

Approved Minutes
BROOKFIELD PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, March 20, 2014 7:30 PM
MEETING ROOM #133 – TOWN HALL, 100 POCONO ROAD

1. **Convene Meeting:** Chairman J. Van Hise convened the meeting at 7:30 p.m. and established a quorum of members: Chairman J. Van Hise; Vice Chairman A. Kerley ; Secretary D. Frankel; Regular Members L. Taylor and G. Hunton; Alternate G. Blass. Alternate I. Agard arrived at 8:15 as noted in the minutes. Also present: Town Public Works Director R. Tedesco, Director of Community Development K. Daniel, and Recording Secretary J. Llewellyn.

2. **Review Minutes of Previous Meetings: 03/06/14: A motion to approve the Minutes of 3/06/14 as submitted was made by G. Hunton as submitted, seconded by L. Taylor and carried unanimously.**

3. **Old Business:**
 - a. **20 Vale Road #201200913: Berkshire Corporate Park – Bond Release Request - \$1,320.** *No one present.* Town Engineer R. Tedesco reported that he had not heard from the applicant who was to notify him when all work is complete. This item is continued.

 - b. **Proposed Regulation Change Application #201400115: Section 242-404K: Design Guidelines.** *No one present.* The Chairman noted that the Zoning Commission was meeting on this matter tonight. This proposal had been brought up at the last Planning meeting, and the Commissioners reviewed the information in the interim. They found nothing was of particular concern. **A motion was made by G. Hunton to send a memo to the Zoning Commission stating that the Planning Commission has received the proposed change to Section 242-404K and after review, at this time, the Planning Commission has no objection to these modifications. The motion was seconded by A. Kerley and carried unanimously.**

4. **New Business:**
 - a. **4 & 6 Belden Hill Road #201400143: Lot Line Revision**
 1. **Lot Line Revision Map revising lots 11 & 12 “Nabby Ridge” dated 02/02/14 prepared by Riordan Land Surveying**
No one present. Some Commissioners raised the question of why this application has been filed: What is the reason for the lot line revision request? K. Daniel said she believed it had to do with the structure located on one of the properties. A. Kerley suggested having the applicant(s) clarify their reason for what they are requesting to do. **A motion was made by J. Van Hise, seconded by G. Hunton, to table this item until later in the meeting in the event the applicant arrives. Motion carried unanimously.**

b. Draft Sidewalk and Access Management Plan for the TCD: Request for 8-24 Referral #201400167 (8 sheets)

1. Memo from First Selectman Tinsley to the Planning Commission dated 03/18/14

Since the map received by the Commission was a bit difficult to decipher, K. Daniel presented an enlarged, hand-colored version. She proceeded to explain to the Commission that the overall objective was to fit as many proposed improvements within the DOT's right-of-way as possible. The key items discussed were a sidewalks and a bike path.

The DOT right-of-way is a bit wider at the southern end of the Town Center District (TCD). The bike path begins at 777 Federal Road. There is enough room for bike path and sidewalk at this point, but at the four corners intersection, the right-of-way is too narrow to accommodate both. Alternatives were proposed, specifically for the actual four-corners area, with some Commissioners expressing concern over safety for both bikers and pedestrians. A suggestion was made that a bike rack be installed at 777 Federal Road so bikes could be left there while riders could visit the TCD on foot. A further alternative for bikers who want to continue past the four corners would be to have the bike path "loop around" from Federal Road (Route 202) to Laurel Hill Road.

Chairman Van Hise and Vice Chairman Kerley both shared their experiences with biker-friendly places such as Hilton Head, South Carolina, and Florida where bikers and pedestrians share the (wider) sidewalk. D. Frankel expressed concern over this, citing safety issues. He felt that there shouldn't be a situation to endanger bikers being hit by cars, nor bikers injuring pedestrians. He favored an outcome that is more well-defined. A. Kerley felt that a bike lane should be just for a specific, designated use. G. Hunton asked about lighting, citing his concern over visibility, and Ms. Daniel said that streetscape lighting was proposed for the TCD. K. Daniel showed the Commission a rendering of the shared sidewalk concept.

K. Daniel then addressed the angled parking on the west side is actually a site plan of a proposed development super-imposed on this plan. The DOT needs to approve this diagonal parking. She also pointed out that the Zoning regulations require a four-foot grass strip on the road side, adjacent to sidewalks. Areas will be proposed for a snow shelf where feasible.

The proposal also calls for elimination of one of the driveway cuts (closest to the intersection of Station Road and Route 202, on the latter road) at the present Citgo station, in the event there is a transfer of this property. In addition, a left-hand turn lane is proposed for Station Road where it meets route 202.

This plan also incorporates improvements to the existing Craft Center crosswalk over Whisconier Road, including a raised median in the center and a pedestrian-activated signal. A suggestion has been proposed to move the crosswalk further west, to align it with the Brookfield Market, and to locate it with a more favorable sight line.

Commission Vice Chairman Kerley asked if there had been any further discussion of sewerage in this area, but it was determined that the cost of infrastructure is too high, unless there are grant funds.

Chairman Van Hise asked where these STEAP grant monies are being spent, and was told there was no final, detailed plan at this point. A. Kerley added that this, then, is an “after the fact” Referral, which is supposed to be sent prior to appropriation of the money. Chairman Van Hise asked again which part of this proposed plan the money is being appropriated for, since the costs involved exceeded the STEAP grant.

A discussion ensued over how the money is being spent: “brick and mortar” improvements vs. more studies of the site. A question was also raised about the timing for spending the funds from the grant. G. Hunton pointed out that what was before the Commission was “a plan to have a plan.” L. Taylor added, “We’re backtracking now.”

K. Daniel confirmed that what has been done so far was to sign a contract with URS to create the plans that the Commissioners had before them. J. Van Hise wanted a “specific plan” to give them a good idea of what the entire proposal is going to cost.

A motion was made by A. Kerley stating that we approve the 8-24 Referral from the Board of Selectman noting that this is an after-the-fact situation and the Commission is all in favor of this, but at the same time, would like to inquire how the monies will be used.

The motion did not receive a second and was subsequently withdrawn.

Irv Agard arrived at 8:15 p.m.

The discussion continued about how the money will be spent. J. Van Hise noted that “Streetscape Improvements” would cost \$790,000, though it is believed to be much more than that. Any approval, he added, would be “premature,” since the Commission has only a preliminary plan, not a specific plan, in front of it. K. Daniel reminded him that URS is fulfilling its contract to design a streetscape. This design cost \$127,000.00 and are not improvements to Town property but rather a plan.

A motion was made by A. Kerley stating that the Commission has considered the proposal and supports it, but will withhold judgment until further clarification from the Board of Selectmen on how these monies will be used. D. Frankel seconded the motion.

The motion was subsequently amended by A. Kerley to ask how the monies will be used in terms of any specific brick and mortal projects where these monies can be applied, adding that the Commission understands that per the Town Meeting (3/3/2014), the grant money will not be applied to further studies. G. Hunton seconded the amendment. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Minutes of Other Boards & Commissions:

- **02/27/14 Zoning:** No comments;
 - **03/03/14 Zoning Board of Appeals:** a repair shop near Lew White Appliances has been approved;
 - **03/03/14 Board of Selectmen:** No comments;
 - **03/10/14 Inland Wetlands:** The Commission was glad to see the membership numbers have increased; no comments on the meeting action items.
6. **Correspondence:** There was none.
7. **Informal Discussion:**
- a. a. **Plan of Conservation and Development:** The Commission discussed the Historical District Section of the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD). A. Kerley felt it was “tacky” as it featured specific addresses of homes in those three sections of town. J. Van Hise noted that he had reviewed other plans from nearby towns, and found some that offered a short, condensed section on their Historic District, while others were much lengthier. An alternative would be to offer a listing as they do in Redding, featuring a percentage breakout of the number of homes built per century. This could be featured along with a map of the town’s three historic areas, and a more generalized presentation of information. A. Kerley said he will research into how other towns feature this section in their POCD’s.
- Also discussed was the use of surveys, and the Commission felt that the on-line approach is preferable.
8. **Tabled Items:** At this time, the Commission asked that the applicant for item 4a: New Business be contacted to appear at the next regular meeting.
9. **Adjourn:** A motion was made by A. Kerley to adjourn the meeting at 8:55 p.m. The motion was seconded by G. Hunton and carried unanimously.

Chairman J. Van Hise