

**SPECIAL MEETING  
APPROVED MINUTES  
BROOKFIELD ZONING COMMISSION ON REGULATION REVIEW  
Thursday, March 20, 2014 – 6:30 p.m.  
MEETING ROOM #133 - TOWN HALL, 100 POCONO ROAD**

---

**1. Convene Meeting:**

Chairman Blessey convened the meeting at 6:34 p.m. and established a quorum of members.

**Present:** Chairman R. Blessey, J. Cordisco, Alternate and Voting Member M. Frankel

**Absent:** Vice Chairman Grimes, Secretary Lollie, E. Kukk, J. D'Entremont, Secretary F. Lollie

**Also Present:** Community Development Director K. Daniel, Zoning Enforcement Officer A. Dew, Recording Secretary D. Cioffi, Interested Members of the Public

**2. Proposed Regulation Change #201400115: Town Center District: Workshop to discuss Proposed Regulation Changes in the Town Center District including but not limited to Design Guidelines.**

The Commission steered the discussion utilizing Ms. Carol Gould and CDD Katherine Daniel's Memorandum dated March 19, 2014.

Chairman Blessey requested guidance from CDD Daniel as to how the Commission should focus its work on the Guidelines. She advised that it should finalize the discussion regarding design review versus site plan approval. She indicated that the Guidelines are separate from whether approvals come under a site plan approval or special permit. She advised that the Design Guideline work was funded by a grant related to the incentive housing zone. CDD Daniel suggested that the Commission's review focus on whether certain standards should be obligatory, (i.e., "shall"), or recommendations ("should"). Commissioner Frankel suggested that the design review application has to change to a special permit application. It was clarified that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to look at the Guidelines.

Commissioner Frankel indicated offered a copy of New Canaan's architectural guidelines.

The Draft "Design Guidelines Manual" (hereinafter "DGM") dated February 2014 was reviewed, following the points raised in the Memorandum from Ms. Gould and CDD Daniel. CDD Daniel advised that she felt the first two bulleted items were tasks for the Town Attorney. With regard to the third item, the Draft DGM was reviewed for areas where the guideline is required, denoted by the use of "shall", and where it is preferred, denoted by "should".

Commissioner Frankel read Section 3 of the Draft. She then noted that the terms "new development" and "redevelopment" in Sections 4.1 are not defined. There was lengthy discussion regarding the need for developments to be compliant with the new design guidelines if the project is expanded upon.

With regard to Section 4.1., there was discussion that "should" be replaced with "shall" in the sentence that reads, "All efforts shall be made to strengthen connections among parcels, ..."

With regard to Section 4.2., CDD Daniel pointed out that there is an inventory for historical structures, and she suggested including that in the Draft DGM document. *J. Metcalf, Charter Group, Inc., 346 Federal Rd., was present.* He noted that it is sometimes impractical for an applicant to demonstrate its best effort to incorporate characteristics of historic structures due to financial or other constraints. The Commission decided that “should” will remain in the second sentence of that Section.

With regard to Section 4.3.1, there was discussion regarding adding, “if there is more than one building on a site” to the end of that sentence. For Section 4.3.2, the language will remain as it is. Commission Cordisco advised that the 20’ separation listed in Section 4.3.3 is satisfactory. Sections 4.3.4, 5, 6 and 7 will remain as they are. CDD Daniel will reconfigure the paragraph to outline the mandatory requirements and the recommended design guidelines.

The language in Section 4.4.1 will change from “should” to “shall”. Chairman Blessey indicated that the requirement of 4.4.2 may become “impractical”. The language for Sections 4.4.3 and 4 will remain the same.

After some discussion, it was decided that in all of the sections utilizing “shall” that word will be changed to “must”. This will change “should” in Section 4.4.5 to “must”. Chairman Blessey explained that the language in Section 4.4.6 is intended to reduce curb cuts on Federal Road, to allow that to be a pedestrian access. The first sentence of that section will be changed to: “Site should be served no more than one main access driveway and one service driveway, with access not on Federal Road, when feasible.” Chairman Blessey recommended that the second sentence be removed, and that the third sentence remain.

*CDD Daniel left the meeting at 7:26 p.m. to attend the Planning Commission meeting.*

Chairman Blessey indicated that the goal of the above sections is to not interrupt pedestrian flow.

With regard to Section 4.4.7, the Commission found it satisfactory, and ZEO Dew indicated something similar already exists. *Attorney C. Nielsen was present,* and requested that the section be clarified, noting it will be difficult to interpret. After some discussion, Commissioner Cordisco suggested that a mathematical example be used to help illustrate the intent of the guideline. Commissioner Frankel recommended that the language “adjacent to the parking lot” be used, as the intent is to buffer the parking lot. She also noted that the Commission wishes to encourage shared parking. Chairman Blessey advised that the pedestrian access can allow for interconnectivity. There was discussion regarding the need for easements in certain situations.

*ZEO Dew left the meeting at 7:44 p.m.*

The Commission summarized that what it desires is a landscaped parking lot. It will revise this particular section.

Chairman Blessey indicated that the public hearing regarding the guidelines will be opened at the next regular meeting, and immediately continued to allow for additional drafting. Attorney Nielsen pointed out that there is a moratorium in place for potential applications.

With regard to Section 4.4.8, addressing driveway or private accessways, the word, “should” will be changed to “must”. It was noted that the language for Section 4.4.9 is already built into approvals necessary by State Department of Transportation and local police officials. The language in Section 4.4.10 is satisfactory as it stands.

With regard to Section 4.5.1 and 4.5.2, the word “shall” will be changed to “must”. There was discussion regarding the term, “electrical conduit” in Section 4.5.3, and it was decided that it “should not be a prominent part of the building’s structure.” will replace, “should be an integral part of the building’s architecture.” In Section 4.5.4, the word “such” will be removed. Sections 4.5.5 and 4.5.6 are satisfactory as is.

It was noted that Sections 4.6.1 and 4.6.2 are the identical, and one subsection should be deleted. The remainder of the bicycle parking section will be discussed at the next meeting to obtain the other Commission members’ opinions.

**3. Adjourn:**

**Chairman Blessey moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:59 p.m. Commissioner Cordisco seconded the motion, and it carried unanimously.**

**\*\*Next Regular Meeting Scheduled for March 27, 2014\*\***