June 6, 2022, 6:30 PM Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone **Members Present:** Staff Present: 1 Dr. Michael Klemens (Chairman) Abby Conroy, Land Use Administrator (LUA) 2 3 Cathy Shyer (Vice Chair) Members Absent: 4 Bob Riva (Regular Member) 5 Allen Cockerline (Regular Member) Martin Whalen (Secretary) 6 Dr. Danella Schiffer (Alternate) Debra Allee (Alternate) 7 8 **Brief Items and Announcements** 9 1. Call to Order/ Establish Quorum Chairman Klemens called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. With four regular members and one 10 alternate present (Chairman Klemens, Vice Chair Shyer, Commissioner Riva, Secretary Whalen, and 11 Alternate Schiffer), a quorum was established. Alternate Schiffer was seated as a voting member. 12 13 2. Approval of Agenda 14 15 Chairman Klemens amended the agenda with the addition of the following two points: 16 Amendment #1: Point 22 – Zoning Maps Progress Update Amendment #2: Point 23 – RFP Review 17 18 *Motion:* To approve the agenda as amended 19 20 Made by Riva, seconded by Shyer 21 Vote: 5-0-0 22 3. Minutes of February 22, 2022 23 24 4. Minutes of March 7, 2022 25 5. Minutes of March 8, 2022 6. Minutes of March 21, 2022 – Pending 26 27 7. Minutes of April 4, 2022 – Pending 8. Minutes of April 12, 2022 - Pending 28 9. Minutes of April 18, 2022 – Pending 29 10. Minutes of May 2, 2022 – Pending 30 11. Minutes of May 16, 2022 - Pending 31 32 33 Vice Chair Shyer, Commissioner Riva, Secretary Whalen, and Alternate Schiffer were not able to review the minutes from the February 22, March 7, and March 8 meetings. Chairman Klemens tabled the 34 35 review of the three sets of minutes until the next meeting. 36 37 12. Correspondence

- 38 There was no correspondence for review.
- 40 13. Public Comment *Public comment is restricted to items that are neither on the agenda nor the*
- 41 <u>subject of any pending Planning and Zoning application or action and are limited to three minutes</u>
 42 per person.

Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes 06/06/2022

39

June 6, 2022, 6:30 PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

- 43 Chairman Klemens opened the meeting to public comment at 6:35p.m.
- 44
 - 45 Bruce Palmer commented on the importance of being aware of individuals in attendance for both in-
 - 46 person and virtual public meetings. Chairman Klemens read the names of the individuals in attendance
 - 47 as follows: Bill Manasse, CATV6, Ian Findlay, John Sprague, Lobna Elsarafy, Nick Brazzale, Peter Findlay,
 - 48 William Grickis, and Peter Hollatz (Purple Toothbrush LLC).49

50 Public Hearing(s): 6:45 p.m.

- 14. #2022-0174/ Brazzale (Grickis)/ 17 Railroad Street/ Contractor Equipment Storage/ Map 54/ Lot
 58/ DOR: 04/18/2022
- 53
- 54 Secretary Whalen read the call for the public hearing at 6:44 p.m. Chairman Klemens stated that the 55 applicant obtained a setback variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.
- 56
- Attorney William Grickis (Grickis Law Offices Lakeville) represented Nick Brazzale for the special permit application. Attorney Grickis reviewed the history of the special permit application as a response to a neighbor's complaint regarding the presence of construction equipment within their line of site along the property line. Attorney Grickis confirmed that a yard setback variance was granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals. He stated that the structure would be 1,500 square feet (30'x50') with a maximum building height of 16 feet. He also presented correspondence addressing how the application meets requirements of Zoning Regulation 213.4 for Contractor Equipment Storage.
- 64
- 65 Chairman Klemens noted that the proposed equipment storage structure is located on the opposite 66 end of the property from the Elsarafy's property line. Mr. Brazzale confirmed that the portion of the 67 property facing the Elsarafy has been cleaned up. Secretary Whalen asked for the location of the 68 entrance into the equipment storage structure. Mr. Brazzale stated that there would be two garage 69 doors on the northern and eastern sides of the proposed structure.
- 70

72

- 71 Chairman Klemens opened the meeting for public comment at 6:56 p.m.
- Mr. Elsarafy requested that his comments submitted to LUA Conroy prior to the public hearing be
 placed on the public record for the special permit application. LUA Conroy displayed Mr. Elsarafy
 correspondence which read as follows:
- 76
- The purpose of the following commentary is to clarify expectations in order to minimize the likelihood
 of future issues. The current proposal before the Commission is to resolve a prolonged and ongoing
 issue and establish a path forward. It is thus critical that the path does indeed lead forward and not
 eventually allow for digression from its intended purpose or a regression to the current status quo.
- 81
- 82 What is meant by that is businesses eventually grow and evolve, and 1,500 square feet of space could 83 become insufficient. During the ZBA meeting in February, the Commission asked Mr. Brazzale if he
- thought 1,500 square feet would be sufficient for his future needs. He responded in the affirmative and

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

also that such a storage size was all that the lot could handle. These are forward-looking statements. Of 85 course, such assessment can prove to be incorrect in the future. However, the liability for incorrect 86 87 business assessments is solely that of the business owner, that is, the person who secures a profit from the enterprise. No other person, in a capitalist economy, can bear responsibility for incorrect estimates 88 89 related to their enterprise other than the entrepreneur. In addition, had the statement been made in 90 the negative – namely that 1,500 square feet would not suffice for future needs – the ZBA's decision in granting a variance could very well have been different. Further, our position on the proposal could very 91 92 well have also been different.

93

As such, it cannot be the case that in a few months or a few years' time, we begin to again see 94 95 commercial equipment outdoors, along the property lines, pr being worked on and stored in the garage on 12 Indian Cave Road because the storage became full or business needs have evolved. If at any point 96 the storage becomes insufficient, it should then be reasonably clear to all parties that the business has 97 grown so successfully that is has simply done what every businessowner hopes to accomplish when 98 99 starting a business: outgrow their initial location...

100

With that being said, we are hopeful that this solution will allow all parties to move forward in a way 101 102 that meets their needs and are looking forward to its implementation in the fastest time possible. In the meantime, all activity currently occurring that is causing ongoing issues – noise, traffic, aesthetics – 103 104 should be done at an absolute minimum. We are ready to move forward in good faith, but the solution 105 being proposed and considered on June 6, 2022 must be one that permanently moves us forward rather than merely act as a temporary fix, a building block for greater commercial aspirations, or a hedge 106 against incorrect business assumptions. Any digression and regression from what is currently being 107 108 proposed and considered will be documented and shared with the Commission – we reserve this right 109 without hindrance. 110

111 Recap of Main Expectations:

- All commercial equipment on 12 Indian Cave Road and 17 Railroad Street be stored within the proposed structure at all times.
- The garage on 12 Indian Cave Road no longer be used for any commercial storage, maintenance, and activity.
- 116 The entry/exit points of the structure, where equipment can be viewed, should face railroad ٠ street to facilitate ease of movement, to promote aesthetics with respect to the neighboring 117 property on 16 Indian Cave Road. 118
 - Per discussions from the fall, a fence should be erected, consistent with other storage facilities, • in Salisbury and Lakeville.
- 120 121

119

112

113

114 115

- Attorney Grickis stated that the original idea of a fence along the property line was presented to 122
- improve the aesthetics for the neighboring Elsarafy property. With the construction of the equipment 123

124 storage structure to house all of the applicant's construction equipment, Attorney Grickis stated that a

125 fence would no longer be needed. Mr. Brazzale stated that his efforts would be put towards

126 construction of the equipment storage structure rather than a fence at this time, but that he would

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

127 consider adding a fence in the future. Attorney Grickis added that Mr. Brazzale's proposed equipment

- storage structure's estimated cost is \$150,000, with these funds going directly to address the
- complaint submitted by the Elsarafy family. Mr. Elsarafy stated that the addition of a fence would allow
- 130 the property to remain consistent with other construction storage facilities within Salisbury and
- 131 Lakeville.
- 132

Lobna Elsarafy stated that the original plans to address the complaint included both the construction of 133 an equipment storage structure and a fence. She also requested clarification of whether additional 134 135 sheds would be built along the property line, and if so, requested their location to be identified on the 136 proposed site plan. Attorney Grickis stated that the original plan was to erect an equipment storage 137 structure of 750 square feet which was determined to be insufficient to meet the needs of the applicant's equipment. The applicant proceeded to obtain a variance to build a structure greater than 138 750 square feet from the Zoning Board of Appeals to accommodate the storage needs for his 139 equipment. Attorney Grickis stated that the addition of a fence was not part of the original plan. Mr. 140 141 Brazzale stated that the shed depicted on the site plan would be moved to the rear of the house to 142 serve as a garden shed, with no additional sheds to be added along the property line.

143

144 Alternate Schiffer asked if there was a rendering available of the proposed equipment storage 145 structure. Mr. Brazzale did not have a rendering of the structure available, but explained that the 146 structure would have vertical wooden siding with a slightly pitched metal roof. Vice Chair Shyer asked 147 if all of the applicant's vehicles will be stored in the proposed structure each evening with the garage doors closed. Mr. Brazzale stated that two vehicles (pick-up trucks) would remain outside of the 148 149 proposed structure in the existing gravel parking area, along with two personal vehicles on the eastern 150 side of the applicant's home parked on an asphalt driveway. Mr. Brazzale stated that there are large 151 pine trees along the eastern property line that serve as a natural fence between his property and the 152 Elsarafy's property.

153

154 Mr. Elsarafy read the correspondence from Attorney Grickis from the September 17, 2021 meeting. 155 The correspondence indicated that an eight-foot fence would be erected along the property line in 156 addition to the construction of the equipment storage structure. Chairman Klemens requested that this correspondence letter be added to the record at the next public hearing for continued discussion 157 and deliberation. Attorney Grickis stated that continuing the discussion at the next public hearing is 158 159 unnecessary due to the efforts and financial investment put forth by the applicant to address the 160 complaint. Because the Elsarafy family purchased their home in a commercial zone, Attorney Grickis 161 stated that commercial structures and activities should be expected within their line of site.

- 162
- 163 **Motion:** To close the public hearing for application #2022-0174/ Brazzale (Grickis)/ 17 Railroad Street/
- 164 Contractor Equipment Storage/ Map 54/ Lot 58 at 7:30 p.m.
- 165 Made by Riva, seconded by Schiffer
- 166 Vote: 2-3-0 Riva and Schiffer voted in favor, Klemens, Shyer and Whalen Opposed. The motion to close
- 167 the hearing failed.
- 168

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

169 Chairman Klemens stated that the public hearing stays open for the application until the Commission 170 views the correspondence letter written by Attorney Grickis from September 17, 2021.

171

Vice Chair Shyer stated that she commends the efforts of the applicant and desires to see the letterfrom September 17, 2021 prior to making a final decision on the application.

174

LUA Conroy displayed the correspondence letter from Attorney Grickis dated September 17, 2021which read as follows:

177

178 Dear Abby,

179

180 Thank you for meeting with Mr. Brazzale and me at the above captioned property last Tuesday. Your 181 visit and discussions were very helpful in explaining to Mr. Brazzale what is expected from him and his 182 business operations in order to comply with the current zoning regulations. To that end, it appears that 183 Mr. Brazzale has not applied for a zoning permit to operate his landscaping business from the property, 184 which he also uses has his personal residence.

185

189

We are aware that his equipment storage on the property has drawn the attention and concern of one
or more of his immediate neighbors. In that regard, I must remind the Commission that the property is
located in a CG-20 zone, the same zone in which the complaining neighbors apparently reside.

Having reviewed the Regulations following receipt of the Notice of Potential Violation from your office
and having reviewed the property with Mr. Brazzale previously and with you on this past Tuesday, we
contend that Mr. Brazzale's current accessory use of the property is consistent with the current
Regulations. Specifically, Table 205.3 [More than one commercial vehicle and/or equipment storage];
Section 207.12 [Commercial Vehicle and Equipment Storage]; and Section 224.4 [Commercial Vehicle
and Equipment Storage].

196

Mr. Brazzale does recognize, however, that both Sections 207.12b and 224.4a require that vehicles and
equipment storage "must occupy a combined area of less than 750 square feet, with no one vehicle or
piece of equipment occupying more than 250 square feet." Mr. Brazzale believes that the equipment
now stored on his property comprises less than 750 square feet, although business needs from job to
job do make the volume of stored equipment somewhat of a moving target.

202

To accommodate the Commission and enhance the Compliance with the Regulations, Mr. Brazzale is prepared to undertake the following actions within a reasonable time frame to achieve:

- 205 1. Apply for a zoning permit, if one is not already in place;
- 206 2. His mother will transfer ownership of the property to him, if required by the Commission;

Erect an 8-foot fence along the entire southern property boundary to provide screening of stored
 equipment from the neighboring residential property;

- 209 4. Reduce the wood pile adjacent to his house to the level needed for personal heating and fire wood;
- 210 5. Sell the large boat on the north side of the property;

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

211 6. Burn the brush pile to the rear of his house;

212 7. Use large tarps to cover the equipment on the south side of the property.

213

The bigger picture for Mr. Brazzale is to apply very shortly for a setback variance that will allow him to erect a tasteful barn to the rear of his house for the purpose of storing all vehicles and equipment and eliminate any claim of unsightliness or nuisance.

217

As the Commission well knows, there is a dearth of commercially owned space in Salisbury and that real estate prices in general have soared, making acquisition of another property beyond the reach of hardworking small businessmen like Mr. Brazzale. I am very confidence that the Town of Salisbury and the Commission very much want to encourage successful entrepreneurs to operate from commercially zoned properties. I am hopeful that the Commission will cooperate with Mr. Brazzale in finding an equitable and fair solution to the current contention.

224

With regard to the complaining neighbors, it is worth noting that such neighbors have a private right of
action against the neighbor who purportedly has created nuisance conditions by filing a nuisance tort
law suit in the Superior Court. As the bar to prove an actual nuisance exists is very high, it is not
surprising that aggrieved neighbors will seek to employ taxpayer dollars in attempting to leverage the

229 Commission to be as vigilant as Odysseus in resisting these siren calls. The Commission is tasked with

- interpreting and enforcing the Regulations consistently and equitably within the tenor of the
 Regulations, not as would be manipulated by a neighbor unwilling to commit personal resources to
 redress a perceived wrong.
- 232

234 Very Yours Truly,

235

236 William V. Grickis

237

Chairman Klemens reviewed the seven potential action steps outlined in the correspondence letter. He noted that actions steps four through six were complete, with step seven no longer applicable due to the plan to construct an equipment storage facility. LUA Conroy stated that the above letter was an outline of temporary measures to resolve the neighbor's complaint, with the future intention to build an equipment storage structure dependent upon the issuance of a set-back variance.

243

244 New Motion: To close the public hearing for application #2022-0174/ Brazzale (Grickis)/ 17 Railroad

- 245 Street/ Contractor Equipment Storage/ Map 54/ Lot 58 at 7:39 p.m.
- 246 Made by Riva, seconded by Whalen
- 247 Vote: 5-0-0
- 248
- 249 **Motion:** To approve application #2022-0174/ Brazzale (Grickis)/ 17 Railroad Street/ Contractor
- 250 Equipment Storage Building/ Map 54/ Lot 58
- 251 Made by Riva, seconded by Schiffer
- 252 Vote: 5-0-0

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

15. #2022-0173/ Sprague/ 120 & 126 Dugway Road/ 3-Lot Residential Subdivision/ Map 8/ Lot 28-1/ 253 254 DOR: 04/18/2022 255 256 Secretary Whalen read the call, opening the hearing at 7:43pm. John Sprague (Applicant and Property 257 Owner) and Attorney Bill Manasse (Manasse, Slaiby, and Leard, LLP) represented the application. LUA 258 Conroy presented the following letter from the applicant: 259 260 Dear Sirs, 261 By this letter, my wife, Elizabeth, and I, formally request permission to subdivide our property in the 262 263 following manner and for the following reasons. 264 We propose to divide our 94.172 acres into four parts. There would be three lots plus a fourth portion 265 (88.856 acres) that would be designated as a Forever Wild Nature Conservancy. The visions would be as 266 267 follows: Lot #1, consisting of 3.041 acres; Lot #2, consisting of 6.417 (containing our house, our guest 268 house, and our barn); and Lot #3, consisting of 2.275 acres. 269 *Our intention is to put lots #1 and 3 on sale in the near future. We have been working with the Salisbury* 270 Land Trust with the advice and assistance of John Landon and Harry White, to immediately submit our 271 272 application to designate the 88.856 into a Forever Wild Nature Conservancy which would still be owned 273 and maintained by ourselves or the future owners of our property. Of that 88.856 acres, 6.417 acres 274 would be designated as open space as required by the City of Salisbury. 275 276 Please accept this request for your approval. 277 Sincerely, 278 John and Elizabeth Sprague 279 280 281 Chairman Klemens asked for the distance from the proposed Lot #1 to a nearby wetland area. LUA 282 Conroy stated that the wetland was greater than 100 feet away from the proposed Lot #1, residing outside of the Wetlands Upland Review. While the proposed Lot #1 meets the current Wetlands 283 Upland Review Regulations, she continued that future lot development and/or amendments to the 284 285 Regulations may result in a larger Wetlands Upland Review in the future. Mr. Sprague stated that there 286 has been an absence of overflow of the wetland during his time residing on the property. Chairman 287 Klemens asked whether the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission completed an 288 investigation on the species of flora and fauna living within the wetland area. LUA Conroy stated that 289 an investigation had not been completed due to the absence of development. Chairman Klemens 290 asked if proposed lots one and three had undergone a perc test. Mr. Sprague confirmed that both lots 291 had a completed a perc test. LUA Conroy stated that the property was within the RR-1 zone. Chairman 292 Klemens noted the presence of a septic reserve within proposed conservation area (Lot #2) on the 293 map. LUA Conroy displayed the Area Summary of Proposed Lot #2 to provide clarification on the 294 presence of the septic reserve within the conservation area. The Area Summary read as follows:

June 6, 2022, 6:30 PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

295 Proposed Area of Dedicated Open Space: 18.383 +/- acres

296 Proposed Restriction Portion Lot #2: 64.056 +/- acres

297 Proposed Unrestricted Area: 6.417 acres +/- acres

- 298 Total Area: 88.856 +/- acres
- 299

Mr. Sprague stated that the location of the proposed septic area within Lot #2 was selected to meetTorrington Area Health District requirements.

302

Attorney Manasse stated that the applicant is negotiating for a conservation easement with the Salisbury Land Trust. He continued that no agreement has been reached at the present time. He stated that under the conservation easement, the land in proposed Lot #2 would still be owned by the Mr. Sprague. Chairman Klemens stated that the septic reserve area would be better suited within the property lines of proposed Lot #3 rather than within the conservation area of proposed Lot #2. LUA Conroy clarified that the proposed septic reserve within conservation area is not for proposed Lot #3, but is for the applicant on their unrestricted portion of land.

310

LUA Conroy recommended having Bill Colby and the Salisbury Land Trust come to a future meeting to
 discuss the reasoning of placement of a septic reserve within the proposed conservation area.
 Chairman Klemens recommended presenting an alternative map to display details that note the areas
 of space for the conservation easement, onen space, and the subdivision plan. LUA Conroy provided

of space for the conservation easement, open space, and the subdivision plan. LUA Conroy provided

clarification to the applicant that the Commission is requesting the creation of a second map that does not display the Proposed Restriction Portion of Lot #2. She requested that the applicant submit a

written statement granting permission for an extension to continue the hearing on the July 18, 2022

- 318 meeting.
- 319

Mr. Sprague asked the Commission for clarification on the 15% requirement for dedicated open space within the proposed conservation area. Secretary Whalen clarified that the request for a subdivision requires a portion of land to be dedicated for open space, even if a portion of the subdivision is being used as a wildlife conservation area. Mr. Sprague stated that he would provide the necessary information to the Commission for the July 18, 2022 meeting.

324 325

326 16. #2022-0180/ Findlay/ 42, 44, 79, & 81 Prospect Mountain Road/ 2-Lot Residential Subdivision/ Map
 327 15/ Lot 58/ DOR: 05/16/2022/

328

Secretary Whalen read the call opening the hearing at 8:22 p.m. Because the proposed subdivision is a
 family subdivision, Chairman Klemens stated that there is no requirement for dedicated open space.
 LUA Conroy displayed the proposed subdivision map for Commission review and noted the areas of the
 property previously under conservation easement by the Salisbury Land Trust.

333

Attorney Bill Manasse (Manasse, Slaiby, and Leard, LLP) represented the subdivision application. He stated that the applicant seeks to establish a two-lot subdivision to divide out Proposed Lot #1 to

separate the residential area of the applicant's son, Ian Findlay.

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

Chairman Klemens opened the hearing for public comment at 8:27 p.m. There were no public 337 comments. 338 339 Motion: To close the public hearing for application #2022-0180/ Findlay/ 42, 44, 79, & 81 Prospect 340 Mountain Road/ 2-Lot Residential Subdivision/ Map 15/ Lot 58 at 8:27 p.m. 341 342 Made by Whalen, seconded by Shyer Vote: 5-0-0 343 344 345 Motion: To approve application #2022-0180/ Findlay/ 42, 44, 79, & 81 Prospect Mountain Road/ 2-Lot Residential Subdivision/ Map 15/ Lot 58 at 8:28 p.m. 346 Made by Shyer, seconded by Schiffer 347 348 Vote: 5-0-0 349 350 17. #2022/0176/ Tomaino/ 56 East Main Street/ Special Permit to Convert an Accessory Building to 351 Contain a Detached Apartment on a Single-Family Residential Lot (Section 208)/ Map 57/ Lot 10/ 352 DOR: 05/02/2022 353 354 Secretary Whalen read the call opening the hearing at 8:30 p.m. Erik Tomaino (Applicant and Property Owner) presented the special permit application. LUA Conroy displayed the following written 355 356 statement from the applicant: 357 The proposed use of the structure at 56 East Main Street in Salisbury: 358 Renovation of the existing approximately 650 square foot structure and change of use to comply with 359 360 all accessory apartment regulations. Visible changes from the road to existing structure will consist of the removal of existing garage doors and replacement with a front door and a window. The design will 361 362 remain consistent with the character of the neighborhood. Replacement siding will remain as is and the 363 cedar clapboard siding will be repatched after removal of garage doors. 364 365 The dwelling will be a one bedroom, one bathroom apartment with a full kitchen including radiant heat 366 and air conditioning. The roof has already been replaced. The design is consistent with the character of the neighborhood. 367 368 369 My intention is to remain in the main dwelling and provide the accessory apartment to a local resident. The accessory building will be connected to the utilities in the main dwelling. This building will not have 370 371 a separate water or electric service. In addition, there are six parking spaces total for both dwellings. 372 373 *I believe my purpose falls within the requirements as this garage is existing.* 374 375 Thank You, 376 377 Erik Tomaino 378 Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes 06/06/2022

9

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

Chairman Klemens asked whether construction had begun for the conversion to the accessory 379 apartment in absence of a Zoning Permit. With a Building Permit previously obtained, Mr. Tomaino 380 381 stated that the construction process has started for the creation of the accessory apartment with 382 regards to exterior modifications (e.g., roof and siding repairs; removal of the garage doors), but the 383 interior of the garage has not undergone any modifications. Chairman Klemens requested further clarification of heating. Mr. Tomaino admitted that radiant heat and insulation had been installed 384 under a permit issued by the building department. Chairman Klemens asked if there was a construction 385 drawing available for the proposed accessory apartment. Mr. Tomaino did not have a construction 386 387 drawing present, but stated that the 650 square foot garage space would have a kitchen, one 388 bathroom, living area, one bedroom, and a laundry room connected to Town water and sewer. Mr. 389 Tomaino stated that he had submitted the necessary paperwork and \$3,500 fee to the Water Pollution 390 Control Authority for approval. Chairman Klemens commented that the application process has been pursued out of order. The applicant has installed the sewer connection, obtained building permits and 391 392 now the applicant is pursuing the zoning approval.

393

394 Alternate Schiffer asked the applicant for details on the proposed use of the accessory apartment. Mr. Tomaino stated that he would be renting the accessory apartment to a local resident or family member 395 396 for long term use. He continued that the accessory apartment will not be used for Air BnB. Vice Chair 397 Shyer requested clarification on the presence of a second story to the proposed accessory apartment. 398 Mr. Tomaino stated that the window seen in the front of the garage leads into uninsulated attic 399 storage and would not be part of the living space of the proposed accessory apartment. He added that 400 he would be moving the parking area for both personal and potential tenant vehicles to the front of the principal structure to allow for a small yard space in front of the proposed accessory apartment. 401 402 LUA Conroy stated that changing the parking arrangement on the property would trigger the need for 403 a site plan modification with the presence of an accessory apartment. She stated that at least three 404 parking spaces are required for the property (two spaces for the principal residence and one space for 405 the accessory apartment).

406

407 Chairman Klemens opened the floor for public comment at 9:14 p.m. There was no public comment. 408

Chairman Klemens requested that the applicant provide a drawing to show the removal of the area of
parking directly in front of the accessory apartment and its conversion to a garden area, as well as
preservation of the three-space parking area to the east of the principal dwelling, for the next meeting.
Mr. Tomaino stated that he would provide written consent for an extension to continue the hearing at
the July 18, 2022 meeting.

414

415 Pending Business

416 18. #2022-0160/ Cassidy and Teti/ 9 Academy Street/ Special Permit - Change of Use to a Hotel

- 417 (Section 205.2) and Use Rendering a Lot More than 30% Impervious Surface in the Aquifer
- 418 Protection Area (Section 403.4.c.)/ Map 54/Lot 74/ DOR: 02/07/2022
- 419

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

- 420 LUA Conroy presented a draft resolution regarding the special permit application for the Change of Use
- to a Hotel at 9 Academy Street. Chairman Klemens stated that the draft resolution was created to
- 422 clarify permissible zones for hotel establishment, provide guidedance for addressing pre-existing hotels
- 423 and motels in residential zones, and provide clarification for the thought process behind the
- 424 determination of the permissibly of the establishment of a hotel at 9 Academy Street. The draft
- 425 resolution read as follows:
- 426
- 427 Whereas a building used exclusively for short term transient rentals is considered a hotel or a motel; 428
- 429 Whereas hotels and motels are not allowed in residential zones and are restricted to the following 430 zones: RE, C20, and CG 20;
- 431 Whereas the proposed building (9 Academy Street) will be used exclusively for short term transient 432 rentals and is therefore deemed to be a hotel;
- 433 Whereas the proposed building is in the C20 zone where such uses are allowed; and
- 434 Whereas the applicant has revised plans to accommodate the abutting property owners and comply
- 435 with directives of the PZC engineer; and
- 436
- 437 Whereas the applicant has received approval from the Salisbury Historic Commission to renovate the 438 structure.
- 439
- Resolved that the special permit to create a hotel at 9 Academy Street is approved in accordance with
 the regulations of the Town of Salisbury; and
- 442
- Resolved that the special permit to exceed 30% lot coverage in the Aquifer Protection Overlay District is
 simultaneously approved as the applicant has taken necessary steps to minimize impacts to the aquifer;
 and
- 446
- Resolved that these permits are conditioned upon the applicant providing full-size paper plans of the
 final approved plan (accompanied by a Mylar copy for filing on the land use records) as well as full sized
 paper plans of each iteration of said plans that were reviewed by the PZC and its consultants to comply
 with FOI record keeping; and be it
- 451
- 452 Resolved that no zoning or building permits will be issued until the applicant files all necessary full size
 453 paper copies of each reviewed plan set to the Land Use Office.
- 454
- Chairman Klemens stated that the proposed draft resolution has been reviewed by the Planning andZoning Commission's legal counsel.
- 457
- 458 Alternate Schiffer asked for a distinction to be made between a hotel and a bed and breakfast.
- 459 Chairman Klemens stated that if the structure is being used solely for short term rentals, it would be
- 460 classified as a hotel and would need to be within the RE, C20, and CG20 zones. Any short-term rental

June 6, 2022, 6:30 PM

m and Tolonh ata Maating by Live Internet Video Str **–**

	Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone
461	that occurs on an intermittent basis within a residential neighbor (typically within someone's home)
462	would qualify as a bed and breakfast and/or an Air BnB.
463	
464	Motion: To accept and approve the resolution and application #2022-0160/ Cassidy and Teti/ 9
465	Academy Street/ Special Permit - Change of Use to a Hotel (Section 205.2) and Use Rendering a Lot
466	More than 30% Impervious Surface in the Aquifer Protection Area (Section 403.4.c.)/ Map 54/Lot 74 at
467	9:33 p.m.
468	Made by Shyer, seconded by Riva
469	Vote: 5-0-0
470	
471	New Business:
472 473	19. 8-24 Referral/ Town of Salisbury/ Renewal of Apartment Lease – 414 Millerton Road
474	Motion: To approve referral 8-24/ Town of Salisbury/ Renewal of Apartment Lease – 414 Millerton
475	Road, at 6:40 p.m.
476	Made by Whalen, seconded by Riva
477	Vote: 5-0-0
478	
479	20. 8-24 Referral/ Town of Salisbury/ Property Purchase – Library Street Island Parcel
480	
481	Chairman Klemens stated that a portion of Library Street is owned by Aiden Cassidy (15 Library Street).
482	In order for the Town of Salisbury to continue to use the street, the island parcel in the middle of
483	Library Street must be purchased by the Town. As determined by Town Meeting, the purchase price for
484	the island parcel was set at \$30,000.
485	
486	Motion: To approve referral 8-24/ Town of Salisbury/ Property Purchase – Library Street Island Parcel,
487	at 6:41 p.m.
488	Made by Riva, seconded by Shyer
489	Vote: 5-0-0
490	
491	21. 8-24 Referral/ Town of Salisbury/ Property Transfer to Salisbury Housing Trust – 17 Perry Street
492	
493	Vice Chair Shyer questioned whether the Town of Salisbury obtained this property as a result of
494	default. No information was available to confirm or deny this inquiry.
495	
496	Motion: To approve the transfer of the 17 Perry Street property to the Salisbury Housing Trust at 6:43
497	p.m.
498	Made by Riva, seconded by Shyer
499	Vote: 5-0-0
500	
501	Other Business
502	22. Zoning Maps Project Update
	Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission Minutes

06/06/2022

June 6, 2022, 6:30 PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

- 503 Chairman Klemens stated that himself and LUA Conroy have been reviewing the accuracy of the zoning
- maps. He continued that himself and LUA Conroy are creating a presentation to display their ideas for
- updated formatting of the zoning maps that reflect the realities of parcels and aligns with the goals ofthe POCD.
- 507
- 508 23. RFP Review
- 509 Chairman Klemens requested that the Commissioners read the three RFP proposals and come with
- questions, comments, and observations to the June 20, 2022 planning meeting. Vice Chair Shyer and
- 511 Alternate Schiffer stated that they would look at qualifications and experience, previously completed
- projects in other towns, and the written proposals as they pertain to the Commission's requests, for
- 513 each of the three candidates.
- 514 Vice Chair Shyer requested that a special meeting be scheduled to review and approve the previous
- sets of minutes. Chairman Klemens requested tabling a special meeting for minutes until a future date.
- 516

517 Adjournment

- 518 *Motion*: To adjourn the meeting at 9:54 p.m.
- 519 Made by Shyer, seconded by Riva
- 520 Vote: 5-0-0
- 521
- 522 Respectfully Submitted,
- 523
- 524 Abby Conroy, Land Use Administrator