

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

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

MEETING LOCATION:	
Brooklyn Middle School Auditorium, 119 Gorman Road, Brooklyn, CT	
Click link below: <a href="https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87925438541">https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87925438541</a>	or Go to <a href="https://www.zoom.us/join">https://www.zoom.us/join</a> 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 6:34 p.m.
- II. Roll Call** – Michelle Sigfridson, Carlene Kelleher, Allen Fitzgerald, Lisa Herring, Seth Pember, Gill Maiato; Brian Simmons and Karl Avanecean (all were present in person).  
Sara Deshaies was present via Zoom.  
John Haeefele 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:** Attorney Kathleen Cerrone, The Northeast Law Center; Dr. Donald J. Poland, PhD, AICP, Goman+York Property Advisers, LLC; Diane Wimmer, Brooklyn Conservation Commission; Mindy Delp; J.S. Perreault, Recording Secretary.  
There were approximately twenty-five additional people present in the audience.

**Present via Zoom:** Lori Corriveau; Mary Kalencik; Carrie Juhasz Horton; Dalia Belliveau; Jenn Nemeth; Amy Clark; Galaxy A50.

**III. Seating of Alternates**

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to seat Brian Simmons as a Regular Member for this meeting (December 7, 2022), in the absence of J. Haeefele.  
Second by C. Kelleher. No discussion.  
Motion carried unanimously by voice vote (6-0-0).

**IV. Adoption of Minutes:** Meeting November 15, 2022

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to approve the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of November 15, 2022, as presented.  
Second by S. Pember. No discussion.  
Motion carried by voice vote (6-0-1). S. Deshaies abstained due to losing power at her home (while attending that meeting via Zoom) prior to the public hearing being continued.

**V. Public Commentary**

**Tina Russo** purchased a property on Pomfret Center Road in the Village Center Zone thinking that she could have backyard chickens and goats and some other things. She said that the previous owner had chickens and that there is a chicken coop on the property. She said that people can have chickens five blocks away. She explained that she wants to have a garden and to teach her children responsibility and sustainability.

J. Roberson stated that agriculture is a permitted use in the VCZ and that non-commercial agriculture is by site plan review. She explained that Ms. Russo does not have a site plan for her property and that there is no relief from that requirement in the Zoning Regulations. She said that it would probably cost a few thousand dollars to have a site plan prepared. She had suggested to Ms. Russo that she come before the PZC and present the situation that could be described as backyard agriculture.

There was discussion and the consensus of the Commission was for Ms. Roberson to draft language, for review by the Commission, to go through the proper process to amend the Zoning Regulations.

## **VI. Unfinished Business:**

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

b. **Continued Public Hearings:**

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, Applicant: Little Dipper Farm.

Attorney Kathleen Cerrone explained that the questions of the Commission had been taken into consideration regarding modifications to the Application to be addressed by Dr. Donald Poland who was present. Lori Corriveau, Applicant/Owner of Little Dipper Farm, was present via Zoom. Attorney Cerrone asked that she be allowed to speak again after public comments.

Dr. Donald Poland had submitted two documents regarding modifications (both dated November 29, 2022 and were included in packets to Commission Members). Dr. Poland stated that although he had not attended the public hearing on November 15<sup>th</sup>, he had reviewed the record including comments by the Commission during discussions. He explained that this is an effort to continually work with the Community to try to find a path forward with a workable regulation. Dr. Poland reviewed the modifications, he addressed additional related matters and he offered to answer any additional questions from the Commission:

- Regarding the Commission's concern that the 200-foot setback from property lines may not be enough, they proposed a modification that the setback be increased to 250 feet where there are residential dwellings on neighboring parcels. He noted that the other large 200-foot setback in the Regulations relates to mining and gravel operations.
- Regarding the Commission's comment that farmland is important, Dr. Poland explained that both he and the Applicant agree. He explained that he did some research into Prime Farmland soils and he has put forth a provision (Standard #1 in his memo dated 11/9/22) that no more than 25 percent of the total parcel area to be designated as Prime Farmland.
- Regarding comments from the Conservation Commission, Dr. Poland commented that their recommendation that glamp-grounds not be permitted to do any damage to resources identified in the co-occurring resource inventory in the POCD is unreasonable for a number of reasons: 1) It is a standard that does not exist in the Regulations; 2) Has that standard been applied to other applications for either zone changes or site plan?; 3) Would it be the policy of this Commission to apply that standard to a single-family, residential lot? He said that the approach for "no impact" becomes a bit high and is inconsistent with the current Regulations.

Dr. Poland stated that they had submitted, for the record, a Map (dated July 2022) - "Natural Diversities Data Base" which, he explained, is the State's (DEEP) gold standard for natural, cultural and archeological resources and is often utilized in the creation of POCD's to highlight those areas, ecosystems and locations that are of concern and sensitive to the community. He clarified that, although it is referenced in the POCD in the context of the co-occurring resources, on the Map, the contemplated parcel associated with Little Dipper Farm does not have any resources identified by the State's "Natural Diversities Data Base." He said that the idea of doing a comprehensive inventory also goes

a bit far because we already have the comprehensive inventory which is maintained by the State and the Map (available online) is updated on a yearly basis by the State.

- In response to the Commission's question regarding the overall maximum number of sites on a glamp-ground, Dr. Poland explained that the maximum number of glamping sites is controlled by the total acreage of the parcel. He explained the following controls which are in the proposed text amendment:
  - One glamping site per acre.
  - Maximum of three glamping units per glamping site. There are a limited number of sites that can have more than one unit.
  - Maximum number of occupants per glamping site is twelve occupants.
  - Maximum occupancy for the entire glamp-ground, including events, is 225 persons.
- Regarding the Commission's request for quiet time restriction between 10:00 p.m. and 9:00 a.m., they added a provision between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. as they feel that 9:00 a.m. is a little bit late.
- Regarding the Commission's question about changing from a 15-foot height requirement to an 18-foot height requirement, Dr. Poland explained that they did it mainly because of complaints by residents and what had been discussed with the Commission. He explained that they have put forth another modification to address height for the units which will vary in size depending on their utilization (he referred to photos in his memo dated 11/29/22). He explained that the height of the platform may be more than the minimum of 6-inches high depending on topography. The new proposed modification is to maintain the 15 feet, measured based on the height of the tent, not including the platform that it may sit on.
- Regarding the Commission's concern about the 1,250 sq. ft. glamping-site minimum and suggestion to have a maximum, that a site could not exceed a certain size, Dr. Poland explained that under the original proposal, an additional 250 sq. ft. would need to be added for each a second and a third unit, if added to the site (three-unit site would be a 1,750 sq. ft. minimum). He explained that, to provide a maximum, they added a provision to establish a maximum of a 2,500 sq. ft. site. He referred to the last photo provided in his memo to demonstrate that the unit will occupy a portion of the site, but you still need exterior space for things such as a campfire and seating space.
- Regarding the Commission's concerns about glamping unit size and number of people per glamping unit, Dr. Poland explained that he did some research and sizes ranged from 150 sq. ft. to 700 sq. ft. They propose two provisions: 1) No more than twelve occupants on a glamping site; added 2) Maximum of eight persons in a glamping unit and the size of a glamping unit is not to exceed a maximum of 600 sq. ft. in size.

Dr. Poland referred to the photos in his memo again and explained that the glamping units should not be considered static as hotel rooms and he explained that the units would be adaptable and may be set up differently based on need and demand for what the reservations are. He explained that the square footage is not directly related to the number of people renting the unit.
- Regarding the Commission's concern about density, Dr. Poland explained that they added a provision that makes it clear that the units can be dispersed or clustered together. He said that the glamping model is the clustering model. He said that the site-per-acre is just a density calculation, it doesn't prohibit them from being closer together.
- Regarding concerns raised by the public about someone with a three-hundred acre parcel applying for two separate glamp-grounds, Dr. Poland explained that they are proposing a separation distance of one mile (5,280 feet). He noted that there could never be more than one glamp-ground at the Little Dipper Farm location (even with a 1,500-foot separation distance).
- Regarding the Commission's question about why accessory structures/temporary worker dwellings were called out and not other structures, Dr. Poland explained that residents were concerned about the residential

occupancy of staff on the site, so they felt that that was the biggest accessory concern and, therefore, called it out. He said that they had gone from five structures to three structures and he said that he has done more research. He found that certain labor markets have significant shortages and, in certain locations, the hospitality industry, overall, has not been able to find enough staffing in the local labor market. He said that it is the hope that the labor market here would have enough and that such units would not be needed. But, they don't want to go into this assuming that. The Commission would have final discretion through the special permit process. They are providing a provision that no more than 50 percent of the staff of such a facility could be housed on site. He is hopeful that this would imply that no more than 50 percent of the staff would not come from the community.

- Regarding the Commission's concern about interplay between events and glamp-ground operations and approval of events, Dr. Poland explained that they added a standard to tie certain events or size of events to the existing Zoning Regulations for special events in Section 6.J. There is a Town Ordinance for large events (250 or more persons). Because there is a 225 person limit, this would never be applicable for a glamp-ground.

It has to be clear as to what is an event vs. what is a glamping lodger.

Dr. Poland explained that they are proposing that an event for more than 50 persons, who are not lodgers at the glamp-ground, shall require special permit in accordance with Section 6.J. The intent is to differentiate between the activities associated with the lodgers and activities or events aimed at persons who are not lodgers. He explained that lodging activities are self-contained until you start attracting people to the site and get to the level of the larger trip generation, then the special event provision would kick in.

Dr. Poland offered to answer questions.

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

- L. Herring asked about different styles of units and about live music events. Dr. Poland explained that, while tents would be more easily removed, the wooden platforms that either tents or cabins would be attached to would have a level of permanence. He explained that the Commission would have discretion regarding the units and entertainment through the special permit process.
- C. Kelleher asked about how the maximum number of people allowed relates to the sites and units. She voiced concern regarding how to enforce it. Dr. Poland explained that each maximum stands on its own: no individual site can have more than three units; no unit can have more than eight occupants; and no site can have more than twelve persons. Sites with a minimum of 1,250 sq. ft., no more than 2,500 sq. ft. and only a percentage of the sites can have more than one glamping unit in them. These would all have to be laid out as part of the site plan. Total site occupancy, between lodgers and event goers, is 225 people. He said that you would enact your typical enforcement policies and procedures, there is nothing different here. He suggested that conditions of special permit approval could be placed to require that a yearly affidavit be submitted based on maximum occupancy or a provision to require renewal of the special permit after a number of years. He suggested that, for an enforcement provision if persistent known violations exist, they could be required to come back before the PZC for a public hearing. Dr. Poland advised that the more you try and constrain something on the regulatory side for worst-case scenarios, the more likely you're just going to undermine the regulatory provision and make it non-functionable. He explained that the PZC has a lot of discretion to influence the application when it comes in.
- M. Sigfridson indicated that, since the units/sites are dynamic and flexible, more clarification was needed regarding C. Kelleher's question about the number of people in the units/sites.

Dr. Poland stated that during the special permit application process, the Commission should be sure to get an explanation of what the program is for each site/unit, require them to show their formats for each unit size and for each site so that it will be known what the total potential is. The applicant will be bound to whatever the PZC approves. He suggested that there could be a condition of approval that the Town is able to make an on-site inspection twice per year with a 24-hour notice.

Dr. Poland stated that, at this point, we are considering the suitability of a use within a zoning district that lays out 24 specific standards from the start. They have put a lot of regulatory restrictions on this use to address the concerns. Special permit would provide protection later.

Ms. Sigfridson stated her appreciation for the proposed modifications, specifically addressing events. However, she explained that she still has concerns regarding scope because, if an event (e.g. concert or wedding) is going to be held, we already have a regulation for that and it should be used, but she feels that there may be other impacts besides traffic.

Dr. Poland said that the Regulations have performance standards and he referred to, and read aloud from, Section 7.F. He explained that there is a fine line to allow the glamping activities to exist while not overburdening the other activities. He explained that events have been held at the Farm forever and he feels that more events will continue to be held in association with the Farm and maybe not directly in association with the glamp-ground itself. The primary use at the glamp-ground will be glamping and it will have a degree of activities associated with it and some of them may attract persons who are not glampers. He noted that there are already 6-12 glamp-grounds in Connecticut (in communities where campgrounds were already permissible). He said that there aren't any news stories about them because they are a non-issue. They are not proposing a campground as the community has expressed the desire not to have campgrounds, what they are proposing is a high-end glamping use.

Ms. Sigfridson explained that the concern is not only with the Little Dipper Farm, but for any applicant because the Commission has to consider this provision as a whole. She explained that, if a glamp-ground is primarily going to be a glamp-ground, it may be appropriate and not overly burdensome to expect that a glamp-ground that intends to hold events, apply for a special event permit at the same time.

Dr. Poland suggested that the Commission make the provision state that, if there is intention to do any kind of events on the site, at the time of special permit they apply for the 6.J, 5-year event permit. Dr. Poland stated concern regarding the requirement to provide a 12-month schedule of events at the time of applying because it may not be known at that time. He said he had some concerns about ambiguity, but he thinks that it is fine to require a 6.J permit as an additional special permit through the process.

- A. Fitzgerald asked Dr. Poland for his professional opinion as a Planner, what benefit this would be to the Town.

Dr. Poland stated that he feels there would be a lot of benefits. He referred to the POCD and said that the Community wants more businesses and tourism (he thinks it was 72 percent that want tourism-style businesses in the Community). He reiterated from beginning discussions that if you want to save the farm, if you want the rest of this cherished corner of the Town to be viable as, primarily, scenic land to the benefit of its neighbors, then you have to provide for viable economic opportunities to fund them. Neighbors don't pay for those views, the farm itself has to. He feels that there are a lot of benefits, such as: economic development benefits; agriculture benefits; open space benefits; scenic resource benefits; and tourism benefits. He explained that there is a unique resource that makes Brooklyn ideally situated for this – dark skies.

There were no further questions from the Commission at this time. Dr. Poland asked that questions for him from the public go through the Chair rather than directly to him.

#### **COMMENTS FROM STAFF:**

- J. Roberson addressed Dr. Poland's comments regarding the recommendations of the Conservation Commission (Letter dated December 5, 2022, included in packets to Commission Members). Ms. Roberson noted that Diane Wimmer will be speaking during public comments.

Ms. Roberson voiced disagreement with Dr. Poland regarding the "Natural Diversity Data Base" as being a comprehensive inventory of natural resources. She noted that there is a long list of things that are not included, such as: archeological resources; a consideration of soils; and it does not consider forest fragmentation. The Map contains generalized circles that are a half-mile in diameter and a very short list of critical habitats. Ms. Roberson referred to a series of Maps (known as the Town of Brooklyn Community Resource Inventory) which are included in the Brooklyn POCD. This includes the following: scenic views; trailheads and rock outcrops; historic and archeological resources or the potential thereof; open space; wetland and water resources; aquifer potential; habitat resources including forest fragmentation in the Natural Diversity Data Base which is also in there (as a layer among many), the Co-occurring Resource Inventory which is the map referenced by the Conservation Commission's letter. Ms. Roberson explained that it is a set of four layers: Potential Wildlife Corridor Linkages; Active Agricultural Clusters; Permanently Protected and Municipal Open Space; and the fourth layer called Co-occurring Resources (she explained about this layer which is made up of six different layers and is parcel based). She read aloud a portion from the Map regarding strategically minimizing impacts to natural and cultural resources. Ms. Roberson stated that she had attended the Conservation Commission meeting when this Application was discussed. She noted that they had not asked to be included in this process and that it had been referred to them. Ms. Roberson referred to the letter from the Conservation Commission in which they refer to the "co-occurring resource inventory as stated in the Plan of Conservation and Development," Ms. Roberson thinks that, perhaps, what they meant was the Community Resource Inventory, which is all of the resource-based (she explained natural and cultural) maps in the POCD.

Ms. Roberson stated that a point of agreement that "not do any damage" could be replaced with better language. She suggested, "Strategically minimize impacts to natural and cultural resources including, but not limited to, those identified in the Community Resource Inventory included in the Plan of Conservation and Development." She then stated that current Zoning Regulations, Special Permit Criteria, Section 9.D is reviewed by the Commission for every special permit (she read aloud a portions of Section 9.D regarding factors that may be considered). Ms. Roberson stated that the Special Permit Criteria already address what was raised by the Conservation Commission in their letter.

Ms. Roberson commented that an incredible natural resource in our Community is the Route 169 Corridor which is a nationally designated scenic byway a mile away from Little Dipper Farm. She spoke of efforts in the past to promote heritage road based tourism along the Route 169 Corridor. There is a "Route 169 Management Plan" (a Regional effort) which talks about increasing tourism as one of only four goals. It also mentions agri-tourism. She will share the "Route 169 Management Plan." She said that it does not have the weight of the POCD, but she feels that it is relevant to the conversation of economic development and tourism as a State Regional goal.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION:**

- Diane Wimmer, Vice Chair, represented the Conservation Commission. She explained that they normally work with the PZC on subdivision reviews and that this is the first time that they had ever been asked to weigh-in on a zoning amendment.

Ms. Wimmer explained that they reviewed the documents including the map of potential properties that would qualify if the Application were approved. She

explained that they had used the POCD and the Co-occurring Resources together with the map of the potential properties to conduct their review. She explained that they found from the maps that most of the parcels had some significance and that is why they made the recommendations.

Ms. Wimmer explained that the Conservation Commission would like it to be taken into consideration that they feel that the natural resources must be protected, so there has to be a vetting process for any permit process if the Application is approved.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:**

- **Jim Doherty**, Bush Hill Road, spoke in opposition and he stated that he attended the meeting of the Conservation Commission last night and that he had submitted written comments to them for consideration. He provided copies to PZC Members and stated that he would like the PZC to also give consideration to his comments. He read aloud his concerns/comments.  
Mr. Doherty also commented about statements made by Attorney Cerrone and Dr. Poland at the previous public hearing(s). He feels that the process should continue as there are still too many unanswered questions. He asked the following questions:
  - How Commission Members and other residents would feel if one of these large scale, commercial, luxury camping operations was placed in close proximity to their own homes.
  - How does the amendment benefit anyone other than the Applicants?
  - What compelling reason would warrant approval of this Application? He said that he has not heard one.Mr. Doherty asked that the Application be denied.
- **Jacqueline Igliozi**, Woodward Road, submitted her written comments to the Commission. She spoke of the need to alert the NDDH so that they would perform annual inspections if the Application is approved and before a special permit is applied for.  
A. Tanner stated that he would look into this.  
M. Sigfridson explained that the Zoning Regulations don't refer to the NDDH inspection requirement.  
C. Kelleher suggested that, if the Application is approved, the NDDH would be made aware.
- **Norman Berman**, Bush Hill Road, stated that he remains opposed. He had submitted written comments (Letter dated December 6, 2022, included in packets to Commission Members). Mr. Berman explained his concerns that there are ambiguities, vagueness and lack of specificity in the proposal. He provided copies of a written statement to Commission Members, in which, he addresses his concerns regarding modifications dated November 29, 2022. He referred to Section 6.T.2 regarding standards:
  - Why limit to 25 percent?
  - He voiced concern regarding clustering of glamping sites/units.
  - How will "high-quality and durable" materials be determined?
  - He suggests that language be added regarding the primary access drive be situated some distance from a sharp curve or a hill.
  - He suggests that dark-sky compliant be defined.
  - Regarding #19, he feels that "photographs of similar buildings" is inadequate and that the applicant should be required to provide a drawing of what is intended.
  - He feels that "quite time" should be defined.
  - Regarding #23, he does not know what the second sentence means. He asked how events get incorporated into a glamp-ground.
  - Regarding what needs to accompany a special permit application, he suggests that the following should also be included: certificate of insurance; a comprehensive fire prevention plan which includes plans for infrastructure designed to facilitate fire control as may be prescribed by the Fire Marshal; a trash containment and removal plan; a provision for filing and reporting

complaints for violations of Regulations; a comprehensive neighborhood impact and security plan designed to eliminate noise, nuisance and other things; the plan should prohibit parking on roadways surrounding the glamp-ground; plan must prohibit noise or other nuisance that disturbs the comfort and convenience of the neighbors; the application for a special permit should be accompanied by a printed code of conduct that glampers will receive when they register and agree to in writing (an enforcement mechanism); the application should be accompanied by an approval by Brooklyn Boards and Committees.

- Regarding security/enforcement, Mr. Berman referred to Section 6.T.2 Standards. He feels that there should be annual review.
- **David Loughlin**, Wolf Den Road, read from a prepared statement in response to comments made by Counsel for the Applicant at the November 15<sup>th</sup> public hearing. He feels that none of the concerns have been substantially addressed and that no tangible benefit to the Town has been credibly described. Mr. Loughlin feels that that this Application is a poorly conceived, potentially destructive proposal that will have a negative impact on the Town forever. Without demonstrable benefit to the Town, with serious negative consequences for the character of the Town and its budget, he asked that the Application not be approved.
- **J. Perreault**, St. Regis Drive, stated that she is in favor of the Application as she feels that it will be good for the Town of Brooklyn and surrounding communities.
- **Maria Gandy Winslow**, resident and business owner in Brooklyn, read a prepared statement in opposition. She explained that she has attended all meetings for the proposed RA Zone change including the Affordable Housing, Agriculture Commission and Conservation Commission meetings and she said that there have been many meetings that have had Little Dipper Farm within the meeting which, she said, taxpayers would not be aware of so many meetings pertaining to L.D.F. (even if a small part). Ms. Winslow said that she has done a lot of research on glamping and resulting impacts and she feels that the glamping industry is a new venture capitalist venue with hopes of making money hand over fist. She spoke about a similar property in Massachusetts (Dream Away Lodge) where a glamping application was denied. She said that this Application should be denied for lack of proper knowledge.
- **Debbie Cornman**, read from a prepared statement and said that there is no agreed-upon definition or standards for glamping in the State of CT which, she said, makes it difficult to evaluate this Application. The modified Application still leave too much to the imagination and is open to interpretation. She researched glamp-grounds in CT and found between 9-21 sites and she gave examples of types of accommodations and prices. She said that she is not sure how a platform equates with luxury. She spoke of different scenarios regarding number of units/people. She feels that, although the Applicants may have good intentions, it is irrelevant. She would prefer to have homes there. She said that if the PZC allows all RA Zone parcels of sufficient size to become commercial zones, you are agreeing to change the very character of Brooklyn. She urged that the Application be denied.

#### **ONLINE PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- **Lori Corriveau**, stated that they had neighborhood meetings with numerous neighbors including Mr. Doherty, Ms. Igliozi and Mr. Berman who spoke earlier in this meeting. She explained that they suggested a high-end inn with a spa in lieu of the glamping, but that the Applicant's propensity is toward what is proposed.
- **Mary Kalencik**, a small business owner in Brooklyn, spoke in favor of the Application and she asked that the public hearing not be continued any longer.
- **Carrie Juhasz Horton**, resident and business owner in Brooklyn, spoke in favor and stated that she feels that the Applicant intends to fully appreciate the



beautiful land that we have and she feels that other local businesses will benefit from this.

- **Dalia Belliveau**, stated that she is a resident of Brooklyn and is still opposed to the RA Zone change, she is not being represented by an attorney and that she had submitted a letter. She said that she, as well as others, like Brooklyn the way that it is.
  - Ms. Belliveau suggested that some Commission Members may have a conflict of interest. She stated that M. Sigfridson's company should have no contract because that would create a problem. She commented that A. Tanner's farm could potentially become a glamp-ground.
  - Ms. Belliveau stated that she had asked about a referendum and was told that she could not, but she said that she has since found out that people can petition.
  - Ms. Belliveau stated that she believes that motorcyclists will cause noise.
  - Ms. Belliveau believes that one Applicant is being given a lot of power and she feels that public comment should be given weight.
  - Ms. Belliveau stated agreement with a comment that had been made by the Applicant's Attorney about how the RA Zone could be converted entirely to low-density, residential uses. Ms. Belliveau stated that she would welcome new members to share the same values that she came here with—RA. It would be less stress on the entire Community and you could request high-end restrictions on what homes are built.
  - Ms. Belliveau said that she questions the transparency and hopes that the Board has no gain in this proposal to hire or contract work because she sees a conflict of interest.
  - Ms. Belliveau suggested that the Applicant consider the history of the land, 588 acres. She said that a high-end realtor could easily be attracted and she offered that she would gladly help with the process.
  - Ms. Belliveau suggested figuring out a baseline of current traffic.
  - Ms. Belliveau spoke of how she picks up trash.
  - Ms. Belliveau spoke about crime in Brooklyn.
  - Ms. Belliveau stated that the Commission should have requested the extensive academic research done by Dr. Poland. She suggested a B&B rather than glamping to test if the need exists.
  - Ms. Belliveau stated that she is resisting the change of her RA status and she feels that it has been totally disregarded. She wonders if the Town is being manipulated or perhaps discriminated. She asked if that is a threat that this group is trying to say. It concerns her that one application has that much power.
  - Ms. Belliveau suggested that if the Applicant truly wants to change the RA status of this Community, they should get the definition changed at the State level and then come back to the PZC. She does not feel that Brooklyn should be used as a pilot project.

M. Sigfridson asked Ms. Belliveau what she meant when she said that she saw a conflict of interest.

Ms. Belliveau stated that if they are going to use high-end quality to build high-end platforms, where is that wood coming from?

M. Sigfridson asked Ms. Belliveau if she is accusing her of having a conflict of interest in this matter.

Ms. Belliveau stated that she feels that M. Sigfridson should expressly state that she has no interest or any gain in this to the entire Community so that we are all aware.

M. Sigfridson stated that she does not sell wood, if that is what Ms. Belliveau is asking.

Ms. Belliveau stated, "You don't sell wood, but your company does."

M. Sigfridson stated, "No, ma'am."

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM STAFF:**

- J. Roberson stated that, in light of the recent revisions to dimensional criteria that were submitted November 29, 2022, she re-did her GIS analysis of qualifying parcels, eligible for glamping. The eastern side of Town is where most of the farmland soils are (Quinebaug River Valley / Historic Flood Plain). She submitted, for the record, a revision to her earlier Map. She was able to calculate the percentage of prime farmland soils on each of the qualifying parcels. There are three parcels that are greater than 25 percent prime farmland soils, so they are eliminated from the list. There are four remaining parcels (two have frontage on Route 169 and two that are reasonably proximate to Route 169 which is why she had mentioned the National Scenic By-Way and the Route 169 Corridor Management Plan).

#### **ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:**

- M. Sigfridson commented that one of the earlier suggestions that the permit be revoked based on repeated violations seems like an interesting concept to her. She thinks it may be helpful for other permits also. She asked if this is within the PZC's jurisdiction.  
J. Roberson explained that the Commission had revoked a gravel special permit, for gross violations, in the past.  
Ms. Sigfridson stated that providing that a special permit be reevaluated periodically is within the PZC's jurisdiction.
- C. Kelleher commented that it would be difficult to act on this Application tonight. She stated that there were some good suggestions from Mr. Berman. The Commission reviewed Mr. Berman's comments which he had provided. Ms. Kelleher stated agreement with Mr. Berman's suggestion about being more specific regarding the wording "may include, but not limited to" rather than leaving it open ended.  
Attorney Cerrone called a Point of Order and she stated that Dr. Poland would be able to provide helpful information.  
Ms. Sigfridson commented that she thinks that dark-sky compliant is defined.  
A. Tanner stated agreement with Ms. Kelleher that Mr. Berman brought up a lot of good points, some already covered under our Regulations. Mr. Tanner explained that he feels that it is better to not try to put everything into the zone change and to require the special permit. We have the ability to hire consultants. Mr. Tanner clarified that his land would not qualify for a glamp-ground. Mr. Tanner commented that words like luxury can't really be described further. He said that we should clarify what we can, but it's not possible to clarify everything.  
Mr. Tanner explained that, as Town Officials, we have to take everything seriously, we cannot pick and choose. We have to give due process to everything that comes before us.  
Ms. Sigfridson stated agreement with Mr. Tanner that a lot of things are already covered under the Regulations. She explained that it would not be cohesive with our other Regulations to require that ten other Boards/Commissions/Departments look at an application before it comes before the PZC.  
Ms. Sigfridson stated that she agrees with Ms. Kelleher that it would be difficult to act on this Application tonight, although she feels that the Commission is ready to try to bring the public hearing to a close unless an extension is granted.

#### **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM DR. POLAND:**

- Regarding a statement that he was designing a model regulation on glamp-grounds to be used throughout the country and the industry.  
This is not what he is doing. Dr. Poland explained that it was the Attorney representing the neighbors that implied that.
- Dr. Poland clarified that they are not pushing things off to special permit. Regulations establish uses. Special permits establish specific provisions and

approaches and considerations for specific kinds of uses (the uses that require special permits). It is a normal process within the zoning process.

- Regarding the attack on wording being arbitrary and undefined (luxury, high-end). For the record, he explained that the PZC determines these things and gets the final say in how you interpret your Regulations. He referred to, and read aloud from, Section 2.A.1. - Rules and Terms. He said that things were not left open-ended.
- Dr. Poland referred to testimony that glampers would litter the streets and make a mess out of their neighborhood, but they also talk about the litter that already exists on the road and how they have to pick up the litter. The fact is, there is litter and the glampers aren't here yet. He said that this is a metaphor for the rest of the things that are thrown out there.
- Regarding a question from C. Kelleher about building codes, Dr. Poland explained that all applications/uses are subject to all of the other codes: public health code; building code; fire prevention code.
- Regarding the question about inspections, Dr. Poland explained that under the State Campground Regulations, the State will consider this a campground regardless of how we define it. #1 - The local director of the Public Health District has to annually inspect the campground; #2 - The campground has to re-register on a yearly basis; #3 - Regarding the issue of capacity and enforcement, they have to maintain a registry of all occupants in all units at the campground and under the Campground Regulations, they are subject to reveal. You can work with the State Department of Health to get access to those records if you have an occupancy issue.
- Dr. Poland feels that this is a workable Regulation.

#### **ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE COMMISSION:**

- Regarding the special event issue - M. Sigfridson stated that, if this Application were approved, she would not want events being called out as an accessory use to glamp-grounds. The Special Events Regulation specifically excludes events held at a hotel as those events are accessory to hotel uses. She does not feel that it would be appropriate for the PZC to consider events held at a glamp-ground to automatically be accessory to a glamp-ground. She feels it would be more appropriate to require a special event permit if that was contemplated. She suggested incorporating (into proposed Section 6.T.2.23) some of the special event language (from Section 6.J) into any glamping text amendment. Suggested language: "A glamp-ground seeking to host events such as banquets, wedding receptions, parties, performances and similar gatherings, shall require a special permit in accordance with Section 6.J."

Attorney Cerrone thanked the Commission Members for their patience and referred to the Staff Guidance and she stated that the Commission is not to be told what to do but to decide what to do by following certain standards. She noted the amount of scrutiny that the Applicant has been under, the lengths they have gone to, the time and cost to bring the Application before the PZC. Attorney Cerrone asked, that when the Commission thinks about the overall Zoning scheme, to keep in mind the way they are treating the other commercial activities in the RA Zone. She said that she does not see the level of detail on a utility facility (allowed in the RA Zone by special permit) that you do on glamping. She questions the wisdom of adding any more onerous requirements on this particular Application. She noted the lengths that this Applicant is going to propose a commercial use that can be integrated into a farm. Why not allow a glamping option for the owners of these large parcels in the RA Zone? She said that when someone comes in with a glamping application, they have to provide architectural design data, an environmental impact statement is required (which she feels would answer the questions raised by the Conservation Commission). She referred to Section 9.D.3.4 of the Regulations and explained that the Commission has wide discretion under special permit. An applicant is required to show on a site plan, the locations of all of the primary and accessory uses. She said that this Application fits into the scheme of allowing in the RA

Zone, the compatibility between the agricultural uses, the light residential and some commercial use. Attorney Cerrone thanked the Commission for its consideration and stated that the Applicant asks that the public hearing be closed.

M. Sigfridson explained that any information to be debated or considered during the deliberation process would have to be included as part of the record during the public hearing.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to close the public hearing 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.T Standards for Glamping, Applicant: Little Dipper Farm.**

Discussion: C. Kelleher stated that she would find it more palatable if there were a maximum number of glamping units. It was stated that this could be considered during deliberations because it had been mentioned before the close of the public hearing.

Second by B. Simmons. There was no further discussion regarding the motion to close the public hearing.

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

c. **New Public Hearings:** None.

d. **Other Unfinished Business:**

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, Applicant: Little Dipper Farm.**

J. Roberson stated that the Commission has sixty-five days to act on this Application.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to table **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, Applicant: Little Dipper Farm.**

Second by S. Pember. No discussion.

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

There was discussion following the vote regarding date and location: To be held at the next regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on December 20, 2022, at 6:30 p.m., at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.

Motion was made by C. Kelleher to add the following to the Agenda:

- VII.a.5. **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.**

Second by S. Pember. No discussion.

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

## **VII. New Business:**

### **a. Applications:**

1. **SP 22-006: Special Permit for State Route Business Enterprise (Craftsperson) at 481 Pomfret Road, Applicant: Mindy Delp.**

J. Roberson explained that the current Regulations would not permit the sale of other craftspersons' items at the store. Therefore, if the Regulations were changed, it would not apply to an application received tonight. She explained that an option would be to withdraw this application so that the Commission can have the discussion about additional crafters.

Mindy Delp explained that the main reason for the application was to help the artisan community in the area by allowing them an additional venue to show their work. She said that she is surprised at the restrictive nature of the Regulation.

M. Sigfridson explained that it is a residential zone, not a commercial district. There was discussion. Ms. Roberson stated that there is more than one thing to look at and she explained that there is no relief from the site plan requirement for low-level uses and there is also no signage regulations for State Route Business Enterprise. She explained that when we re-wrote the Regulations in 2019, it was anticipated that these types of things would be found that were wrong. Ms. Roberson recommended that the application be withdrawn to address revisions to the Zoning Regulations prior to submitting an application.

Ms. Sigfridson asked that the application fee be refunded. Ms. Roberson stated that in light of this scenario, that would be practical.

Ms. Delp provided photos for viewing by the Commission. Ms. Sigfridson stated that this is what we were hoping for when crafting the Regulation.

Ms. Delp stated that she will withdraw the application and re-submit.

2. **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.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule 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 for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on January 4, 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. Deshaies. No discussion.

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

3. **SD 22-003:** Two-lot Subdivision including 26 acres at 430 Allen Hill Road (Map 32, Lot 128), Applicant: Naomi Regis.

J. Roberson explained that the Application is being reviewed by the IWWC and there is a lot of plan review going on right now. She asked that the Commission consider:

- Site walk. There was a consensus of the Commission not to have a site walk.
- Public Hearing
- Open Space Dedication (fee-in-lieu or land dedication). There was a consensus of the Commission to refer to the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Roberson stated that comments had been received from a neighbor. She said that there are drainage issues and water table issues which are being reviewed by the IWWC and Regional Engineer, Syl Pauley to be sure the water is flowing the appropriate way. She explained that there is a lot of run-off in front of the grassy field. There is some water leaving the property in an uncontrolled fashion.

Ms. Sigfridson stated don't schedule a site walk or public hearing and it will come back on the agenda after it goes to the IWWC.

4. **SP 22-007:** Special Permit for an Events Facility at 459 Wolf Den Road, Applicants: Nicole and Greg Fisher.

M. Sigfridson recused herself and took a seat in the audience. She stated that members of her family have business dealings with the Applicant.

Ms. Roberson asked if the Commission would like to consider hiring third party consultants as an option for traffic and potentially drainage. The Applicant has voluntarily submitted a traffic study, drainage study and report from a wildlife biologist (digital version in packet has the full studies), but the Commission can also require a traffic study to compare the two (expert cross-checking process). Ms. Roberson explained that this decision would need to be made in the early stages. No decision was made regarding third-party consultants.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule the public hearing for SP 22-007: Special Permit for an Events Facility at 459 Wolf Den Road, Applicants: Nicole and Greg Fisher for the regular meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to be held on January 17, 2023, at 6:30 p.m., at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building, 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT and via Zoom.

Second by B. Simmons.

There was discussion about Bed & Breakfast/overnight stays.

Motion carried by voice vote (6-0-0). M. Sigfridson had recused herself and took a seat in the audience.

5. **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.

M. Sigfridson returned and resume the position of Chair.

There was discussion and S. Pember recommended that third-party consultants be hired to do both a traffic study and a drainage study, independently. C. Kelleher agreed. Discussion continued. C. Kelleher stated that there was an issue with the previous traffic study that had been done because of the time of year. There was discussion about drainage and A. Fitzgerald stated that he didn't think that the drainage was an issue at all. Ms. Roberson stated that previous studies are included in the revised plans.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that we would at least want somebody to look at the traffic and possibly a hydrogeologist. She suggested using the same consultant as last time. Scope of work could change.

Motion was made by A. Fitzgerald to schedule 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 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).

**b. Other New Business:**

1. Review of 2023 Regular Meeting dates.

There was discussion and it was decided that there would not be a meeting on April 5, 2023 (Passover).

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

- a. Staff Reports – Margaret Washburn's Report dated 12/1/2022 was included in packets to Commission Members. No discussion.
- b. Budget Update (included in packets to Commission Members). No discussion.

- c. Correspondence – None.
- d. Chairman's Report – None.

**IX. Public Commentary – None.**

**X. Adjourn**

**M. Sigfridson adjourned the meeting at 10:41 p.m.**