

Michael W. Klemens, LLC
Environmental Land Use Planning
POB 8--Falls Village, CT 06031
July 20th 2026

Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission
Via email

In Re: #2026-0315/Lime Rock Park II/Regulation Amendment

Dear Chair Shyer and Members of the Salisbury PZC:

I write to you not only as your immediate past Chair of more than 15 years but as a part-time resident of Sharon, where I reside within the vicinity (sound shed) of Lime Rock Park. I too experience traffic jams on certain days on Rte. 7 and other impacts associated with the Track. Yet, I agree strongly with many others in the community that the Track is an important asset to our Town and the region. But that recognition doesn't grant the Track *carte blanche* to pursue all manner of programming and activities without considering the community in which the Track is embedded within. The name Lime Rock for many has become synonymous with the Track. One cannot lose sight of the fact that Lime Rock is one of Salisbury's three historical villages, and serves as home and workplace for many local residents. There has been and will continue to be a dynamic tension between the goals of the Track and the quiet enjoyment of those that live within the village of Lime Rock. Having observed this relationship for close to two decades I believe that the collegiality exhibited by the new owners of the Track has gone a long way to helping all parties coexist. Everyone has compromised and that compromise has created a more harmonious situation for all parties.

The new owners of Lime Rock Park (Lime Rock Park II) have diligently worked with their neighbors, organized under the umbrella of the Lime Rock Citizens Council, to adjust the stipulation that was incorporated into our Regulations after a lengthy court battle with the previous owners of the Track. The position of the PZC and your counsel Chuck Andres has been that when the neighbors and the Track reached an agreement concerning new hours/days of operations, the PZC would be able to amend its Regulations to comport with them.

The concept that the PZC could take a stipulated agreement between two private parties and simply insert that without modification into our Town Regulations is illogical. When I first looked at the draft regulations, I noticed a lot of language that was inappropriate to place in a municipal regulation. By the time you reviewed it this evening most of that had been removed, but there was at least one section 12-D that had reference to a mutual agreement between private parties that had nothing to do with the Town. Concerning signage, you may wish to ensure that the signs that have been agreed on between LRP II and the Lime Rock Citizens Council conform with the size and number allowed by the Town's Signage Regulations. If they do not, and the PZC concludes that these signs should be allowed, you probably need to specifically allow these signs in these proposed Regulations. That will also mean that you need

to place such exceptions for these signs in the Town's Signage Regulations, if they exceed those that are permitted in the Town. This may require changes to that Section of the Regulations. These types of questions are exactly why you wisely continued the hearing to make sure everything is lined up correctly. A small inconsistency occurs in Section 9 where "Lime Rock Road" is used instead of Rte. 112. For clarity's sake, refer to Rte. 112 consistently in the Regulations or alternatively qualify Rte. 112 as being Lime Rock Road. Take your time and get it right. Are there new terms presented in these proposed regulations that need to be defined in the definitions section of the Town's Regulations? Amending a section of the Regulations without thoughtfully considering the entire Regulations has been a problem in the past and the PZC has been working over the last years to address the conflict and inconsistencies in the Regulations caused by piecemeal insertions and changes that failed to consider the entire body of the Regulations. While the stipulation changes have been worked on for more than four years by private parties, as it was correctly stated by several commissioners last night, this is all new to the PZC so you are wisely exercising deliberative caution to get it right.

What gives me pause, and should be seriously considered by you, is that there is an item in the draft regulations that in my opinion constitutes a new use. Drifting specifically. When former Chair Jon Higgins worked with the Track on behalf of the PZC to assemble all the uses that were occurring there, in our efforts to make many of those activities conforming, drifting was not included, because at that time we had been told by the owner Skip Barber (through his manager Georgia Blades) that there would be no more drifting at LRP because it created such an outcry within the community. At that point LRP had, I believe, voluntarily abandoned their so-called grandfathered rights to drift. That is why I find that the implication that they could drift all the time nothing more than a clumsy threat to intimidate their neighbors and frankly surprising given the overall collegial conduct of the principals of Lime Rock Park II both toward the Land Use Office and the Citizens Council.

No one wants to go to court again. Of that fact we can all agree. The arguments proffered that by not inserting the stipulation verbatim into our Regulations we have to return to court rings hollow as there have already been significant alterations made to the text of the stipulation – specifically cleaning up language and removing inappropriate provisions that are agreements between private parties that are not appropriate for a municipal regulation. So why is modifying the drifting section so different that it requires a return to court? Text modification and refinements were never objected to with all the other redlining, so why is this raised now?

It's quite apparent that the Track wishes to conduct limited drifting activities and those limited activities have the blessing of the Lime Rock Citizens Council. Whether the Council truly believes that LRP could radically increase their drifting as of right, or are just understandably wishing to put this all to rest, it's the PZC's decision whether or not it is the public's health safety and welfare to allow to do so. If the PZC wishes to allow drifting as a new use, the PZC should decide by which mechanisms and controls it will allow this to occur.

Those who have been on the PZC for the last years know full well that we have very limited resources to enforce our Regulations. We do not even have a citation ordinance. So how

exactly are you going to enforce these proposed purportedly strict controls on drifting? As per Section 8, where is the specific tree line that will be the benchmark for smoke to stay below? Who is going to stand out there with a stop watch to count the seconds of airborne smoke? If you decide to allow drifting, focus on something that be remotely monitored, such as air quality. That is a real scientifically measurable parameter and one that is directly tied to human health. The Track's counsel stated that obtaining a special permit for each drifting event would create too much unpredictability for their scheduling. I suggest that you use the same approach that you have taken for certain events such as Trade Secrets. Issue a special permit for the first time, and then a zoning permit for subsequent events, automatically granted as long as there are no violations or emergent problems. That would give you the control that you need, while assuring LRP II of a reasonable expectation of permission so it can create its programming schedules.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael W. Klemens". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Michael" and last name "Klemens" being clearly legible, and "W." in the middle.

Michael W. Klemens, PhD