

**TOWN OF BROOKLYN  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Public Information Session on Draft Zoning Regulations  
Wednesday, August 15, 2018  
Brooklyn Middle School  
119 Gorman Road  
6:30 p.m.**

**MINUTES**

- I. Members Present:** Michelle Sigfridson; Carlene Kelleher; J D'Agostino; Aaron Kerouac; Earl Starks; Austin Tanner.

**Staff Present:** Jana Roberson, Director of Community Development; Richard Ives, First Selectman and Ex Officio Member.

- II.** First Selectman, Richard Ives opened the meeting at 6:40 p.m. and thanked those in attendance for coming.

Michelle Sigfridson, Chair of the Planning and Zoning Commission, explained that this is a working draft and that the primary reason for this session is to get feedback from the public and from contractors work in Town. The Commission Members will, then, review what has been discussed here tonight at a future meeting of the Commission (which are also open to public attendance).

Copies of the draft regulations and summaries of the proposed draft regulations were available for viewing by the public.

Ms. Sigfridson introduced Glenn Chalder, Consultant with Planometrics.

**III. Presentation of the Draft Zoning Regulations**

Glenn Chalder explained the importance of having user-friendly regulations and spoke of the three goals:

- Re-organize so that like provisions are together.
- Clarify to make them easy to read and understand.
- Update for proposals which are in concert with State Law and other provisions (court cases, etc.).

Mr. Chalder gave an overview of the Draft Zoning Regulations explaining each of the four major sections (including subsections under them):

- Regulatory Basics  
He explained that the basic premise of the zoning regulations is that, if it is not specifically permitted in the regulations, then it is assumed to be prohibited.
- Zones and Uses
- Standards
- Procedures

The Zoning Map was displayed for viewing by the public and Mr. Chalder explained that there are some proposed changes to the Map which would also be considered as part of the zoning regulation modifications.

Mr. Chalder invited comments from the public.

#### **IV. Public Commentary**

##### **PAUL ARCHER:**

- The draft is easier to follow.
- Does not agree with minimum lot size of 90,000 s.f. in the RA Zone. Suggests reducing to 80,000 s.f. (country acre).
- Suggests increasing the grade for the asphalt portion of driveways from 12 percent maximum to 15 percent maximum.
- Route 169 Overlay Distruct – Feels that 500' off the centerline of the road is excessive.
- Signs – Suggests that, if a lot has two road frontages, they be allowed to have two freestanding signs (one for each road).
- Paradise Lake – Suggests that it not be an R-30 Zone as it will be hard to make the lots conform to 30,000 s.f. He suggests a minimum frontage, but no certain lot size (as in conservation subdivision), and subject to Health Department approval.
- He agrees with eliminating the buildable area requirement.

##### **PAUL LEHTO:**

Introduced discussion regarding conservation subdivision. Paul Archer stated that he has done two in Town noting that the Town has worked hard to get the conservation subdivision regulations in place. He feels that it is great where open space needs to be preserved, but it is not the perfect scenario for every subdivision. A contractor can reduce the infrastructure and make it affordable while protecting greenery in the front or the rear.

##### **JOE VOCCIO, 60 Fairway Drive.**

- Mr. Voccio would like to see provisions for affordable housing to be sure to maintain the 10 percent required. He warned that the Town is only slightly above the 10 percent at this time and explained that a developer (with an affordable housing component that does not get approved) can by-pass the local zoning regulations if the Town goes below the 10 percent. He suggested that an inclusionary zoning ordinance (or some other feature that allows some percentage of units in any development (ownership or rental) to be set aside as affordable would be the Town's best defense. He stated that kids who grew up in this Town now can't afford to live here, so if there were more affordable units in Town, maybe some residents would be able to stay as residents.

Mr. Voccio clarified Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance - Any real estate development being constructed (homeownership or rental), some percentage of the units would need to be set aside as affordable deed-restrictive housing and which is generally accepted throughout the State.

##### **DON FRANCIS:** Former Member of the Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission.

- Mr. Francis spoke about why the minimum lot size requirement of 90,000 s.f. He agrees that it keeps some properties from being built on and that conservation subdivision can help with that.

- A number of years ago, approximately 45 homes were built in Brooklyn under the old Farmer's Home Regulations (non-profit housing), none of which are on 90,000 s.f. He said they may not have even been built on 40,000 s.f. which was the requirement at the time. He said that agrees with Mr. Voccio that the Town should look at affordable housing. He recommended that the Commission consider eliminating the 90,000 s.f. requirement and he mentioned that lots at Paradise Lake could be adjusted. He feels that 80,000 s.f. may be more than needed in many cases.
- Mr. Francis agrees that the draft makes it easier to find things, however, he could not find Air, B and B, but could not find it.

Ms. Roberson stated that it is not in the draft.

**PAUL LEHTO:** Retired Builder/Developer.

- Spoke of how it has totally changed/a whole new world since the beginning of zoning. There is a big demand for a different type of housing from the big houses that he was building in the 1980's. Now, people are looking for smaller houses on smaller lots with the need of being affordable (single people / elderly) and he has to refuse to do them. He spoke of a community of condos and apartments (duplexes) that he built on Allen Hill Road. He said that he gets a lot of calls asking him to build more, but only one duplex (per lot) is permitted in the RA Zone. He is looking for land in the R-10 or the R-30, but there is none available that he can buy.
- Regarding global warming/climate change, he spoke of net-zero energy homes which, once finished, get 100 percent of their energy from the sun. However, up-front money is needed, so, even though money will be saved due to energy costs being eliminated, the average person can't afford to build them.

He suggested that this type of home is better than conservation subdivision (open space) because, even though more trees would be cut down (one mature tree absorbs 200 lbs of CO2 per year), there would be less CO2 being released into the atmosphere as one net-zero house saves 10,000 lbs of CO2. He offered that, if he were given a bonus lot for every net-zero house he builds, he would take that deal (it would cost him more to build that house, but he could use more of the land). The people who buy them would benefit because they would not have any energy bills and the environment would benefit also. More green and more affordable is the point he is trying to make. He has been studying this since the 1970's.

He explained that the State and Federal Government have programs that pay half of the cost, but you have to come up with the rest of the money up-front as banks will not finance it as part of a mortgage (due to the appraisal).

He spoke of how seniors and disabled have different needs and that he would like to do small, two-bedroom, handicap-accessible, net-zero green homes of 1,000 to 1,400 s.f.

Mr. Lehto feels that Zoning can add incentives/bonuses to lots in the green space.

- He suggested that a way be found to allow multiple duplexes in areas determined by the PZC.

**PAUL ARCHER:**

- Introduced discussion regarding minimum dwelling size of 600 s.f. for a one-bedroom unit in a multi-family development. He mentioned someone tried to put in a mini house at Paradise Lake, but it isn't allowed because of the minimum square footage. He suggested that the minimum square footage be reduced.
- Asked if Family Compound would cover what Mr. Lehto was saying regarding bonuses. Ms. Sigfridson explained that it does not offer any type of bonus.

Rick Ives stated that there are over 40 properties with delinquent tax at Paradise Lake. He agrees with Mr. Archer's suggestion - if the lot is able to be approved for septic and water and is suitable to be built on, it should be allowed as this is the one way to put life back into the Paradise Lake property. Regarding setbacks, Mr. Ives stated that we ought to make it as easy as we can, but he understands that there is a need for some preservation and setbacks. His hope is that the Health Department's ability to get sewer and water there with some minimum property boundaries, that ought to be enough.

Ms. Sigfridson asked if there were any comments from the Commission Members. There were none.

J. Roberson stated that she had received written comments from residents and that copies of them had been distributed to the Commission Members for their review. She stated that all of the information is being compiled and asked that if anyone has comments or concerns to relay them to the Commission so that all can be considered.

**SANDRA BRODEUR:** Brooklyn Agricultural Commission

- Asked if farmstands will not be allowed anywhere in the agricultural area unless it is on the person's own farm property. She is concerned that something like Lapsley's Orchard in Pomfret would not be allowed.

She stated that, in the past, she has sold her vegetables from a farmstand on someone else's farm and she is concerned that this would no longer be allowed.

Ms. Sigfridson and Ms. Roberson stated that this concern has been addressed in the draft regulations and explained that you are allowed to sell regionally-grown produce that came from off-site. The new regulations expand farmstands to include everyone with a backyard garden who wants to have an honor-system table on the side of the road (allowed with no permit required) to something like Lapsley's Orchard. A distinction was made between a Temporary Farmstand and a Permanent Farmstand (which would require a permit).

Ms. Roberson offered to review with the Agricultural Commission.

Carlene Kelleher commented that, if the document is ever going to get completed, the Commission cannot fully address every issue (e.g. affordable housing). She explained that suggested changes/comments may not all be able to be incorporated in this draft, but that she would like to let it be known which items would be addressed at a later date. She did not want the Commission to misrepresent that all comments could be accommodated. Mr. Lehto disagreed and stated that he would rather the Commission

take the time to do it right once. He is concerned that it won't be completed for years. He would like to see big issues addressed (environmental and affordable housing).

M. Sigfridson commented that the regulations are never really finished, they are constantly being revised.

**BOB SIMONS:**

- Wanted to know where to find procedure for making changes to the regulations. He feels that it would be helpful for people to know the process. Glenn Chalder explained that it is addressed in Section 9 – Procedures, E. - Text Amendment Application.

**JOE VOCCIO:**

- Stated that he is disappointed because of the fear of affordable housing and what it could create. He stated that there isn't anything to be afraid of if incorporated the right way. He explained that very minor changes can accommodate small percentages of affordable housing within proposals that come before the Board to try to maintain the ten percent. The last time he spoke on this issue with the PZC was two years ago.

Paul Lehto feels that the Town does not want affordable housing and wants to serve one type/percentage of the population. He agrees with Mr. Voccio and stated that he would rather be proactive. Ms. Sigfridson admitted that the PZC has discussed this issue, but has not had to worry about it yet because the Town has been at 10.5-11 percent.

Mr. Lehto asked for Don Francis' viewpoint on affordable housing. Mr. Francis stated that, over the years, the Town has been receptive toward affordable housing. Some people from Quebec Square were able to buy properties on streets off of South Street (through programs offered by the Department of Agriculture). He mentioned that Paradise Lake could be an opportunity for affordable housing and he suggested there may be a location in Town with sewer and water for a mobile home park. He agrees with allowing 600 – 650 s.f. houses onto which additions could be made if the financial situation of the owner improves. Mr. Francis stated that two units at Quebec Square are going to be fixed and will be occupied which will help with the affordable housing percentage.

M. Sigfridson clarified that affordable housing doesn't necessarily mean a 600 s.f. house or a mobile home as there are developments where you cannot tell which units are the affordable housing ones.

Mr. Ives agreed with Mr. Francis and feels that Paradise Lake is a great place for smaller homes. He stated that he gets asked a lot where apartment buildings can be located. We allow it, but it is very difficult. There are many different definitions of affordable and he would like the Commission to continue discussion regarding this issue.

Mr. Lehto likes almost every part of the conservation subdivision regulations except that the developer has to leave a portion of the land empty (and pass the cost on to the buyers). Without the requirement for open space, it would be affordable housing. It would be a considerable difference and the developer could get 12-20 percent profit.

**DIANE WIMMER:** 555 Wauregan Road, Brooklyn Conservation Commission Member

- Explained that the Conservation Commission recommends that the open space from a conservation subdivision remain with the property owner or developer (with deed restrictions) because many are inaccessible to the Town so she hopes that the PZC will not change it so that the open space becomes owned by the Town. She explained that it needs to be maintained and the Town can't maintain it if it is inaccessible. Ms. Wimmer also explained that if an open space area will abut another open space area that the Town has interest in owning, it is allowed now and she would not want that to change.

Ms. Roberson clarified that any required open space designation can be handled many ways and that the PZC has never discussed eliminating any of those options.

Mr. Lehto explained that he does not see the benefit of open space and he feels that the open space requirement does not help conserve land/trees.

Austin Tanner is against 2-acre zoning and he agrees that lot size should be reduced.

M. Sigfridson stated that zoning is balancing and there are differing interests which need to be considered. There are homeowners that are concerned for their home value.

There was discussion regarding wetlands on a conservation subdivision.

Ms. Sigfridson introduced discussion regarding parking. Ms. Roberson stated that all of the parking requirements have been reduced and also explicitly allows pervious parking where it is appropriate.

**BOB SIMONS:**

- Asked about businesses with overlapping parking.  
J. Roberson explained that it is allowed and has been expanded in the new regulations. She also explained shared driveways (curb cuts) among businesses (reciprocal access rights) which is safer.

**DON FRANCIS:**

- Asked Mr. Chalder if a system could be created for reducing the lot size for affordable housing, maximizing the land for affordable housing (not regular housing), every house required to be less than 1,000 s.f.  
Mr. Chalder explained that it would fall under inclusionary zoning. Regarding the conservation subdivision, there could be a situation where deed restricted affordable housing is provided on the land that would have been open space, a comfortable balance can be found. He explained that the Commission is working on multiple objectives: preservation of open space; provision of affordable housing; trying to find a way to make it work. The Statutes allow a Commission to do almost anything in terms of accomplishing affordable housing. The key is, what is right for Brooklyn.

Ms. Sigfridson added that the Commission has been considering the Plan of Conservation and Development while reviewing the Zoning Regulations. She invited anyone who is interested to get involved in the process of updating the POCD. According to the current POCD, Brooklyn is a rural town and most people preferred to keep it that way.

Ms. Roberson commented that the Commission has worked on the Section of the Regulations regarding accessory apartments which are allowed and excessive permitting is not required. She offered that a deed restriction could make the accessory apartment qualify as affordable housing. She added that what the State mandates as affordable units is probably higher than Brooklyn's average market rate for apartments.

Ms. Roberson stated that ten percent of affordable may not be enough and the need of the community should be addressed. There is work to be done.

**PAUL LEHTO:**

- Regarding the Route 169 Overlay – 1,000 feet is too wide. A lot of control.
- He asked if the architectural elements of a home (build or change) are being considered. He asked what the architectural style of the homes is on Route 169 because there are all types. He said that they all make Route 169 beautiful because they are not all the same and there were no rules telling them what to build. He agrees that stone walls and some trees should be protected.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that the Commission has struggled with this. She thanked him for his comments.

Ms. Sigfridson stated that the Commission will discuss if another public information session will be needed at its next meeting on Wednesday, September 5, 2018, at 6:30 p.m., at the Clifford B. Green Memorial Building located at 69 South Main Street, Brooklyn, CT.

Mr. Chalder and Ms. Sigfridson thanked everyone for their input and welcome any additional comments.

**V. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

J.S. Perreault  
Recording Secretary

From: Paul Lehto <nzeh100@gmail.com>  
Date: August 11, 2018 at 6:31:43 PM EDT  
To: Jana Roberson <J.Roberson@Brooklynct.org>  
Subject: Re: Preliminary Meeting Materials 1 of 2

Here are two main concerns that I hope the new zoning regulations will address. We need more affordable housing . Especially housing for single head of households and elderly. There is very little available, r10 and r30 land that is not developed. Expanding r10and r30 zones would help. Climate change due to co2 emissions concerns me even more. we owe the next generation a healthy earth to enjoy as we have. The conservation subdivision does a good job for a rural town like Brooklyn as far as the environment is concerned. It needs better incentives in order for developers to use it. We must do much better job in reducing co2 emmissions in how we build. Average home in Ct.. emits ten thousand pounds of co2 per year. We need to reduce this drastically along with co2 emmitted in transportation and agriculture in order not to have severe consequences in future.

My idea to help solve both affordability ( by reducing or eliminating energy cost) and making our community more environmentally friendly is to allow builders to get bonus lots in conservation subdivisions base on how much co2 emmissions are reduced. All low energy homes can get rated for free. rating are base on how well it does in reducing co2 emissions . Her's rating of zero is a home that makes as much energy Thur solar or wind that it consumes, thus resulting in zero co2 emmissions. Each home that results in zero emmissions , builder can receive bonus lot for one zero co2 emmissions lot. Hopefully builders would use this option so that we get environmentally friendly housing and buyers get homes that have no energy cost making it more affordable.

Sent from my iPhone

XXX

From: Paul Lehto <nzeh100@gmail.com>  
Date: August 14, 2018 at 12:07:47 PM EDT  
To: Nick <Nick@LehtoDesignBuild.com>  
Subject: Re: SPG 18-001 additional memos.pdf

Not allowing multiply duplex houses on one lot. 35% of population is single or elderly. Many can't afford or desire 90000ft2 lots, I could not find any land forsale in Brooklyn in R10 or R30 zone. Brooklyn should expand these zones and allow multiple duplex units on one lot like I built off Riverwalk Drive(RA zone). They provide affordable housing and lifestyle that many seniors desire. They depend on each other in many ways and don't want to be isolated on 2 ac lots.

Sent from my iPhone

XXX

From: JEFFREY OTTO <jotto@snet.net>  
Sent: Tuesday, August 14, 2018 2:00 PM  
To: info@pruelawgroup.com  
Cc: Jeff Otto <Jotto@snet.net>; Rick Ives <r.ives@brooklynct.org>; Bob-Carlene Kelleher <bobcar64@charter.net>  
Subject: Zoning Regulation Revision

Att'y. Sigfridson,



Please excuse my use of your business e-mail to comment on a matter related to Brooklyn's Planning and Zoning Regulation revision proposal. I was unable to find on Brooklyn's website an alternate address with which to communicate with you. I am copying Carlene Kelleher to be sure that this opinion is lodged with the PZC.

I will be unable to attend the public information session scheduled for 8/14 due to being out of the state on that date.

I recently had a chance to review the proposed regulation changes. While I think that the format changes make the document a little more readable, I am appalled and sorely disappointed that the PZC did not take this opportunity to markedly reduce and simplify Brooklyn's already excessive, overly complicated and severely onerous land use regulations.

At a time when numerous communities in Connecticut are reducing, and, in some cases minimizing, such regulations (e.g., eliminating minimum lot sizes in all zones), Brooklyn appears to be adding unneeded complexity by creating various "overlay zones" and creating new definitions (e.g., "compounds") that complicate compliance. Gone are the days when a landowner could frame a zoning application and expect it to be heard and approved based on his or her reading of the regulations. We seem intent on supporting the zoning compliance industry rather than making it easy for landowners to know what is allowable and what is not.

Brooklyn did not need to revise its regulation to attempt to erase its well-earned reputation of complicating, delaying and impeding new construction. It almost seems as though the intent is to generate revenue through excessive fees rather than assisting prospective builders in developing property that would result in additional tax revenue.

I have some understanding of the dynamics associated with voluntary units crafting regulations. PZC's all over the state have experience with well-meaning members creating exceptions or establishing regulatory language that allows current applicants to partially comply, while creating new problems for subsequent applicants. It's fun to demonstrate the ability to compete in the mental gymnastics necessary to aid an applicant in the face of complex regulations, and it gives the participants a great feeling of having benefited the community. How much simpler and helpful it would be to simplify and minimize regulation of land use!

I wish members of the Commission would evaluate each portion of the regulations by asking themselves what the role of the state should be in imposing these restrictions on the ability of landowners to use their own property in the way they choose.

I have great respect for those members of our town who have volunteered to serve on the PZC. I do, however, feel that many of them have been swept up in the same type of problem that appears in many zoning boards in relatively affluent parts of the country. That problem is to fail to accept that the potentially adverse effect of no regulation is better than the known adverse effect of excessive regulation.

Jeffrey B. Otto

XXX

**From:** Syl Pauley <Syl.pauley@neccog.org>

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 15, 2018 11:30 AM

**To:** Jana Roberson <J.Roberson@Brooklynct.org>

**Subject:** RE: Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission Seeking Public Input on Draft Zoning Regulations

Hi Jana,

Thanks for sending along the draft zoning regulations to me. I haven't had time to look through the entire document but it looks like a big improvement in formatting and ditching all the acronyms that were in the initial rewriting of the current regs. However, I did focus on the earth Excavation Operations section of the regs (Section 6.O) and found there is no mention of leaving a natural soil buffer between final excavation and the elevation of seasonal high groundwater. In Section 6.O.5.5.c. there is a statement of leaving a 5' buffer to bedrock. I feel it is also important to maintain a minimum unexcavated (in situ) buffer to groundwater of at least 5' for locating future septic systems as well as maintaining the compaction and filtering properties of the original soil strata.

Syl Pauley, Jr., P.E.

Regional Engineer

Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments

XXX

# Memorandum

---



**To: Brooklyn Planning & Zoning Commission**

**From: Rawson Materials**

**Date: August 15, 2018**

**Subject: Revisions to Zoning Regulations**

This memorandum pertains to the recent draft Zoning Regulations put forth by the Brooklyn Planning and Zoning Commission. Rawson Materials (“Rawson”) is an aggregate producer with a sand and gravel operation in Brooklyn, Connecticut and therefore has an interest in several of the suggested revisions. Upon review of the Draft Zoning Regulations dated July 3, 2018, Rawson wishes to offer the following suggestions, comments and questions.

## **5.A Scenic Route 169 Overlay Zone**

Rawson understands the value of establishing a Scenic Route Overlay Zone on Route 169 for the preservation of historic and scenic features. Rawson currently has property that was previously used for gravel excavation near Route 169. Section 5.A.2 discussing the boundaries of the overlay states that the zone applies to land within “500’ of the centerline of Route 169 or land that is within view of Route 169.” Rawson would request that this language be clarified as to whether an entire parcel of property within 500’ of Route 169 would be subject to the overlay or only projects that occur within 500’ of the center of Route 169 would be affected. Since the intention of the regulation is to preserve the scenery it would be more appropriate that only projects within the 500’ space, rather than entire parcel of land, be affected.

Additionally, under Section 5.A.4.1 Prohibited Uses, the regulation lists Excavation Operations as a prohibited use. Rawson understands the purposes of prohibiting such uses but would suggest that the Commission add an exception for excavation when it is in conjunction with a permitted use such as site development. As part of the purpose of this overlay district the Regulations name certain compatible uses such as farm wineries, breweries, bed and breakfasts, etc. It is plausible that businesses and uses of this nature may require portions of their property to be developed and excavated for better use and more aesthetically pleasing opportunities. Under the current language of the regulation prohibiting excavation would effectively limit the opportunities of these businesses to develop property within the overlay district.

## **6.O Excavation Operations**

Rawson believes that a majority of the regulations as they relate to excavation operations in Brooklyn are fair and well drafted. In the interest of practicability, Rawson would suggest revising section 6.O.4 (6)(c) to remove the measure regarding “mulching” stockpiles. In the aggregate industry, a stockpile is presumably sand, stone, or gravel. Adding mulch on top of an existing stockpile would have a negative impact on the product and would be highly impractical. The section already calls for measures including

watering/wetting stockpiles or employing the use of coverings. Both of these measures sufficiently reduce any nuisance as it relates to stockpiles without rendering the product/stockpile a total loss.

Section 6.O.4(8) regulates that the first 300' of an access road have a dustless surface. Rawson would suggest making a revision to state that if an access road is less than 300' then the entire length of the access road be made a dustless surface.

The Regulations, under Section 6.O.5 (13) and (14) discuss the retention of topsoil from the site and the restoration of a 6" layer of topsoil upon completion of excavation. Rawson would propose that the Commission consider changing the language to allow for a restoration to the depth of top soil that previously existed at the site prior to excavation. Often when a site is excavated, and the top soil removed for stockpiling on site, 6" of topsoil is not initially present at the site. To mandate that more topsoil than what previously existed at a site be restored to a site would create an undue hardship on the applicant by requiring the addition of topsoil to the site from an outside source.

Section 6.O.7 (1)(c) allows the Town to withdraw funds or call a bond if they determine that there has been abandonment of an excavation operation. Abandonment is not clearly defined as part of the regulations. Rawson would suggest that the Commission create a definition for abandonment or defer to Connecticut's established definition of abandonment which states abandonment "has been defined as the voluntary relinquishment of ownership of property without reference to any particular person or purpose." *Favorite v. Miller*, 176 Conn. 310, 313, 407 A.2d 974 (1978). Connecticut case law further states that to "constitute an abandonment there must be an intention to abandon or relinquish accompanied by some act or omission to act by which such intention is manifested. . . . While mere nonuser and lapse of time alone are not enough to constitute abandonment, they are competent evidence of an intent to abandon, and as such may be entitled to great weight when considered with other circumstances, and abandonment may be inferred from circumstances, such as failure by acts or otherwise to assert any claim to the right alleged to have been abandoned . . . ." *Glutzer v. Keyes*, 125 Conn. 227, 233, 5 A.2d 1 (1939).

## **Conclusion**

Rawson appreciates and values the time that the Commission has put into revising the Zoning Regulations. Rawson is willing to provide comments on any other revisions that are made to the Regulations and hopes that its comments and suggestions will be taken into consideration before a final Zoning Regulation change is made.



# COMMENTS

8-15-18

- P.A.
- 90,000 S.F. DOESN'T MAKE SENSE  
↳ SHOULD BE 80,000 S.F.  
"COUNTRY ACRE"
  - INCREASE MAX. DRIVEWAY SLOPE TO 15%
  - SCENIC 169 - 500' TOO WIDE
  - SHOULD BE 1 FREE-STANDING SIGN PER ROAD FRONTAGE
  - PARADISE LAKE - 30,000 SF. IS TOO HIGH, MAKE MINIMUM FRONTAGE + HEALTH CODE APPROVAL
  - GOOD THING: GETTING RID OF MIN. BUILDABLE AREA



# COMMENTS

- J.V.
- AFFORDABLE HOUSING, CONSIDER  
REQUIRING ~~AND~~ AFFORDABLE  
<sup>+ ENCOURAGING</sup>  
HOUSING UNITS, I.E. INCLUSIONARY  
— WE ARE ONLY SLIGHTLY <sup>ZONING</sup> ABOVE 10%  
— INCLUSIONARY = SOME % OF HOUSING  
UNITS ARE DEED RESTRICTED AS  
AFFORDABLE
- 

- D.F.
- 90,000 S.F. IS TOO BIG
  - REGS. SHOULD COVER AIRB+B
- 

- P.L.
- HOUSING MARKET HAS CHANGED, NEED  
MORE SMALLER + AFFORDABLE UNITS
  - MAKE "NET ZERO ENERGY" HOMES
  - AFFORDABLE TO ALL DENSITY BONUS  
— GET MORE GREEN + AFFORDABLE

(COMMENTS)



## COMMENTS

B.S.

- CLEAR PROCEDURES ARE GOOD
- 

J.V.

- DON'T BE AFRAID OF AFFORDABLE, HAS NOT SEEN ENOUGH ACTION
- 

D.F.

- THERE IS REAL OPPORTUNITY FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT PARADISE AND MAYBE A MOBILE HOME PARK
- 

R.I.

- GETS QUESTIONS RE: WHERE TO BUILD MULTI-FAMILY/APTS.
- 

P.L.

- NEED SMALLER LOTS, BIG LOTS ARE LESS AFFORDABLE



# COMMENTS

P.A. — WHAT ABOUT MINI-HOUSES  
LESS THAN 600 S.F.?

---

R.I. — AGREES WITH NO OR LOWER  
MINIMUM LOT SIZE IN PARADISE  
LAKE AREA

---

S.B. — CONCERNED ABOUT PROHIBITING  
FARMSTANDS

---

C.K. — BIG, NEW CHANGES MIGHT  
HAVE TO BE ADDRESSED IN  
FUTURE EDITIONS



# COMMENTS

D.W. — KEEP OPEN SPACE IN ITS  
MANY DIFFERENT FORMS

---

P.L. — THINKS OPEN SPACE REQ'T.  
DOES NOT HELP CONSERVE  
LAND

---

A.T. — AGREES LOT SIZE IS TOO  
BIG

---

P.L. SCENIC 169 OVERLAY -  
1000' IS WIDE, DESIGN REVK  
IS A 'CAN OF WORMS', ALLOW  
ARCHITECTURAL FREEDOM,  
PROTECT STONEWALLS + TREES