

**Zoning Regulation Re-Write Ad-Hoc Committee Notes**  
**Brookfield Town Hall, 100 Pocono Road, Brookfield, CT**  
**Room 209 – 9:00 AM**  
**January 9, 2018**

Present: Chair Erik Kukk; Commissioner Rick McCarty; Alternate Jim D'Entremont

Also Present: Rebecca Augur, AICP, Planning Consultant from Milone and MacBroom; First Selectman Steve Dunn; Economic and Community Development Manager Betsy Paynter; Greg Steiner, Property Owner and member of the Ad-Hoc Rewrite Committee; Zoning Enforcement Officer Fran Lollie; Land Use Director Alice Dew; Curt Timmerman; Land Use Secretary Nina Mack

**Fees:** The Committee discussed fee recommendations.

**Feedback:** The Committee has reviewed feedback from several property owners. Steve Trinkaus, wetlands consultant, has also submitted his feedback for the record.

R. Augur noted that there are substantive comments and details received from the Town's property owners. She recommended focusing on the following concerns:

- Intensity and purposes of gateway zones and types of uses in these zones
- Affordable housing and processes of affordable housing applications
- Design review guidelines and process
- Stormwater management (either through the regulations or as an independent manual)

These are issues for which the Ad-Hoc Committee should have a stance before sending recommendations to the Zoning Commission.

**Aquifer Protection:** A. Dew noted that she has done research on aquifer protection and regulations, which is primarily based on wells and well water. Meadowbrook is of concern as level A because of the volume of wells in the area, and the other areas throughout town are level B. A. Dew suggested that the Town retain the aquifer protection districts the way they are currently worded. Regulations for these areas should reflect DEEP requirements. The purpose of proposed revisions is simply to clarify the regulations relative to the aquifer protection districts.

**Illumination of Signs:** A. Dew suggested that illuminated signage be permitted by the Zoning Enforcement Officer rather than by the entire Zoning Commission. F. Lollie would then have the option to enforce the lighting signage. A. Dew mentioned that most signs have settings that may reduce the brightness of the lighting.

**Gateway Zones:** Recommendations of the Committee have suggested adding gateway zones around the Town Center District, which would consist of a mix of commercial and residential uses, but not at the pedestrian level. There should be some level of flexibility within these areas for market fluctuation. R. Augur noted locations of industrial zoning throughout the Town. Light industrial would be added back to the list of allowable uses for the gateway zones. The question is how the uses will work well together with other uses in the gateway zones. Significant buffering would be needed if light industrial were included as allowable uses. There was question of adding larger setbacks for certain uses. There was discussion of buffer requirements for light industrial uses.

Another suggested use was indoor contractor's equipment. R. Augur suggested that any light industrial use have restrictions on exterior storage. Warehousing and trucking materials will not be allowable uses in gateway zones.

**Design Review:**

- R. Augur asked: Is the design review process important for the industrial zone? Most of the industrial zone is not directly visible from Federal Road. There would be requirements and regulations, however, there will be a lesser standard for industrial development. Industrial development would not require the full architectural/design review requirements required in other zones, such as the gateway and TCD zones. Light industrial zones generally are

required to conform to franchise and corporate development industry standards. A. Dew suggested certain materials and entranceways be used to enhance the look of industrial uses.

C1 and C2 Areas are the major commercial areas, particularly along Federal Road. C1 will house the larger commercial brands which generally have company development standards. R. Augur asked if there should be more tiers for design guidelines in C1.

**Design Review Process:** R. Augur noted the current process, which is not clearly delineated in regulations. She asked how the ad hoc committee would prefer to handle the design review process moving forward. She asked if there should be an independent group reviewing architectural designs in all zones, or in just specific zones. There are zoning standards for the areas, but the question is whether there will be a separate review standard. Chair Kukk noted the need for an ease of application process. A. Dew noted that there are Development Services Team meetings for all land use-related departments, as well as a small architectural review committee for projects proposed in the TCD.

The design review process will be termed site plan and special permit process. A. Dew noted that there should be a committee to review proposals. R. Augur mentioned that usually there is membership on architectural review committees by engineers, architects, etc. The reviewers would then provide their recommendations to the Zoning Commission. R. Augur stated that other municipalities keep architects on retainer and ask for opinions about proposals. A. Dew suggested that the same architect or engineer remain on retainer so there would be continuity within the review process. Mr. Steiner noted that the meeting should be done in the first review process to ensure that the developer does not spend more money than needed for the proposal.

**Architectural Review:** The process for architectural review was discussed, and the recommendation was that the Land Use Office retain an architect for the architectural review process. For purposes of consistency, A. Dew suggested that the Office use one architect to complete all reviews. Fees are set ahead of time, and passed along to the applicant. The Land Use Department had completed several architectural reviews and wetlands consultant application reviews, so the escrow accounting would be similar.

There was discussion of what type of development would require pre-application review. It was decided that the proposal will first be sent to a pre-application review meeting for any proposals within the Town Center and the gateway zones. The members of the pre-application review will then determine if the application is required to undergo an architectural review process. B. Paynter noted that the forms will now need to be changed to reflect this requirement.

**Street Signs:** A. Dew noted that each building in Brookfield is required to be numbered for health and safety reasons, and she suggested uniformity on the numbering on each of the signs. The number on the sign should not be included in the overall calculation of the sign size.

**Affordable Housing:** Incentive Housing Zones have been removed. The section on affordable housing has been removed, and the sections on accessory apartments have been retained, for temporary use purposes. Chair Kukk noted that once accessory apartments are permitted, affordable housing use should be permitted. A. Dew mentioned that it is difficult to sell a home with an accessory apartment. Chair Kukk replied that permitting the apartment to be rented as affordable on the deed allows more owners to purchase additional housing options, and permits the housing market to be opened up to additional people who may not normally be able to afford the market.

R. Augur discussed inclusionary zoning options, which requires new development to include a percentage of affordable housing. B. Paynter noted that other towns have provided second-story apartments to be renovated into affordable housing units. The Committee discussed several options relative to affordable housing regulations. There was discussion about deeding accessory apartments on the land records, as affordable housing for a period of years, such as forty years.

R. Augur reviewed the regulations of accessory apartments, in the affordable housing section of the current regulations.

**Stormwater Management:** Steve Trinkaus, Wetlands Engineering Consultant, has recommended a separate design manual, but R. Augur asked if the Committee would prefer to move forward with what is proposed. The Committee agreed to move forward with the proposal in the current draft set of regulations.

**Next Steps:** R. Augur will incorporate the discussed revisions and complete the crosswalk for discussion at the next meeting. A. Dew noted that Fire, Building, Public Works and Police have not yet had the chance to review the proposed revisions. B. Paynter explained the timeline of the review process. Chair Kukk suggested that the Committee be present to review the process and suggested revisions.

The Ad-Hoc Committee and Zoning Commission will schedule a special meeting to review the suggested revisions the Committee is bringing forward. B. Paynter will ask Atty. Beecher to attend the upcoming special meeting.

**Fees:** Fees and application terms were discussed. Revisions of current fees were discussed and revisions suggested, based on analysis of surrounding towns' fees. The analysis includes consideration of average cost of construction per square foot.

Meeting adjourned 11:00 am.