained that the goal, as a Commission, is not to do feasibility studies for the developers.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:

- **M. Sigfridson** commented that self-storage facilities are not her favorite use, however, this would be meeting a need in this area and would have an immediate positive affect on the Grand List with very little need for services from the Town. She appreciates that it is proposed in such a way to limit storage units as far as the eye can see.
- **C. Kelleher** stated agreement with Ms. Sigfridson and asked Ms. Roberson about distances possibly being changed by the ZBA. Ms. Roberson explained that language could be added specifying that the distances cannot be changed by the ZBA. Ms. Kelleher stated that she would like the language to be added. M. Sigfridson agreed and mentioned concern for an applicant asking for a variance regarding the rear lot requirement. Ms. Roberson stated that that would be a huge change from the anticipated impact as it would open up the frontages.
- **J. Haefele** commented that, although his preference would be residential which had been denied in the past, this is a viable option that would not be a tremendous eyesore as it is internal storage and, in this case, combined with some retail space. He stated that he has concern that the retail space will end up sitting empty like much of the other retail space in Town, but Mr. Townsend has tenants lined up that may be interested. He stated agreement with the restriction regarding the ZBA.

There was discussion regarding language to be added: Amendment to the proposal (#4): "No variance shall be issued to reduce or modify the entirety of the dimensional requirements."

Mr. Parent and Mr. Townsend both stated that they have no objections to this language.

- **A. Fitzgerald** stated that he is in favor of the proposal as it would benefit the Town Grand List and would not disturb property values, as it had already been approved for commercial buildings. He stated that research a number of towns and no other town restricts self-storage facilities in the commercial zone.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to close the public hearing for **ZRC 22-008: Revisions to the Planned Commercial Zone to allow self-storage facilities as a Special Permit Use with specific standards, including Sec. 4.D.2.3.19 Permitted Uses in the PC Zone, and Section 6.T Standards for Self-Storage Facilities, Applicant: Townsend Development.**

Second by G. Maiato. No discussion.

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

c. New Public Hearings: None.

d. **Other Unfinished Business:**

1. **ZRC 22-008:** Revisions to the Planned Commercial Zone to allow self-storage facilities as a Special Permit Use with specific standards, including Sec. 4.D.2.3.19 Permitted Uses in the PC Zone, and Section 6.T Standards for Self-Storage Facilities, Applicant: Townsend Development.

There was discussion regarding whether the Town Attorney should review the additional language. Ms. Roberson explained that the Town Attorney had been consulted and had suggested a different scenario. Ms. Sigfridson commented that she feels comfortable moving ahead.

There was discussion regarding the amendment to the proposal (#4): “No variance shall be issued to reduce or modify the entirety of the dimensional requirements of this Section.”

Motion was made by L. Herring to approve the amended proposal to allow self-storage facilities as a Special Permit Use with specific standards, including Sec. 4.D.2.3.19 Permitted Uses in the PC Zone, and Section 6.T Standards for Self-Storage Facilities 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 G. Maiato.

Discussion: M. Sigfridson stated that the Commission had discussed their feelings during the public hearing.

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

Amendment to the proposal (#4): “No variance shall be issued to reduce or modify the entirety of the dimensional requirements of this Section.”

2. **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.

Ms. Sigfridson noted that the Applicant’s Representative, Attorney Cerrone, was present.

Ms. Roberson explained that, using the last submission from the Applicant (dated 11/29/2022), she had provided the draft language (dated 1/12/2023), which includes her track changes as per discussion from the last meeting, for review by the Commission. The draft language was displayed. She stated that grammatical corrections had been made.

- Regarding Section 6.T.2.15, Ms. Roberson stated that the last six words, “including both lodging and event guests” should have been removed from the draft as the Commission had discussed, at the December 20th meeting, changing it to just lodging occupancy as there could be events that are not related to the glamping.

Section 6.T.2.15 to read as follows: “Maximum lodging occupancy for the Glamp-ground shall be a total of 110 persons.”

- Ms. Roberson reviewed Section 6.T.2.5 and there was discussion. The Commission had previously discussed setting a maximum number of Glamping Units at 50. Ms. Roberson referred to, and read aloud, C. Kelleher’s email dated 1/16/2023 (provided to Commission Members at this meeting as it was received after packets had been sent on 1/13/2023), in which she states that she feels there is a conflict with the maximum of 50 Glamping units and the density language, therefore, she suggests using the language from the original draft, as follows:

“The maximum density of Glamp-grounds shall be one Glamping Unit per every two suitable acres. A suitable acre is defined by the Connecticut Department of

Public Health regulations for Family Campgrounds as dry land available for unit site development – dry land meaning land not designated as wetlands or watercourse. The density of one Glamping Site per acre shall not prevent Glamping Site or Glamping Units from being clustered together.” Ms. Kelleher noted that this approach would increase the maximum units to 62(.5). Discussion continued.

The following language was decided upon for Section 6.T.2.5: “The maximum number of Glamping Units shall be one per every two suitable acres, not to exceed fifty (50) Glamping Units. A suitable acre is defined by the Connecticut Department of Public Health regulations for Family Campgrounds as dry land available for unit site development – dry land meaning land not designated as wetlands or watercourse.”

- Ms. Roberson reviewed Section 6.T.2.9 to read as follows: “All Glamping Units shall be installed on raised permanent platforms no less than 6 inches off the ground.”
- Ms. Roberson reviewed the definition for Glamping Unit, to read as follows: “A lodging structure to be occupied for transient and recreational lodging. Such structures may include, but are not limited to, safari tents, yurts and teepees. Such Glamping Units may not exceed 600 square feet and must be part of the Glamp-ground operation and located on approved Glamping Sites. Glamping Units, like hotels, are not included in the definition of a dwelling, as defined in these Regulations.”
- There was more discussion regarding Section 6.T.2.15 and whether to increase the maximum occupancy from 110 as discussed at a previous meeting to 125 or 150 as suggested by Ms. Kelleher in her email (dated 1/16/2023).
 - A. Tanner stated agreement with Ms. Kelleher.
 - S. Pember disagreed as he feels that it would be easier to increase, if needed in the future, rather than to decrease.
 - L. Herring stated that she understands both sides, but stated agreement with Mr. Pember. She is comfortable with 110.
 - M. Sigfridson considered whether maybe it should be tied to the number of Units. Discussion continued.
 - C. Kelleher feels that raising it by 15 people won’t make a huge difference in impact to the neighborhood, but could make a difference in feasibility.
 - S. Pember stated that you have to draw the line somewhere and that he prefers that the number be 100.
 - Ms. Roberson stated that it started at 250 and suggested 150 (3 per unit).
 - Ms. Sigfridson and Ms. Herring both stated that they do not feel it should be less than 110.
 - Ms. Kelleher stated that if it is approved, it should be something that is workable or not approve it at all. If approved, she would like it to be successful.
 - Ms. Sigfridson feels that it makes sense to tie the maximum the number guests to the number of units (maximum number of guests per unit). She suggested 2.5 guests per unit, total of 125 guests. She said that a smaller Glamp-ground would have fewer guests than a bigger Glamp-ground. She said that she is excited about this proposal as she feels it will be good for the Town. She stated that she agrees with Ms. Kelleher and that, if approved, it should give the Applicant a realistic shot at doing it in a way that won’t ruin the lives of the neighbors. She said that she would be in favor to make whatever changes are necessary to see what this would look like in Town and, if it’s with a cap of 110, so be it.

Ms. Roberson explained that if the Commission takes action to approve this Application, the Section number would be 6.U rather than 6.T because the previous Application (ZRC 22-008) was approved as Section 6.T.

J. Haefele stated that it needs to be put on the Record how this Application fits in with the POCD. He said it is not a clear fit. He said we're getting there, but Glamping is not in the POCD.

C. Kelleher stated that the POCD calls for supporting agriculture tourism.

M. Sigfridson stated that it has been discussed a lot that this Application doesn't directly conserve farmland and she said that she wouldn't try to argue that it does, but it certainly is supportive of tourism which she thinks that most people in Town are in favor of that type of business development because tourism brings money into Town, hopefully, without a huge requirement for Town services. Schools are not impacted which is a big part of the budget, although, there may be a consideration for emergency services.

L. Herring explained that she feels that it does sort of preserve open land with the way we set it up by changing the direction a little bit by not allowing things that can't be taken apart very easily (hard structures).

M. Sigfridson stated, although somewhat conjecture, people running a Glamp-ground would want to preserve scenic resources so that it will attract people to come there.

J. Haefele stated that a positive is that there is somebody who is interested in a site of almost 600 acres in the Town of Brooklyn whose first thought isn't development. He said that, eventually, it will get developed. This proposed development has some tie-in to agriculture, to reasonable things that are nice to keep alive in Town. He feels there is hope this way.

There were no further comments.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to amend the proposal for **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.U Standards for Glamping. Amend Section:

- 6.U.2.15 to read as follows: Maximum lodging occupancy for the Glamp-ground shall be a total of 125 persons."

Second by J. Haefele.

Discussion: G. Maiato asked for clarification. Increase from 110 persons to 125 persons.

Motion failed by voice vote (2-4-1). L. Herring, J. Haefele, G. Maiato and S. Pember were opposed.

A. Fitzgerald abstained.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the proposal to allow Glamping as a Special Permit Use in the RA Zone with specific standards, including revisions to Section 2.B-Definitions and Section 3.C.2.4.- Permitted Uses in the RA Zone and the addition of Section 6.U-Standards for Glamping to the Zoning Regulations 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 L. Herring.

Discussion: M. Sigfridson clarified that the Motion was to approve a change that would allow Glamping as a special permit use.

A voice vote was taken, but it was unclear how Commission Members voted.

A. Fitzgerald requested a Roll Call Vote.

Roll Call Vote: L. Herring – yes; J. Haefele – yes; G. Maiato – no; M. Sigfridson – yes; C. Kelleher – yes; A. Fitzgerald – no; S. Pember – yes.

Motion carried (5-2-0).

There was discussion regarding those who voted opposed stating their reasons.

A. Fitzgerald was opposed for the following reasons: He doesn't feel that it would benefit the Town/Tax Roll; and he doesn't feel it would do anything for property values.

G. Maiato was opposed for the following reasons: He feels it would ruin the Quiet Corner; concerns for safety, traffic on the road, fire and EMS; if he lived on that road, he wouldn't want it.

3. **SP 22-007:** Special Permit for an Events Facility at 459 Wolf Den Road, Applicants: Nicole and Greg Fisher. ***Public Hearing 2/21/2023***

Ms. Roberson explained that the location will need to be changed to the Middle School. There was discussion and Ms. Sigfridson agreed that the Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium would be the best place.

4. **SP 22-008:** Special Permit Application for Multi-Family Development (50 Condominium units) on south side of Louise Berry Drive (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 19), 13.5 acres, R-30 Zone, Applicant: Shane Pollack and Erin Mancuso. ***Public Hearing 2/1/2023***

This public hearing will take place at the Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium.

Ms. Roberson provided copies of the Scope of Services for the Traffic Engineer (dated 1-9-2021) and she also provided copies of a proposal from the same Traffic Engineer (KWH Enterprise, LLC dated 1-15-2023) that the Commission had used before, who suggested charging hourly (amount not to exceed \$6,000). Ms. Roberson stated that she shared this with the Applicant. Nicholas Mancuso (the Applicant's Attorney) strongly objected as he feels that the Applicant should not have to pay twice for the same work and does not think that it is appropriate for the Commission to take action on this. For the record, Ms. Roberson read aloud from Attorney Mancuso's e-mail.

Ms. Roberson spoke about how the Traffic Report received is not the same Traffic Report. School was not in session when the Study was first done due to COVID-19. She said that she specifically requested that they collect traffic count data from while school is in session. She explained that the Commission is within its authority to request a third-party consultant to review that Report and she does not feel that the purpose of the third-party consultant is changed by this being a revision of a previously withdrawn application. The work involved is less. She referred to the Ordinance which specifies a 25-percent contingency.

There was discussion:

- Mr. Haefele would like to instruct the Traffic Engineer to give us a percentage increase.
- Mr. Pember suggested that someone who has done the Study before would go back with that same Study in mind that they already did. So, he feels that a fresh set of eyes would be better to do a completely new Study with school in session. The cost is not our major concern.
- Ms. Sigfridson reminded the Commission that the third-party Consultant would be reviewing the data provided by the Applicant.
- Mr. Pember stated that he would like the Applicant to do a completely new Traffic Study with a new Engineer. Mr. Fitzgerald stated agreement with Mr. Pember. The two stated that they could not approve the Application based on the previous Traffic Study. Mr. Fitzgerald suggested that the Town Attorney be consulted.
- Ms. Roberson stated that she had strongly suggested that they collect contemporary data and she read from the most recent Traffic Report submitted in December 2022, which states that data was collected from school afternoon peak hours on September 21, 2021. This, she said, indicates to her that they did not collect more contemporary data. The third-party Consultant would give their expert opinion to determine this. They may determine that the Applicant needs to collect more data. Discussion continued.
- Mr. Pember stated that he is not biased one way or the other, but he knows, personally with kids in that school, that the data collected in September of 2021 is not going to be correct. He said that there is now double or more traffic than there was then. He offered to abstain, if necessary. Ms. Roberson stated that she does not think that it is grounds for abstention.
- Ms. Sigfridson stated that the Commission needs to determine if we are okay with the Scope of Work.

Mr. Tanner suggested that the Scope of Work be more specific.
There was discussion regarding language to request specific data. Mr. Fitzgerald suggested that a site visit be requested during the times that people would be going to the School. He said that the traffic is the biggest problem with the Townspeople.

Ms. Roberson stated that she will revise the Scope of Work to include concerns about changes to the traffic pattern since September 2021, and to request a site visit during both drop off and pick up. Ms. Roberson referred to, and read from, the Ordinance and asked that a motion be made to accept the Scope of Services.

Motion was made by J. Haefele to amend the Scope of Services – Traffic Engineer regarding SP 22-008 to add #5 to request a site visit during drop off and pick up to address concerns about changes to the traffic pattern since September 2021.

Second by S. Pember. No discussion.

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

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to reschedule the public hearing for SP 22-008: Special Permit Application for Multi-Family Development (50 Condominium units) on south side of Louise Berry Drive (Assessor's Map 33, Lot 19), 13.5 acres, R-30 Zone, Applicant: Shane Pollack and Erin Mancuso for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on **February 1, 2023** at 6:30 p.m. at the Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium, 119 Gorman Road, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.

Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.

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

5. **SD 22-004:** One lot Resubdivision including 2 acres on Allen Hill Road/Wauregan Road (Map 31, Lot 97C), Applicant: Wayne Jolley/Lori Pike. ***Public Hearing 2/21/2023***

Ms. Roberson explained that the public hearing for this Application would also be at the Brooklyn Middle School.

Mr. Fitzgerald asked if this item could be placed early on the agenda as it is pretty cut-and-dry. Ms. Roberson stated that she will do that.

Motion was made by J. Haefele to reschedule the public hearing for SD 22-004: One lot Resubdivision including 2 acres on Allen Hill Road/Wauregan Road (Map 31, Lot 97C), Applicant: Wayne Jolley/Lori Pike for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on **February 21, 2023** at 6:30 p.m. at the Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium, 119 Gorman Road, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.

Second by A. Fitzgerald. No discussion.

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

6. **ZRC 22-009:** Multiple revisions to Section 4.F Mill Mixed Use Development Zone, Applicant: DMP Palmer Associates. ***Public Hearing to be Rescheduled***

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to reschedule the public hearing for ZRC 22-009: Multiple revisions to Section 4.F Mill Mixed Use Development Zone, Applicant: DMP Palmer Associates for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on **March 21, 2023** at 6:30 p.m. at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.

Second by S. Pember. No discussion.

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

VII. New Business:

- a. **Applications:** None.
- b. **Other New Business:** None.

VIII. Reports of Officers and Committees

There was discussion regarding two training opportunities for Commission Members as PZC and ZBA Members (now required to do four hours of training per year):

- CLEAR Training (included in packets to Commission Members) that is available virtually;

- Connecticut Land Use Law for Municipal Land Use Agencies, Boards, and Commissions (included in packets to Commission Members).

Ms. Roberson will forward links to Commission Members.

Ms. Roberson explained that some members of the public were not happy with how their comments were described in the minutes and that she had asked that, if they would like the Commission to modify the minutes, they provide the actual words they would like inserted.

- Maria Gandy-Winslow and Scott Winslow submitted a letter dated January 5, 2022 (included in packets to Commission Members).
- Ms. Roberson provided copies of the original text of the Minutes of the December 7, 2022 meeting and a copy with Track Changes inserted. Ms. Roberson asked that Commission Members read it as it was not included in the packets. Ms. Roberson explained that her understanding is that previous minutes may be amended, it is not a requirement. Any changes to previous minutes actually would be reflected in the minutes of this meeting, we do not go back and change the old minutes. She said that we had never gotten a request like this before.

There was discussion. Scott Winslow stated that Ms. Gandy-Winslow had read from her letter and only excerpts were included in the minutes. He said that he listened to the audio of the public hearing and everything that she read was on the Record. Mr. Winslow feels that although the recording of each meeting is available to the public, they will not listen to them, but that they would read the minutes. Ms. Gandy-Winslow's comments, in their entirety, as she read them aloud from her letter, which she also submitted to Staff at the public hearing on December 7, 2022, are part of the Record of that meeting. Ms. Roberson confirmed that those comments are part of the Record of the December 7th meeting. Additionally, Ms. Roberson confirmed that all written comments submitted to her were posted on the website and can be viewed under the December 20, 2022 Agenda, Appendix D (206 pages). Ms. Roberson explained that the entire Record of the Application is not posted on the website, but it is accessible to anyone who requests it. The letter from Mr. Winslow and Ms. Gandy-Winslow (dated January 5, 2023) will not be added to the Record.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that the Minutes of the January 17, 2023 Meeting will reflect that a letter was received from Maria Gandy-Winslow and Scott Winslow requesting that Maria's comments be clarified.

IX. Public Commentary

- **Debbie Cornman** asked for clarification regarding the Glamping Application that was approved at this meeting: She asked if it is correct that the Commission went from a maximum of 225 lodgers plus guests together to 110 lodgers and no limit on the non-lodgers. Ms. Sigfridson stated that it is correct. Ms. Kelleher stated that the Special Event Permit will deal with maximums. Ms. Cornman stated that she is disappointed that a limit was not placed on the number of people that can be on the property. She asked if people will be able to come and visit with an unlimited number. She asked if lodgers would need to have an Even Permit to have a party. Mr. Pember stated that if it is more than 50 people beyond lodgers, they would have to get a Special Event Permit. Ms. Cornman asked if Mr. Haefele's suggestion for it to be reviewed every 24 months had been included. Ms. Sigfridson stated that it was not included. Ms. Cornman stated that, for transparency, it would be nice if people's letters were easier to access. There was discussion among the Commission Members regarding the 24-month review. It can be added under the Special Permit. Mr. Fitzgerald suggested that it could be every 12 months. Ms. Kelleher commented about enforcement procedures.
- **Jim Doherty** suggested looking into transcription software. He asked if the Enforcement Official works on weekends. Ms. Sigfridson stated that we have the audio recording and anyone, who wants to, can listen to it. The minutes are not supposed to be a transcript, but rather something that can be quickly

referred to. Ms. Sigfridson and Ms. Roberson stated that they are not aware of requirements of content for minutes in the Statutes. Mr. Fitzgerald read from "Robert's Rules of Order" that the duty of the recording clerk is to record what is done by the Assembly, not what is said by the Members.

Regarding the Enforcement Officer, Ms. Roberson explained that Ms. Washburn's hours could be flexible to address certain situations as they arise. Ms. Washburn is aware that things do happen outside of normal business hours.

Mr. Doherty asked who to call on weekends should an issue arise.

Mr. Tanner stated, "The buck stops here."

Ms. Sigfridson stated that the first call would be to the Zone Enforcement Officer, but if she is not at her desk, Ms. Sigfridson suggested leaving a message or sending an e-mail. The Selectman's contact information is available on the Town website as well. Law enforcement is an option if there are issues of safety or danger. The Resident Trooper is not on duty on the weekends. People can also take photos or recordings as Ms. Washburn does not have to personally witness a violation in order to do something about it.

Mr. Doherty stated that he is disappointed in the decision (he did not identify which) as he does not think it was in the best interest of the Town, specifically the neighbors.

Mr. Doherty commented regarding the other proposal by the School and a traffic study conducted on Bush Hill and Wolf Den.

Ms. Sigfridson and Ms. Roberson explained that a traffic study on Bush Hill Road had not been considered for the Zoning Regulation change. It was a different application.

Mr. Doherty stated that he hopes that it will be scrutinized on the special permit application because it is a significant piece of the equation.

Mr. Doherty stated that a question had been asked to consider the totality of the special permit for the wedding venue on Wolf Den Road. He feels that the Commission needs to look at the totality of everything.

- Maria Gandy-Winslow commented that Dr. Poland was always being introduced as the expert and she had verbally acknowledged what he had said. She said that she would like to have equal detail to what he received in his presentation, as an expert. She said that a financial liability report was never submitted and there are no reasons why this should be accepted.
- Scott Winslow stated that as far as the minutes are concerned, exceptions should be taken because he felt that the Attorney comments were more detailed. He said it was not factual. Mr. Tanner explained that there have been a lot of requests for the audio and they are looking into making the links available to click on for easy access.
- Mr. Fitzgerald asked about getting notifications regarding ZBA so that the PZC can address them.

Anyone can sign up to have updates e-mailed to them.

Ms. Roberson explained that all actions of the ZBA are on the ZEO Report which Members of the PZC receives.

There was discussion. Ms. Roberson stated that the main thing is concerning setbacks. She had provided copies of draft changes, to make it clearer, at the December 20th meeting. She will fill out the form to make it a Zoning Regulation Change and will bring it to the February 1st meeting. It will be assigned ZRC 23-001.

There was discussion regarding a special permit for a storage facility that has not been received yet. Ms. Roberson will look into it.

X. Adjourn

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to adjourn at 9:50 p.m.

Second by G. Maiato. No discussion.

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

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault
Recording Secretary