

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Regular Meeting  
Wednesday, October 5, 2016  
Clifford B. Green Meeting Center  
69 South Main Street  
6:30 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order** - Chair, Carlene Kelleher, called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Roll Call** – Carlene Kelleher; Alan Carpenter; Craig Dunlop; David Fuss; Aaron Kerouac; Jeryl Mohn; Jules D’Agostino. Dale Thompson was absent with notice. Michelle Sigfridson was absent.

**Staff Present** – Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development; Rick Ives, First Selectman and Ex Officio Member of the P&Z Commission.

**III. Seating of Alternates:**

Motion by C. Dunlop to seat J. D’Agostino as a voting member in the absence of D. Thompson. Second by J. Mohn. Motion carried unanimously (6-0-0).

**IV. Adoption of Minutes:**

1. Regular Meeting Minutes September 7, 2016

Motion by D. Fuss to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 7, 2016, as presented. Second by A. Kerouac. Motion carried (5-0-2). C. Kelleher and A. Carpenter abstained as they had not attended the meeting.

**V. Public Commentary**

**Linda Trahan**, 26 Maynard Road, read a letter into the record in which she stated that she was making a formal complaint against Brooklyn Sand and Gravel because of trucks that are traveling on Maynard Road in violation of their gravel permit. She submitted a copy to C. Kelleher. J. Roberson will distribute copies to the Commission Members.

C. Kelleher stated that they will look into the situation and will respond by the next regular meeting.

**VI. Unfinished Business:**

**a. Reading of Legal Notice** – Read by A. Kerouac.

**b. New Public Hearings:**

1. SRD16-001 Gregory J. Lyon, Request for Scenic Road Designation for Beecher Road, 1.2 miles.

Gregory Lyon, 26 Beacher Road, stated that the road has a lot of scenic aspects; productive agricultural areas; numerous spots where the road is less than 20-feet wide; historic stone walls; and large, older trees. They contacted all of the residents on the road and have the support of 99 percent of the frontage land owners. Two of the four not in support are farmers who are concerned about their hauling being limited. They were not able to contact the other two. Mr. Lyon stated that 20 (including himself and one landowner got two) certified letters were mailed (receipts had been submitted to J. Roberson). They also sent separate letters explaining why. He asked that the Commission approve the Application.

J. Roberson explained that an overview map indicating the property owners who signed an affidavit supporting the Application was included in the packets to the Commission Members. Mr. Lyon brought in two additional property owners that were not shown on the map (revised). J. Roberson stated that they more than meet the nominating criteria.

Two scenic overviews: 1) Top of Beacher Road closer to Christian Hill side overlooking the pond and open fields; and 2) At the beginning of Beacher Road where Route 169 is overlooking the large fields there. Discussion ensued.

Mr. Lyon would like to maintain the scenic look and road as there is a lot of history in that area. C. Kelleher stated that she had seen an article in the Norwich Bulletin regarding having a "T" at the intersection of Route 169 in connection with a gravel bank application at the time. Mr. Lyon stated that this scenic road application is not tied to that. C. Kelleher explained that this would not have any impact on limiting traffic and that it would not stop development.

R. Ives agrees with Mr. Lyon that it makes sense to want to preserve the character of the road. He stated that he has an issue with the Ordinance as he does not think that the intent is to make every road a scenic road. He said that many people would like to see something that prohibits the changing of the roadway. He said that there is mention of excessive truck traffic. The selectmen will be taking a look at this Ordinance. Mr. Ives said that we need to make sure why it is there and we have to figure out what we want it to do. D. Fuss agreed.

J. D'Agostino did not agree as there is a statement in the Ordinance (which he read aloud) that would protect the road if it became a scenic road. He stated that there are three scenic sites on the road. He stated that Mr. Lyon's coming to the P&Z Commission is legitimate. C. Kelleher stated that it does give some authority to the P&Z Commission, but that the authority is very focused on the road.

C. Dunlop asked, if it is made a scenic road, will it be an issue if a decision is made to "T" it up to make it safer there. It could be done if it was determined to be necessary. Discussion ensued.

A. Kerouac disagreed regarding truck traffic.

- Would the bridge have been fixed the way it has if the road had already been designated?
- He considers the stream to be a scenic view.
- 13-5.4 Designation Criteria. The PZC must find that such highway or portion of the highway is free of intensive commercial development and intensive vehicular traffic. He has a hard time considering from the bridge west scenic. He stated that the Commission is not prohibited from designating a portion of the road scenic.

Mr. Lyon was not agreeable to a portion of the road being designated.

Discussion ensued. J. Roberson will check with NECCOG to see if they can assist with doing a traffic count/study: 1) What the actual traffic is; and 2) What would be the typical range for a rural road of that size. J. Roberson looked for the definition of intensive/excessive in the book of accepted standards.

A. Carpenter stated that intensive is subjective. He suggested comparing what you already have for scenic roads with what this road is. He suggested continuing the public hearing. He asked how much this road has changed in the last 20 years. He noted that, without scenic designation, it has been pretty much maintained as a scenic byway at least 20 years.

R. Ives stressed again that the Commission needs to decide what the Ordinance was meant for and that the Town still feels the same way. There must have been specific reasons why those three roads were protected. Vague sentences in the Ordinance should be cleaned up without changing the fact that there is a scenic road. A. Kerouac agreed with Mr. Ives since Windham Road (historic turnpike) is not protected.

There was discussion regarding whether the P&Z Commission needs to hear from the Conservation Commission. J. Roberson stated that they do not need to hear from them. They have been notified (after the public hearing was scheduled in August), but they have not reviewed it yet. She suggested continuing to the next regular meeting since there is need for more information (traffic count). C. Kelleher stated that the Board of Selectmen, the Director of the Highway and the Tree Warden must also be notified. She stated that they may have comments. R. Ives stated that the Board of Selectmen will talk about this. He stated that safety is a requirement. J. Roberson stated that she had spoken with the Tree Warden who had no comment.

The Director of Public Works was present in the audience and J. Roberson asked him if he had any comments. He spoke of concerns regarding maintaining the road.

**Attorney Ernest Cotnoir**, 163 Providence Street, Putnam, CT, stated that he was representing Rawson Sand and Gravel, Laframboise Sand and Stone, and River Junction Estates. None of his clients reside in Brooklyn, but they all do business in Brooklyn. River Junction is the owner of the property that is a gravel bank that was recently permitted. None of his clients have a particular position on the specifics of the Application as they have a different type of interest. He wants to clarify that they have been before the Commission (twice, recently, on an informal basis) and have proposed submitting an application for a gravel permit which involves using part of Beacher Road for gravel trucks. The purpose being to come up with a scheme that would eliminate truck traffic from Maynard Road and Wauregan Road, both, of which already have significant truck traffic. Part of the proposal would have included making improvements to the intersection of Beacher Road and Route 169. The Commission had responded favorably (on an informal basis). He stated that Rawson had hired professionals and began the process of doing surveying engineering at that intersection. He reminded the Commission that this was a previous proposal and a lot of the gravel work had been done and that the State had all but approved it, but everything has expired through lapse of time. He stated that they are beginning the process again, and will be coming to the Commission with a specific proposal, as they had said they would. As part of the process, in June of this year, they had sent a letter to several of the landowners on the Beacher Road area (including the Applicant, Mr. Lyon) specifying why they were doing the surveying. He read part of the letter (dated June 9, 2016).

Attorney Cotnoir stated that this is an unusual, uniquely personal-type of application and that they believe that the Commission sits on this application in a legislative capacity. He stated that, if it is granted, they are concerned that they would have to come before the Commission (showing probable cause) for approval to make the kinds of improvements contemplated at the intersection of Beacher Road and Route 169. He stated that this would flip the burden to the applicant and that it would be slower than originally contemplated.

Attorney Cotnoir read from Section 13-5.1 of the Ordinance and stated that if the designation is to prohibit safety-related improvements, he would argue that it is not consistent with safety. He stated that 13-5.3.e.2 allows the Commission to designate a lesser portion, which may be appropriate in this case (to 500 or 1,000 feet just before the intersection to allow the modifications to be made). He stated that they want to be up front and that he and his clients have been very public about what they want to do. He advised the Commission that after the application for designation was filed, Rawson made other inquiries and found that it would be possible (because of change in ownership) to, instead of going out to Route 169 by Rukstela Road and Beacher Road, they could do it over private property. He explained that he and his client remain committed to the application that they were working on when the designation application was filed.

Motion by C. Dunlop to continue the public hearing for SRD16-001 Gregory J. Lyon, Request for Scenic Road Designation for Beecher Road, 1.2 miles to the next regular meeting to be held on November 2, 2016, at 6:30 p.m., at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Center located at 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT. Second by D. Fuss for discussion. There was no discussion. Motion carried unanimously (7-0-0).

J. Roberson explained the timeline.

2. SD16-001 A. Kausch & Sons; Map 46, Lot 37, 6.44 acres on the east side of South Street; 6-Lot Subdivision in R-30 Zone.

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, represented the Applicant and distributed revised plans (dated October 5, 2016) to J. Roberson and the Commission. He also submitted the certified mail cards. He gave an overview:

- Six-lot subdivision using the free split, so there are two parcels (text amendment allows for double access drives next to one another). He indicated on the map.
- He explained that both parcels contain a drainage easement and an open space easement.
- He explained that some lots are under 30,000 s.f., but if served by public water and sewer, the R-30 Zone Regulations allow for a 25 percent deduction allowing lot size to go down to 22,500 s.f.
- He explained that all of the water from East Brooklyn drains onto this property and the Town never had a legal right to drain onto this property. They are proposing to install a 36-inch pipe that will handle the water from East Brooklyn. He indicated on the plan and stated that this has been approved by Syl Pauley and his comment was to put a grate at the end of the pipe (dated September 12, 2016, included in packets to Commission Members). They will deed over a

drainage right-of-way and an access right-of-way over it and also an access right-of-way over the existing driveway and another portion (he indicated on the map). He stated that he had spoken about this with the Director of Public Works regarding manholes.

- He spoke with Joe Couture at Suez regarding sewer as he had been told that it was not necessary to go before the WPCA as long as Mr. Couture was okay with it. He submitted a letter from Mr. Couture stating that he has reviewed and approved it.
- He submitted a letter from Jerry McDermott of Connecticut Water Company which stated that he has reviewed the plans and approves.  
He indicated that there will be three meter pits with home runs to the three lots and will be tied in directly.  
He indicated the design of the sewer line and a change in the plans that had been submitted: three lots will be on a 2-inch, low-pressure sewer line using grinder pumps to get it to go into the main. Joe Couture had been concerned that the 90's should go into manholes, so Mr. Archer explained (indicated on the map) that in that area (South Street), it will be gravity fed into manholes.
- Driveways are within 10 percent grades.
- Received Wetlands approval.
- They have not heard from the Conservation Commission yet.
- Open Space: He indicated on the map where they are proposing an easement regarding an existing hiking trail along the Quinebaug River. Which could be expanded in the future. They are requesting a waiver of access to the open space.

J. Roberson stated that Syl Pauley's comments were mostly regarding utility connections. She explained passive solar and asked how was considered since the short side of the house is facing south in the lot layouts presented. Mr. Archer explained that they had considered it but, due to shape of the lots and the topography, it was not possible. They chose to face the road instead.

J. Roberson stated that it is on the plans that they will be putting a cover on the drainage outlet.

J. Roberson asked about the soil scientist signature block. Mr. Archer stated that it has been added to the Existing Conditions Plan (page 2) and that, when the mylars are filed, it will be signed by Joseph Theroux.

J. Roberson asked about the flood zones depicted on the plans and how it was determined where they should fall. Mr. Archer explained they used elevation (worst-case scenario) and that they are nowhere near either of the flood zones with any of their elevations or gradings. No base flood elevations has ever been determined.

J. Roberson referred to Item #9 of Syl Pauley's comments in which he recommended that permanent boundary markers be included for every change in direction for the proposed drainage easement as well as the access and utility easement. J. Roberson was concerned with drainage on the back lots. Mr. Archer explained (and indicated on the map) that they will be setting boundary markers at all of the corners of all of the lots. He stated that the manholes will be located in the middle of the easement and he does not feel that there will be a problem. He offered to put more pins if required.

J. Roberson asked what percentage of the open space is under the Quinebaug River. Mr. Archer stated that of the 42,200 s.f. of the proposed open space, 7,500 s.f. is under the Quinebaug River. He explained that it is land and suggested that a boat ramp could be put in for access to the River. He mentioned that there is also 16,000 s.f. of drainage easement dedicated to the Town which will help an existing Town drainage situation. The original deed for the property carries the property line to the center of the River and the boundary between Brooklyn and Killingly is there also.

J. Roberson explained that, regarding the open space percentage dedication, the Commission has the authority to require that it be similar in characteristics to the original parcel per Section 8 of the Subdivision Regulations. She stated that sometimes that is not the best way to look at open space. In this case, she feels the open space closest to the River is the most valuable and that the fisherman's trail that has been created there is probably the most significant passive recreation resource. When the Kathleen Drive subdivision (to the south) was approved, a 50-foot, pedestrian access (walking easement) along the River was created (it is not currently being used for public access). She stated that a 20-foot easement over one of the lots in this proposed subdivision could connect to the Kathleen Drive easement. She stated that the Commission could require a way to get to the open space, but she

feels that the north/south access is the more important one to build over time. She stated that if the Applicant were to designate that as part of this subdivision (and it were approved), it would help to add another link in the chain. Mr. Archer stated that the Applicant would want to do a fee-in-lieu of open space rather than allowing the public to walk across private lots and that the open space is far more valuable to the Town. Discussion ensued regarding public access. J. Roberson read from the Regulations regarding open space access. She stated that the Applicant is specifically asking for a waiver and that the Commission has to specifically grant it, otherwise, it is a requirement. Discussion continued.

J. Roberson stated that the plans were sent (digitally) to the Conservation Commission, but they have not reviewed them yet. She stated that the P&Z Commission does not have to wait for feedback, but it is an option.

Discussion ensued regarding liability of the open space.

J. Roberson indicated/explained the northern part of the trail from the Tiffany Mill property to Davis Forest. C. Kelleher stated that it is sensible planning for the future and she polled the other Commission Members to see if they were in agreement. All Commission Members agreed.

Motion by A. Kerouac to grant the waiver for the 20-foot pedestrian access for Application SD16-001 A. Kausch & Sons; Map 46, Lot 37, 6.44 acres on the east side of South Street; 6-Lot Subdivision in R-30 Zone. There was no second.

Motion by A. Kerouac to close Application SD16-001 A. Kausch & Sons; Map 46, Lot 37, 6.44 acres on the east side of South Street; 6-Lot Subdivision in R-30 Zone. Second by J. D'Agostino.

There was discussion. A. Carpenter did not feel that the public hearing should be closed.

A. Kerouac withdrew his motion.

A. Carpenter asked the following:

- If the design/size of the pipe for the drainage was designed based on calculation. Mr. Archer stated that David Held of Provost & Rivera had done the design work and had submitted it to Syl Pauley for review.
- If all of Syl Pauley's comments had been addressed. Mr. Archer explained that they mostly deal with the water service and the low-pressure sewer line. There was discussion.
- How many locations in Town have access to the trail and would it be beneficial to have access to the trail by combining the drainage easement and a pedestrian access to get to it (as suggested by A. Kerouac earlier). Mr. Archer stated that Mr. Kausch would accept that. J. Roberson stated that current locations for access to the trail are the Kathleen Drive subdivision and the other is Davis Forest (which get used, but are not formally maintained). Discussion ensued. R. Ives stated that the Town is not looking for a lot of access points right now.
- Has the site been designed to attenuate pre and post storm water? Will driveways be paved? Mr. Archer stated that David Held did a good job on the design. Due to wetlands, they will be paving some of it to pitch water toward the (grassy) wetlands.
- None of this site is draining into the drainage easement? Mr. Archer explained that it is not and that the water comes from East Brooklyn. The drainage area size is in excess of 40 acres. There is a written calculation and Syl Pauley has reviewed it. Mr. Archer stated that it had been redesigned per request of the IWWC.
- He suggested that passive solar be considered. J. Roberson suggested changing the orientation of the houses that don't face the street.

#### Comments from the public:

**Don Stevens**, Franklin Drive, asked if it is only one lot that will be crossed over for the easement. Mr. Archer stated that it would be over one lot in favor of the Town.

**Mr. Stevens** asked if the homeowner would be maintaining that property. Mr. Archer stated that is correct and he explained that, as part of the subdivision, the Town would be granted a deed giving the easement and right-of-way. When the mylars are filed, there will be a deed outlining the open-space easement to the Town.

Motion by D. Fuss to close the public hearing for Application SD16-001 A. Kausch & Sons; Map 46, Lot 37, 6.44 acres on the east side of South Street; 6-Lot Subdivision in R-30 Zone. Second by A. Kerouac. Motion carried (6-1-0). A. Carpenter was opposed.

**c. Continued Applications:**

1. SRD16-001 Gregory J. Lyon, Request for Scenic Road Designation for Beecher Road, 1.2 miles. Continued.
2. SD16-001 A. Kausch & Sons; Map 46, Lot 37, 6.44 acres on the east side of South Street; 6-Lot Subdivision in R-30 Zone.

Motion by J. D'Agostino to waive the requirement that open space have access from a public street in accordance with Subdivision Regulation 8.4.2 for Application SD16-001 A. Kausch & Sons; Map 46, Lot 37, 6.44 acres on the east side of South Street; 6-Lot Subdivision in R-30 Zone. Second by C. Dunlop. Motion carried (6-1-0). A. Carpenter was opposed as feels there should be access.

Motion by J. D'Agostino to approve the six-lot subdivision application of Andrew Kausch for the property located on the east side of South Street, Assessor's Map 46, Lot 37, identified in the files of the Brooklyn Land Use Office as SD 16-001, in accordance with all final plans, documents and testimony submitted with the application and including the following conditions:

Prior to the endorsement by the Commission of the Final Subdivision Plan(s) for filing in the office of the Town Clerk:

- The approval and/or review letters from the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission and the Planning and Zoning Commission shall be added to the Final Subdivision Plan(s).
- All boundary pins and monuments shall be set and field verified by the surveyor.
- A 42,200 s.f. public access pedestrian easement along the Quinebaug River shall be transferred to the Town of Brooklyn in a form acceptable to the Town and in accordance with the requirements of CT General Statutes 8-25 and Section 8 of the Town of Brooklyn Subdivision Regulations.

Second by A. Kerouac.

There was discussion. For clarification, the 42,200 s.f. is private land over which there will be a public pedestrian easement. Mr. Archer will send a copy of the revised plan to Syl Pauley. J. Roberson stated that Syl Pauley had reviewed with IWWC and that she brought forward every comment that was not related to sewer. There was discussion regarding the Conservation Commission. They prefer to receive paper copies rather than electronic. C. Kelleher stated that she does not feel that the P&Z Commission needs to hear from the Conservation Commission because this is not a complicated application.

Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

**VII. New Business:**

**a. Applications:**

1. SPR16-006 Brooklyn Center Complex, 71 Vina Lane, Coop 1, Map 24, Lot 158, VCD; Proposed Activity – Craftsperson.

Paul Archer, Archer Surveying, represented the Applicant. Mark Benard (Brooklyn Center Complex) was seated in the audience. Gail and Todd Lutz Leerskov were seated in the audience. Mr. Archer stated that there had been a lengthy discussion regarding whether the tile work that they do is light manufacturing or craftsperson.

Gail Lutz Leerskov did a presentation of their business, Paisley and Parsley, which is relocating from Washington State. She displayed samples of the tiles that they sell. Ms. Lutz Leerskov explained the work that they do and that she considers herself to be a craftsperson. They buy the marble tile from a company in the United States which imports the tile from Turkey. The stone is cut and tumbled (to soften the edges) in Turkey. She showed how the tile arrives to her. She stated that they do not cut the tile. They do not mass produce or inventory anything. Everything is produced by hand as ordered. She stated that she (they also feature several artists) creates the images and they are finished with a magnet and a piece of cork. There is no machinery. They will use a company in Rhode Island that will put the image on the tiles (ink-jet printer and UV cured). Their customers are mostly small gift shops, art galleries and art museums. She stated that they hope to grow and be able to hire some local residents.

The shipments will come on a truck with a lift-gate (two crates at a time). Fed-Ex will come once per week to pick up. Mr. Archer explained and indicated the loading dock.

Mark Benard explained that he had mistakenly stated, previously, that they cut the tiles.

C. Dunlop stated that he is concerned as he still feels that it is more light industry rather than craftsperson (based on the definition). C. Kelleher stated that she is looking at it differently and she read from Section 3.4.1 regarding uses that are related or equivalent to listed uses. She stated that the designing is a craft being performed. The fact that they are not being printed in-house makes it less intensive. She is comfortable saying that it is related/equivalent to a craftsperson. C. Dunlop agreed. J. D'Agostino gave an example of a vase, one with a print on it and one without. He explained that the one without the print was made by an artisan and the one with the print was made by something other than a craftsperson as it is a product that was improved and made into a different product. He stated that his problem is with the word craftsman. C. Kelleher stated that it is similar to craftsman and that it is not possible to list every conceivable use. This would be a nice, low-impact addition to the neighborhood. D. Fuss agreed. R. Ives agreed and stated that maybe the Regulation needs to be tweaked. C. Kelleher stated that she does not feel the Regulation needs to be tweaked as the language is there to give latitude.

A. Carpenter asked how many employees and what is the projection for growth. Mrs. Lutz Leerskov stated two right now, her husband and herself. Todd Lutz Leerskov stated that he thinks they will hire two full-time people for two-to-three days a week with two or three additional part-time people that would come in to help. For the long term, he does not have a business plan in place, but he is optimistic because they have seen modest growth each year over the six years they have been in business. Sixty percent of their clientele is in New England.

A. Kerouac, regarding the history of the parcel, asked Mr. Archer to indicate which buildings are adaptive re-use. A. Kerouac stated that he agrees with what was said regarding craftsperson, but he has issue with the two buildings being non-conforming and that the Commission cannot change or increase the non-conformity. He said that he had warned the Commission of this. C. Kelleher disagreed. J. Roberson explained that this is a new use that isn't related to any previously permitted or grandfathered uses. A. Kerouac suggested that it would be cleaner if the Commission remove the approval of this structure (Building 1) as adaptive re-use because it is not allowed in the VCD. J. Roberson explained that it is not the building, it is the uses.

Motion by J. Mohn to approve Application SPR 16-006 submitted by Brooklyn Center Complex, LLC of 71 Vina Lane to locate a use similar to Craftsperson as permitted in Section 3.4.1 in an existing structure in the Village Center District in accordance with all final plans, documents and testimony submitted with the application. Second by D. Fuss. Motion carried (5-2-0). A. Kerouac and J. D'Agostino were opposed.

J. Roberson

**b. Other:**

**1. Discussion regarding Pet Grooming in the NC Zone.**

J. Roberson referred to a letter from Corner Properties (dated October 4, 2016) regarding locating a pet grooming business (Mr. Cristina thinks dogs and cats) in a building owned by Mike Cristina at 174 South Main Street. She stated that pet grooming is not listed in the permitted uses for Neighborhood Commercial. However, Personal Services are allowed (beauty salons, barber shops and nail salons). Mr. Cristina would like to ask the Commission if this could be considered a similar use under Section 3.4.1.

Discussion ensued. C. Dunlop and D. Fuss agree that it would be similar to people. The Commission would like answers to the following questions before deciding:

- What kind of animals?
- How many animals?
- They would need to be kept inside with no external runs.
- No overnight stays.
- Parking.

J. Roberson stated that if there is consensus that it is similar to personal service, it could be handled by the ZEO.

J. Roberson looked up and read (from the Complete Illustrated Book of Development Definitions) the definition of personal services for J. D'Agostino. J. D'Agostino did not agree that the word "personal"

could be stretched to include pets. It was argued that the key word is “grooming”. C. Kelleher stated that, under Section 3.4.1, the Commission could determine that the service provided to cats and dogs is similar to a personal service from a barber shop or a beauty salon. A. Kerouac asked if there is a limit to the number of occupants/customers, and if parking and signage would be issues. J. Roberson stated that they would have to follow parking standards and signage would have to be consistent with the Regulations. There is nothing that says a beauty salon or barber shop can only have so many seats.

There was a consensus among the Commission Members that this should come to the Commission as they may want to impose conditions.

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

##### **1. Budget**

C. Kelleher likes the format. She stated that there is \$1,000.00 for training of Commission Members and would like to use it. She asked for suggestions. J. Roberson stated that, after the holidays, the Center for Land Use Education and Research (CLEAR) would do basic training, if invited, and Brooklyn could invite neighboring towns. NECCOG training was also mentioned.

##### **2. Correspondence.**

##### **3. Chairman’s Report – None.**

##### **4. Schedule Special Meeting for Zoning Regulations discussion**

Scheduled for October 18, 2016. A. Carpenter will not be able to attend.

A. Kerouac wanted to discuss, as a Commission, the NECCOG Route 169 Corridor Management Plan Sub-Committee. He asked that it be put on the agenda for the Special Meeting on October 18, 2016. R. Ives stated that it was postponed to October 28, 2016. C. Kelleher stated that she is interested to see if they will have any recommendations for zoning regulations. There was discussion. J. Roberson stated that the report is on the NECCOG website and will send the link to Commission Members.

J. Roberson will send the definition of craftsperson that she found to Commission Members.

There was discussion regarding the status of the compliance of Brooklyn Sand & Gravel. R. Ives stated that the requirements regarding the excavation materials vs. bringing it in and processing have been met for this period. They met the Wetlands concerns, but the traffic continues to be an issue. There is a condition that they agreed to that they would not have anyone supply them from the Laframboise plant using Maynard Road. They continue to violate it. Mr. Ives has personally seen 34 trucks go by in 46 minutes. ZEO, Martha Fraenkel has been in contact with the Trahans and will discuss it with Mr. Joly.

J. Roberson will give a copy of the letter that Attorney Cotnoir read to Martha Fraenkel and addressing the letter will be put on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

Discussion ensued. A. Kerouac asked that the Commission be notified well in advance of permit renewals so that the Commission can be allowed to evaluate them throughout the process. C. Kelleher stated that, when reviewing the Gravel/Earth Excavation Regulations, she would like it to be put in that the Commission be part of the renewal process. R. Ives stated that they will supply copies of all correspondence with a timeframe that they are expected to answer. And, if they do not answer, he recommends that they do not operate. He stated that it also helps to have a regulation to back that up. Discussion continued.

#### **IX. Public Commentary – None.**

#### **X. Adjourn**

Motion by D. Fuss to adjourn at 9:38 p.m. Second by A. Carpenter. Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault  
Recording Secretary

Brooklyn Planning & Zoning Commission  
Regular Meeting, Wednesday, October 5, 2016