

**Letter for Public Hearing concerning #2025-0287 / Wake Robin LLC & Ms. Serena Granbery (ARADEV LLC)**

---

**From** Brian Miller <bmillier@millerplanninggroup.com>

**Date** Tue 9/9/2025 10:02 AM

**To** Land Use <landuse@salisburyct.us>

**Cc** Perley H. Grimes <pgrimes@cramer-anderson.com>; William Cruger <wcruger@gmail.com>; Angela Cruger <angelacruger@gmail.com>

 1 attachment (154 KB)

Response to McDermott 9-8-25.pdf;

Dear Ms. Conroy;

Please accept the attached letter for inclusion in the public hearing for application 2025-287 Wake Robbin LLC & Ms. Serena Granbery.

Thank you for your cooperaton.

**Brian J Miller, AICP**



The Miller Planning Group  
Land Use Solutions

203-314-7151  
108 Colonial Hill Drive  
Wallingford, CT 06492

108 Colonial Hill Drive  
Wallingford, CT 06492  
203-314-7151  
bmiller@millerplanninggroup.com



The Miller Planning Group  
Land Use Solutions

September 8, 2025

Dr. Michael Klemens, Chairman  
Planning and Zoning Commission  
Town of Salisbury, CT

Dear Chairman Klemens and Planning and Zoning Commission Members,

This letter is in response to Mr. McDermott's reaction to the report I prepared. I hope that is useful to the Commission in their deliberations.

The McDermott report included a critique of several sections of the terminology and methodology of my report. However, the most important takeaway of the report is the sections that he chose not to comment on.

The most critical component of my report was the Conclusions on page 2. I. The essence of these conclusions is based upon and includes:

- This development would change a low-intensity "grandfathered" use into a large commercial enterprise within a rural residential neighborhood within the RR-1 zone. The proposed development would be much larger and more intensive than the current use in many ways, including but not limited to:
  - Events will be the primary focus of the business of the proposed development.
  - The proposed event space would be more than three times the size of the existing event space.
  - There are no limits to the number of events with fewer than 100 attendees.
  - The proposed limit on events with 100 or more attendees would only apply during the first year of operations. There would be no limit to the number of events with fewer than 100 attendees.
  - The total building square footage would be approximately three times as large as what currently exists.
- Permitting a significant business node within the midst of a rural residential neighborhood is not good land use plan. I have not experienced the approval of a 60,000 square foot commercial use or anything like this application receiving approval.
- The proposed development is clearly not harmonious with the neighboring properties and would create adverse impacts on the neighborhood.

- The 2025 application is only slightly smaller than the 2024 application and would have the same impact on the neighborhood.

- **That the application does not conform to Sections 802.1, 803.2, 803.3, and 206.2. of the zoning regulations.**

The issues addressed in the McDermott report included terminology, the location of information, and, of course, differences in our perspectives. Again, I offer the following comments to reinforce and clarify my concerns:

- McDermott's response was very similar to his response last year, which is understandable, as my report had not changed much either. The similarity of his report suggests a consensus that this application is not significantly different from the 2024 application.

- For the Comparison of Existing Conditions section, Mr. McDermott emphasized that the proposal is within the required setbacks and coverage requirements of the RR-1 zone. If this application were just for site plan approval, that would be a reason to approve, but this is a Special Permit application, which, as we all know, has additional requirements.

- A significant section of the McDermott report addressed terminology that I used, such as "mixed-use", "spot zoning", and "commercial center", to the extent that he quoted definitions from professional resources. I concede that the terms used do not conform to some definitions found within some professional sources, but that the argument is irrelevant.

I prefer to use regular American English when dealing with citizens, boards, and commissions. For example, the application identifies several proposed uses: lodging, buildings, and spaces to house events, a restaurant-bar available to the public, and a spa available to the public. I think that it is accurate, and more importantly, understandable, to label this project as "mixed use." Instead of "spot zoning," let us call it "spot uses." I intended to emphasize the extensive and intensive commercial uses of the application, which are not in harmony with the surrounding rural-residential neighborhood.

- He commented that I did not use specific data in my report. I acknowledge that I am not an expert in noise, lighting, engineering, or soil science. For these issues, I used the information of the experts who also testified.

It is up to the applicant to provide all the information necessary. Sections of my report were intended to identify issues that needed consideration.

- I discussed affordable housing, as I am aware it is an issue in Salisbury. The Commission bears the responsibility for the consideration of the range of potential impacts of a development, which was my purpose for inclusion. I now regret bringing it up, as it is

being used in a threatening tactic, which is a poor example of planning and decision-making.

- The MacDermot report challenged my analysis of the sanitary sewer situation. Last year, concerns were expressed that the entire system might be at or near capacity for other planned priority projects. McDermott responded that he "assumed" that the issue was settled. Perhaps it was, and I was just unaware. You know your responsibilities, and I still respectfully suggest that you include this issue in your deliberation.

I appreciate this opportunity to clarify information. I hope that this information is helpful to you and wish all of you well for your deliberations ahead.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian J. Miller". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Brian J Miller, AICP