

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

January 18th, 2022, 5:30 PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

1 **Members Present:**

2 Dr. Michael Klemens (Chairman)

3 Martin Whalen (Secretary)

4 Bob Riva (Regular Member)

5 Cathy Shyer (Vice Chair)

6 Allen Cockerline (Regular Member)

7 Debra Allee (Alternate)

8 Dr. Danella Schiffer (Alternate)

9

Staff Present:

Abby Conroy, Land Use Administrator (LUA)

Alison Forman, Land Use Assistant

Members Absent: N/A

10 **Brief Items and Announcements**

11 1. Call to Order/ Seating of Members and Alternates

12 Chairman Klemens called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. All regular members were in attendance
13 (Chairman Klemens, Vice Chair Shyer, Secretary Whalen, and Commissioners Cockerline and Riva)
14 which established a quorum for the meeting.

15

16 2. Approval of Agenda

17 LUA Conroy indicated that she was unable to upload minutes from November 29th2021 for review and
18 approval by the Commission.

19

20 Amendment #1: November 29th, 2021 Minutes – Pending

21

22 **Motion:** Motion to approve the agenda as amended.

23 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva

24 Vote: 5-0-0

25

26 3. Minutes of November 15th 2021

27 Alternate Schiffer presented three comments:

28 Amendment #1 (Line 50): Modification of word “He suggested” to “The Chairman suggested.”

29 Amendment #2 (Line 91): Modification of word “inquire” to “inquired.”

30 Amendment #3 (Line 350): Modification of word “giving” to “given.”

31

32 **Motion:** To approve the minutes of November 15th 2021 with three amendments

33 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva

34 Vote: 4-0-1 (Abstention: Vice Chair Shyer)

35

36 4. Minutes of November 29th 2021 - Pending

37 5. Minutes of December 13th 2021 -Pending

38 6. Minutes of December 20th 2021 -Pending

39 7. Minutes of December 28th 2021 -Pending

40

41 The minutes were not available for consideration.

42 **Public Hearings:**

43

- 44 8. #2021-0156 / Easton (Churchill) / 104 Interlaken Road / Special Permit for Detached Apartment
45 on Single Family Residential Lot (Section 208) / Map 39 / Lot 17 / DOR: 12/20/21 *Open Hearing,*
46 *Possible Consideration*

47

48 Chairman Klemens introduced the hearing for the special permit application for a detached apartment
49 at 104 Interlaken Road in Lakeville. Secretary Whalen opened the hearing at 5:45p.m. with the reading
50 of the call. Seth Churchill (Churchill Builders, Contractor), Kevin Wolfe (Architect), and Chuck Tuz
51 (Churchill Builders) represented the application.

52

53 Mr. Churchill stated that the special permit request was to renovate an existing guest house on the
54 Easton property. He stated that the main and second floors would serve as the accessory apartment
55 but indicated that the basement was intended to be a separate finished space accessible only to the
56 outdoor pool area. To meet zoning regulations to not exceed the maximum floor area of an accessory
57 apartment (<2,000 ft²), Mr. Churchill shared plans to create an open stairwell from the main floor to
58 the second floor, as well as bring inward the interior walls of the residential space by 14 inches. The
59 resulting proposed maximum floor area of the accessory apartment would be 1,997 ft².

60

61 Vice Chair Shyer inquired about the total floor area of the principal residence on the Easton property.
62 Mr. Churchill and Mr. Wolfe confirmed the principal residence is 3,800 ft². Vice Chair Shyer also
63 inquired about the entrance from the pool to the basement area below the accessory apartment/guest
64 house. Mr. Churchill stated that there would be a set of two doors leading out to the pool area from
65 the basement.

66

67 Chairman Klemens inquired about the property's means of waste disposal. Mr. Tuz clarified that the
68 property utilized a septic system. Chairman Klemens also asked whether Torrington Area Health
69 District (TAHD) had approved the current septic system. Mr. Tuz stated that he was waiting for George
70 Johannesen of Allied Engineering to sign off on a B100A form. LUA Conroy inquired whether the septic
71 system of the guest house was separate from the principal residence. Mr. Churchill and Mr. Tuz
72 confirmed that the septic system of the guest house was entirely separate from the principal
73 residence. Mr. Tuz continued that the septic system of the guest house was designed by Berkshire
74 Engineering to serve a three-bedroom residence with a capacity of 1,000 gallons. Mr. Churchill
75 indicated that Churchill Builders would follow up with the Commission upon receipt of the B100A form.
76 Chairman Klemens requested written approval from the TAHD for the septic system as a contingency
77 of permit approval.

78

79 Chairman Klemens opened the floor for public questions and comments about the permit application.
80 No one came forward to comment.

81

82 **Motion:** To close the public hearing for application #2021-0156 / Easton (Churchill) / 104 Interlaken
83 Road / Special Permit for Detached Apartment on Single Family Residential Lot (Section 208) / Map 39
84 / Lot 17 at 6:02 p.m.

85 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva
86 Vote: 5-0-0

87
88 **Motion:** To approve the application #2021-0156 / Easton (Churchill) / 104 Interlaken Road / Special
89 Permit for Detached Apartment on Single Family Residential Lot (Section 208) / Map 39 / Lot 17
90 contingent upon meeting requirements by the TAHD for the septic system.

91 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva
92 Vote: 5-0-0

93
94 9. #2021 – 0157 / Murphy / 157 Lime Rock Road / Special Permit for Detached Apartment on
95 Single Family Residential Lot (Section 208) / Map 3 / Lot 6-3 / DOR: 12/20/21 *Open Hearing,*
96 *Possible Consideration*

97
98 Chairman Klemens introduced the hearing for a special permit for a detached apartment at 157 Lime
99 Rock Road in Lakeville. Secretary Whalen opened the hearing at 6:05 p.m. with the reading of the call.
100 Greg Murphy (applicant and property owner) represented himself for the proposal.

101
102 Mr. Murphy presented an A2 survey and discussed the conversion of an existing barn to contain a total
103 floor area of 960 ft². Mr. Murphy indicated the existence of a second septic system on the premises to
104 serve the barn. Chairman Klemens requested the total square floor area of both the principal residence
105 and the accessory structure. Mr. Murphy indicated that the principal residence is 2,256 ft² and the
106 accessory structure is 960 ft².

107
108 LUA Conroy clarified that a second approval would be required from TAHD to convert the barn to an
109 apartment. Chairman Klemens identified the documentation from the TAHD as a contingency for
110 approval of the permit application. He then opened the floor for public questions and comments. No
111 one from the public commented on the application.

112
113 **Motion:** To close the hearing for application #2021 – 0157 / Murphy / 157 Lime Rock Road / Special
114 Permit for Detached Apartment on Single Family Residential Lot (Section 208) / Map 3 / Lot 6-3 at 6:10
115 p.m.

116 Made by Whalen, seconded by Cockerline.
117 Vote: 5-0-0

118
119 **Motion:** To approve application #2021 – 0157 / Murphy / 157 Lime Rock Road / Special Permit for
120 Detached Apartment on Single Family Residential Lot (Section 208) / Map 3 / Lot 6-3 / with the
121 condition that it meets the requirements of the TAHD.

122 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva
123 Vote: 5-0-0

124
125 **New Business**

126 10. #2022-0158/ Suratt (Parsons/Lenard Engineering)/ 105 Belgo Road/ Tennis Court – Special
127 Permit for Setback from Wetland (Section 305.2) & Accessory Structure Outside of Buildable
Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes

1/18/2022

128 Area (Section 302.5)/ Map 10/ Lot 05-1/ DOR: 01/18/2022 *Reception, Consideration, Schedule*
129 *Hearing*

130
131 Todd Parsons of Lenard Engineering represented the Suratt property at 105 Belgo Road in Lakeville for
132 the proposal of two special permits.

133
134 Mr. Parsons reviewed the plans and presented a permit request for an accessory structure outside of a
135 buildable area. He identified the eligibility for special permit because the lot predates the requirement.
136 Due to the topography and slope of the property the proposed tennis court cannot be constructed
137 within a buildable area.

138
139 Mr. Parsons presented the second permit request for a reduced setback from a wetland. The
140 Regulations indicate that an accessory structure must be placed no closer than 50 ft from a
141 watercourse or body of water unless a special permit is obtained. He indicated that the southwestern
142 portion of the tennis court would be within the 50- foot setback of a wetland area. The proposed
143 tennis court construction site is currently occupied by the septic system. He indicated pre-approval by
144 both TAHD for the new septic system placement (which would be outside of the 75-foot wetland
145 upland review area) and the Salisbury Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission for the
146 construction plan. Mr. Parsons indicated that the application package for the permit included a written
147 description and plans for grading; alternatives considered; planting; erosion control; invasive species
148 management and removal; and stormwater management.

149
150 Chairman Klemens discussed a potential need for Town consulting engineer review of the construction
151 plans. Commissioner Cockerline believed that the application should be accepted as complete, that a
152 public hearing date should be set, and that Tom Grimaldi (R.R. Hiltbrand Engineers and Surveyors)
153 should review the construction plans.

154
155 Alternate Schiffer questioned whether the proposed application met the Planning and Zoning
156 regulations. LUA Conroy confirmed that the proposed application met regulations for Sections 305.2
157 and 305.5.

158
159 **Motion:** To schedule a public hearing for application #2022-1058/ Suratt (Parsons/Lenard Engineering)
160 / 105 Belgo Road / Tennis Court – Special Permit for Setback from Wetland (Section 305.2) & Accessory
161 Structure Outside of Buildable Area (Section 302.5) / Map 10 / Lot 05-1 / DOR: 01/18/2022 on February
162 7th, 2022 at 5:45 p.m. via Zoom.

163 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva

164 Vote: 5-0-0

165
166 **Motion:** To retain Tom Grimaldi of R.R. Hiltbrand Engineers and Surveyors at the applicant's expense to
167 review the engineering for application #2022-0158/ Suratt (Parsons/Lenard Engineering)/ 105 Belgo
168 Road/ Tennis Court – Special Permit for Setback from Wetland (Section 305.2) & Accessory Structure
169 Outside of Buildable Area (Section 302.5)/ Map 10/ Lot 05-1.

170 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva

Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes
1/18/2022

171 Vote: 5-0-0

172

173 11. #2022 – 0159/ Lakeville 75 Sharon Road LLC (Capecelatro & McMorrow/Berkshire Engineering)/
174 75 Sharon Road/Demo and Build New Single-Family Dwelling and Associated Site Improvements
175 in the Lake Protections Overlay District (Section 404)/ Map 47/Lot 17/ DOR: 01/18/2022

176 *Reception and Possible Consideration*

177

178 Vice Chair Shyer recused herself from this application consideration. Chairman Klemens appointed
179 Alternate Schiffer as the voting alternate.

180

181 Attorney Mark Capecelatro, Engineer Dennis McMorrow (Berkshire Engineering and Surveying),
182 Architects Patrick Walker and Elizabeth Demetriades (Demetriades and Walker) represented the
183 Franchini's property at 75 Sharon Road in Lakeville for the permit to demolish and build a new single-
184 family dwelling and associated site improvements in the Lake Protections Overlay District (LPOD).

185

186 Attorney Capecelatro opened the presentation explaining the existing conditions/demolition plan for
187 the property. The proposed plan would remove and replace the garage, one-story residential dwelling,
188 and driveway, with all new structures respecting the zoning setback requirements. The proposed plan
189 would also include the addition of a swimming pool adjacent to the new principal structure, as well as
190 a stormwater feature/plunge pool on the lakefront portion of the property.

191

192 Attorney. Capecelatro indicated 9,502 ft² of impervious surface within LPOD. The total square footage
193 of impervious surface represented 13.06% of the property, which exceeded the 10.0% maximum
194 allowed by the Zoning regulations in the LPOD. The proposed plan would reduce the impervious
195 surface area to 7,277 ft². which would represent 9.99% of the property area within LPOD. Attorney
196 Capecelatro continued that the Franchini's desire to reduce the total square footage of impervious
197 surface on the entire property from 13,934 ft² to 11,072 ft², resulting in a total reduction of impervious
198 surface from 10.42% to 8.28%.

199

200 Attorney Capecelatro stated that the height of the proposed principal structure has been calculated at
201 26 ft under the provisions of Planning and Zoning Regulation Section 309.2. He indicated that the
202 erosion and sedimentation control plans and stormwater management plans were prepared by Dennis
203 McMorrow of Berkshire Engineering and Surveying. He also indicated that the landscape plan was
204 prepared by Judy Murphy of Old Farms Nursery. Attorney Capecelatro stated that approval by TAHD
205 was not needed due to the property being serviced by town water and town sewer systems. He also
206 identified that the plan was approved by the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission on January
207 10th, 2022, after a review by the Town consulting engineer, Tom Grimaldi of R.R. Hiltbrand Engineers
208 and Surveyors.

209

210 Chairman Klemens questioned the representation that the proposed driveway is an entirely pervious
211 surface, highlighting the presence of catch basins within the schematics. Mr. McMorrow clarified that a
212 two-year storm would be entirely detained within the impermeable pavers, but that the catch basins
213 were included for larger storm events (10, 25, 50, and 100-year storms). Mr. McMorrow displayed a
Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes

1/18/2022

214 cross-section of the driveway plan that would contain 12 inches of two-inch stone subbase, six inches
215 of ¾- inch stone, and two inches of bedding stone underneath the pavers. Mr. McMorrow highlighted
216 that the proposed driveway design could handle total runoff from a two-year and ten-year storm, with
217 runoff from 25 and 50-year storms directed to the proposed northern rain garden.
218

219 Chairman Klemens inquired about documentation related to contaminated soil removal and disposal
220 from a historical oil spill on the property. Attorney Capecelatro stated that two leaking underground
221 storage tanks were removed, along with contaminated soil, on the east side of the property by
222 Berkshire Environmental Services and Technology. Investigation indicated that a portion of
223 contamination reached the footing drains, which were routed out to a corrugated metal pipe within 20
224 feet of the lake shore. He stated that contamination remains under the foundation but that complete
225 removal of the materials would compromise the structural integrity of the current principal structure.
226 Upon demolition of the current principal structure, Attorney Capecelatro stated that Berkshire
227 Environmental Services and Technology would provide documentation of safe removal and disposal of
228 the contaminated soil.
229

230 Chairman Klemens requested a view of the cross section of the permeable stone area in front of the
231 proposed plunge pool, questioning whether the area could be classified as a stone wall or a patio.
232

233 LUA Conroy presented the Zoning definition of a patio, which states:
234

235 “Patio: An improved or graded area located on the ground composed of loose-fitting stone or brick or
236 similar material with no structural/supports other than subsurface base material. A patio shall be flush
237 to the ground with no air spaces beneath. Patios shall adhere to required setbacks.”
238

239 Mr. McMorrow stated the design represents a 1:1 stone slope rather than a stone retaining wall. He
240 continued that the design of the stone slope would act as an additional source of water treatment to
241 go along with the proposed northern rain garden. Attorney Capecelatro added that the proposed
242 design was intended for the prevention of erosion along the lakefront. Commissioner Cockerline
243 highlighted that the area would not meet the definition of a patio due to the presence of air spaces
244 with the permeable stone. Mr. and Mrs. Franchini added that the proposed stone work and planting
245 plan would eliminate the beach area, as well as prevent significant runoff from reaching the
246 waterfront.
247

248 Chairman Klemens inquired about alternative options to the permeable stone area for water quality
249 treatment that would result in less grading. He also requested for elaboration about the proposed 25-
250 foot planted buffer at the lakefront. He indicated that the schematics did not display adequate buffer
251 planting in front of the proposed plunge pool. Commissioner Cockerline and Secretary Whalen agreed
252 with Chairman Klemens on the need for improved buffer planting along the lakefront. Commissioner
253 Cockerline specified a potential 50% increase in plantings within the permeable stone slope to improve
254 the buffer.
255

256 Alternate Schiffer inquired about the total area of the lawn, the distance the lawn extends to the
257 lakefront, and plans to prevent fertilizer runoff. Attorney Capecelatro stated that the property owners
258 have no intention of using fertilizers or herbicides on the lawn. He also highlighted that the planting
259 plan would reduce the total lawn area and move the edge of the lawn further back from the shoreline.
260 Alternate Schiffer also asked about specific situations where the removal of an invasive plant species
261 would be impossible to complete. Attorney Capecelatro clarified that the removal of an invasive plant
262 species was dependent upon the removal's impact upon whether the removal would create an erosion
263 problem because of the slope of the property. LUA Conroy confirmed that removal of invasive species
264 could destabilize the slope of some areas on the property.
265

266 Chairman Klemens commented that the construction of a rain garden would bring additional buffer
267 plantings to the edge of the lawn rather than the use of a stone slope with a plunge pool.
268 Commissioner Cockerline highlighted that the proposed stone slope and plunge pool design could
269 simulate a raised septic system to filter a significant amount of runoff water, but repeated that he
270 would prefer at least a 50% increase in the number of plantings within the stone slope. Chairman
271 Klemens stated that the requested modification to increase the number of plantings would have to be
272 displayed on the proposed site plan prior to permit approval. Alternate Schiffer agreed with Chairman
273 Klemens' request to see alternate site plan options for a "more ecological" treatment of runoff, as well
274 as requested a lake elevation view of the proposal for the next meeting.
275

276 LUA Conroy discussed Zoning Regulation Section 305 regarding Setback from Water Bodies and Water
277 Courses within the Lake Protection Overlay District. Section 305.2 indicated that exceptions for the
278 placement of accessory structures within 50 feet of a water body must include the following within the
279 site plan:

- 281 1. Be designed to protect water quality and quantity
- 282 2. Show the existing and proposed site conditions in relation to the water body, site topography,
283 building(s) location, and footprint especially within the minimum required setback
- 284 3. Include a Storm Water Management Plan meeting the requirements set forth in Article VI
- 285 4. Provide a vegetated buffer with shoreline setback area for the purpose of water quality
286 protection
- 287 5. Provide for protection of existing trees and other vegetation beneficial for water quality
288 protection
- 289 6. Provide additional non-invasive trees and shrubs under a landscape planting plan designed to
290 maintain water quality, retard and treat the flow of existing and potentially increased water
291 runoff into the water body, and to compensate for the loss of vegetation due to building
292 construction
- 293 7. Show all impervious services as defined in Appendix-Definitions and document that the total
294 area of the lot covered with such impervious surfaces does not exceed 10% of the total lot area
295

296 LUA Conroy also provided the Zoning Regulation definition of a *structure* as follows:
297 "Anything constructed or erected which requires location on the ground and/or attachment to or
298 placement on something having a location on the ground. Except as otherwise indicated, *structures* as
Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes

1/18/2022

299 used in these regulations shall be deemed to include: buildings, ground-mounted and roof-top
300 mechanical units, swimming pools, tennis courts, towers, paddle or platform tennis courts, balconies,
301 open entries, porches, decks, patios, signs, permanent awnings, ground mounted antennas, ground
302 mounted solar panels, satellite dishes, fences or walls more than eight (8) feet high, and a gas or liquid
303 storage tank that is principally above ground...For the purpose of these regulations the term *structure*
304 shall not include electric or public communication transmission lines or poles, highway or railroad
305 bridges, or flagpoles.”

306
307 LUA Conroy also highlighted the location of a generator pad that was within the side-yard zoning
308 setback on the proposed site plan.

309
310 Attorney Capecelatro requested that the discussion of the permit for 75 Sharon Road in Lakeville be
311 tabled until the next regular meeting of the Commission.

312
313 **Motion:** To continue the review of the site plan for permit request #2022 – 0159/ Lakeville 75 Sharon
314 Road LLC (Capecelatro & McMorrow/Berkshire Engineering)/ 75 Sharon Road/Demo and Build New
315 Single-Family Dwelling and Associated Site Improvements in the Lake Protections Overlay District
316 (Section 404)/ Map 47/Lot 17 on February 7, 2022.

317 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva

318 Vote: 5-0-0

319
320 Chairman Klemens requested a five-minute recess until 7:45 p.m.

321
322 Commission Shyer returned to the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

323
324 **Public Comment**

325 12. Public Comment – Public comment is restricted to items that are neither on the agenda nor the
326 subject of any pending Planning and Zoning application or action and are limited to three
327 minutes per person.

328
329 There was no public comment.

330
331 **Other Business**

332 13. Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission/Planning and Zoning Commission Subcommittee
333 Update
334 a. Ordinary High Water Mark Referral

335
336 LUA Conroy reviewed the referral by the joint committee of Inland Wetlands & Watercourses and
337 Planning & Zoning of a new *Ordinary High-Water Mark* definition. She presented the current definition
338 of an *Ordinary High-Water Mark* as follows:

339
340 “The line along a lake shore providing evidence of the presence of the lake water level based on
341 vegetative characteristics such as the presence, absence or destruction of terrestrial or aquatic

342 vegetation, and physical characteristics such as a clear natural line impressed on a bank, scouring,
343 shelving, or the presence of sediment or debris.”

344
345 LUA Conroy also shared the draft of updated definitions referred by the joint land use committee:
346

347 “Ordinary High-Water Mark (Lake, Pond, Vernal Pool): The line along the shore providing evidence of
348 the water level based on vegetative characteristics such as the presence of aquatic emergent or
349 floating vegetation and/or physical characteristics such as a discernible natural line impressed on a
350 bank, scouring, shelving, staining, or the presence of sediment or debris. Note: The ordinary high-water
351 mark may not be synonymous with a wetland delineation line.

352
353 Ordinary High-Water Mark (Watercourses): The mark on the land caused by the presence and action of
354 flowing water (including sediment and debris) which presence and action is so common, unusual and
355 sustained in all ordinary years so as to mark upon the land a distinction between the abutting upland
356 and the watercourse. Note: The ordinary high-water mark may not be synonymous with the wetland
357 delineation line.”

358
359 Commissioner Cockerline asked about the steps required to adopt the updated ordinary high-water
360 mark definitions. LUA Conroy stated that the adoption of the new definitions would require a public
361 hearing. Chairman Klemens and LUA Conroy indicated that multiple Planning and Zoning Regulation
362 modifications would be coming for the Commission to review at future meetings.

363
364 14. Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) Discussion

365
366 Chairman Klemens opened the conversation of the POCD survey discussion completed on December
367 20th 2021. He stated that the next steps would be content approval, construction within Survey
368 Monkey, and distribution of the survey to the Town by early February 2022. Chairman Klemens
369 indicated his intention to seek approval from the Commission of the drafted survey prior moving
370 forward with survey’s formal construction within Survey Monkey.

371
372 Commissioner Shyer asked questions regarding the receipt and coalition of the replies from the survey,
373 as well as retrieval of information regarding interested individuals' desire to join town committees
374 and/or commissions. LUA Conroy stated that Survey Monkey automates the receipt and compilation of
375 the survey results. She clarified that the design of the survey would allow for anonymity while
376 simultaneously allowing for the collection of contact information of interested individuals to join Town
377 commissions and/or committees. She concluded that Glenn Chalder (Planimetrics) would assist with
378 the survey construction.

379
380 Commissioner Cockerline inquired about Mr. Chalder’s (Planimetrics) participation in the formulation
381 of the questions for survey. Chairman Klemens indicated Mr. Chalder would assist with any additional
382 grammatical modifications that need to be made to the drafted questions during the construction of
383 the survey.

384
Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes
1/18/2022

385 Commissioner Shyer asked about potential strategies for the collection and analysis of individual public
386 comments to be a part of the survey. She suggested having one open-ended question at the end of the
387 survey for people to provide any additional comments on topics that were absent from the survey.
388 Alternate Allee also asked about the collection and analysis of individual public comment as a deadline-
389 based project or if the proposed project could be completed on an open timeline. Chairman Klemens
390 stated that the survey project is under a deadline due to the need to show significant progress on the
391 POCD.

392
393 Alternate Allee recommended a grammatical change to questions 16 and 17 on the survey from
394 “presently” to “currently.” She also recommended a change to the answer options on question 14 to
395 be “ages 40-64” and “ages 65-79” rather than “ages 40-65” and “ages 65-69.”
396

397 Commissioner Shyer also asked a question about the ability to have both electronic and paper copies
398 of the survey available for completion. Commissioner Cockerline and Chairman Klemens suggested
399 having a limited number (n=10) of paper copies available for individuals to pick up within the Town
400 Hall.

401
402 Alternate Schiffer suggested asking a question on the survey about the perception of importance of the
403 Town of Salisbury having the lowest mill rate in the state. Chairman Klemens confirmed that this
404 question is included.

405
406 Chairman Klemens explained that the survey would be promoted in several ways, including the
407 newspaper, website and discussions with other commissions and special interest groups (e.g., the Twin
408 Lakes Association, Amesville Association, Lake Wonoscopomuc Association, the Lime Rock Citizens
409 Counsel, etc.).

410
411 Commissioner Shyer inquired about the utilization of the data collected from question 13. Chairman
412 Klemens indicated a desire to identify a correlation between specific problems of interest within the
413 Town of Salisbury and special interest groups and/or associations. Commissioner Shyer asked about
414 the estimated time required for an individual to complete the survey. LUA Conroy stated that the
415 Survey Monkey program would provide an average length of time for individuals to complete the
416 survey. She also indicated a potential deadline for participants to complete the survey by the middle of
417 March.

418
419 Alternate Schiffer requested a clarification of the term “duplex” within the problem statements
420 presented in question eight, and requested potential modification of the term to “multi-family home”
421 or “two family home.” Commissioner Cockerline disagreed with the presence of only three options to
422 choose from within question 11 of the survey with regards to the level of perceived importance of a
423 specified issue, and recommended a one to ten scale rating system as an alternative. Commissioner
424 Cockerline concluded that the present survey was satisfactory and desired to move forward with
425 approval.

426

427 **Motion:** To move the presented survey to Glenn Chalder of Planimetrics for the construction of the
428 survey within the Survey Monkey software program with the previously discussed corrections given by
429 the Commissioners.

430 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Shyer

431 Vote: 5-0-0

432

433 15. Discussion Downtown Lakeville Request for Proposal (RFP) – Traffic, Parking, Pedestrian Safety,
434 and Landscaping

435

436 LUA Conroy displayed a map of downtown Lakeville which highlighted areas of relevancy for traffic,
437 parking, pedestrian safety, and landscaping considerations. The highlighted area encompassed
438 Bostwick Street to the Lakeville Town Grove, sections of the Railroad Ramble, and a portion of Route
439 41 up to the Masonic Temple. Alternate Allee stated that the highlighted area of the map includes all
440 local business, the baseball field and tennis courts, and Lakeville Lake. She continued that the
441 intersections of Ethan Allen Street and Route 41/Route 41 and Route 44, were unsafe for pedestrian
442 travel. Commissioner Cockerline suggested that the DOT Traffic Study be included within the RFP.
443 Alternate Schiffer inquired about the absence of discussion of the affordable housing plan on the
444 Holley Block. Chairman Klemens stated that he removed the sections from the RFP regarding the
445 affordable housing project and the VHB study due to litigation proceedings.

446

447 The Commission highlighted the following topics for the RFP:

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458

459

460

461

462

463

464

465

466

467

468

469

1. Pedestrian Access and Safety for Crossing the Street
2. The Volume and Speed of Through Traffic
3. Pedestrian Friendly Sidewalks and Street Lighting
4. Designated Areas for Bicycling (esp. for children)
5. Public Parking Availability
6. Traffic Circulation within the Downtown Area
7. Enhancement of Natural and Historic Beauty of the Area

The Scope or Services presented within the RFP included the following:

1. A tour of the Lakeville Village with Chairman Klemens and LUA Conroy for review and refinement of the designated study area
2. Review of relevant studies pertaining to the project area
3. Consultation of wetland maps to determine boundaries of existing wetlands and watercourses
4. Location of existing pedestrian crossing areas and identification of opportunities for additional and/or safer places to walk
5. Preparation of pedestrian access, circulation, and safety plans
6. Identification of all existing and potential parking spaces within the study area
7. Identification of locations for parking opportunities and preparation of a parking plan
8. Combination of the above aspects into a cohesive narrative plan
9. Preparation of a final map that clearly shows all proposed improvements and other features

470 Commissioner Shyer recommended that reference to the aquifer protection area be included in the
471 RFP. Alternate Allee suggested that this point be added to paragraph two of page two in conjunction
472 with the description of the "Railroad Ramble." Chairman Klemens recommended that information
473 about the aquifer protection area be added to paragraph three of page two regarding the "several
474 planning efforts" within downtown Lakeville.

475
476 **Motion:** To approve the Downtown Lakeville Request for Proposal (RFP) with the previous
477 amendments discussed by the Commissioners and moved towards circulation
478 Made by Shyer, seconded by Cockerline
479 Vote: 5-0-0

480
481 **Adjournment**
482 The Zoom video recording for the adjournment of the meeting stopped prior to the motion and vote at
483 8:45 p.m.

484
485 Respectfully Submitted,
486
487 Sara C. Woloszyn
488 Recording Secretary