

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

1 **Members Present:**

2 Dr. Michael Klemens (Chair)
3 Cathy Shyer (Vice Chair) *arrived 6:31PM*
4 Martin Whalen (Secretary) *arrived 6:40PM*
5 Allen Cockerline (Regular Member)
6 Bob Riva (Regular Member)
7 Beth Wells (Alternate Member)

Members Absent:

Dr. Danella Schiffer (Alternate Member)

Staff Present:

Abby Conroy, Land Use Director (LUD)
Miles Todaro, Land Use Technical Specialist (LUTS)

10 **Brief Items and Announcements**

11 1. Call to Order / Establish Quorum

12 Chair Klemens called the meeting to order at 6:30PM. A quorum was established with three regular
13 members present (Dr. Michael Klemens, Allen Cockerline, Bob Riva). Alternate Member Beth Wells was
14 also present.

15
16 Chair Klemens appointed Alternate Member Wells as a voting member.

17
18 2. Approval of Agenda

19 Chair Klemens requested that agenda items #5, 6, and 9 be combined into one item called “Land Use
20 Director’s Report.”

21
22 Vice Chair Shyer joined the meeting at 6:31PM.

23
24 **Motion:** To approve the Agenda as amended.

25 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva.

26 Vote: 5-0-0 in favor.

27
28 3. Minutes of May 6, 2024 – *pending*

29
30 4. Minutes of May 20, 2024 – *pending*

31
32 5. Land Use Director’s Report

33 LUD Conroy shared that she and LUTS Todaro attended a Connecticut Association of Zoning Enforcement
34 Officials (CAZEO) training class which covered a variety of topics. Per CAZEO recommendations, LUD
35 Conroy proposed a new procedure for Minutes. LUD Conroy explained two separate sets of minutes can
36 be adopted: “Action” and “Detailed” Minutes. Action Minutes composed by LUTS Todaro will identify the
37 votes and motions, then be posted on the Town website and filed with the Town Clerk within the
38 required seven days. Secretary of Minutes Erika Spino will then compose Detailed Minutes afterwards to
39 ensure the intricacies of zoning decisions and discussions are captured. LUD Conroy explained the
40 Detailed Minutes will still be reviewed by the Commission for adjustments. LUD Conroy summarized that
41 this change allows the Commission to comply with the statutory obligation to file minutes within seven
42 days, while still achieving a detailed set of Minutes. All Commission Members agreed to try this new
43 procedure of Minutes.

44
45 #2024-0248 / Mendelsohn (Citrin) / Canaan Road / Site Plan Application for Nursery Use / Map 15 / Lot
46 47 / DOR: 05/06/2024 / Decision by 07/10/2024 / *Update*

47

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

48 LUD Conroy explained Attorney Citrin sent the Commission a summary of their request to the Town
49 Attorney for review on Wednesday of last week. LUD Conroy explained an escrow and an opinion from
50 the Town Attorney have not yet been received and the business must be continued to the next meeting,
51 June 17, 2024.

52

53 9. Staff Update on Potential Violations

54

55 LUD Conroy explained a significant number of potential violations have been reported to the Land Use
56 Office (LUO) and let the Commission know that several enforcement items will be added onto meeting
57 agendas in upcoming weeks.

58

59 LUD Conroy also mentioned that a grant she previously applied for through the Department of Energy
60 and Environmental Protection (DEEP) was awarded to the Town.

61

62 Secretary Whalen joined the meeting at 6:40PM and was seated as a voting member in place of
63 Alternate Member Wells.

64

65 **Public Hearing - 6:45PM**

66 7. #2024-0244 / Town of Salisbury (Salisbury Housing Trust) / 26 & 28 Undermountain Road / Special
67 Permit Application for New Multi-Family Housing Construction in the Multifamily Housing Overlay
68 District (Section 405) / Map 56 / Lot 05 and Lot 06 / DOR: 04/15/2024 / OH: 05/20/2024 Close by
69 06/24/2024 / *Continue Public Hearing*

70

71 The Public Hearing continued at 6:43PM.

72

73 Chair Klemens stated the following:

74

75 Tonight, we open the Special Permit hearing on 26 & 28 Undermountain Road
76 (Assessor Parcels 56-05 and 56-06) colloquially referred to as the Grove Street
77 Affordable Housing Project. I, like many residents, am familiar with the article
78 published in Sunday's Waterbury Republican relative to this project. I think it
79 would be beneficial to explain to the public how this process has evolved in light
80 of some of the misleading statements made in that article.

81

82 Political Process: Various concepts were discussed by the First Selectman and the
83 Housing Trust. These were not plans, but concepts, and it is important to
84 distinguish between the two. I understand there were robust discussions with
85 many stakeholders during this conceptual process, including residents
86 surrounding the property.

87

88 8-24 Review: As part of this conceptual process, the Selectmen and the Housing
89 Trust requested an 8-24 determination if the concept of using the site for
90 affordable housing would be consistent with Salisbury's Plan of Conservation and
91 Development (POCD).

92

93 The 8-24 review found that a conceptual design featuring two houses was

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

94 consistent with the POCD's goals of providing affordable housing. The review also
95 found that preserving the mini-park (roughly 1/3 of the site at the rear) was also
96 consistent with POCD goals of preservation of open space within the village.
97 Furthermore the 8-24 review discussed the Special Permit process required to
98 construct those houses. It was explained that development must comply with the
99 Zoning Regulations including that housing be built consistent with the
100 development pattern of the surrounding neighborhood maintaining the street
101 wall on Undermountain Road, and siting one house behind the other, mirroring
102 the pattern of development within the neighborhood.

103
104 The 8-24 review was a public meeting (as are all P and Z meetings) but not a
105 public hearing. The distinctions between a public meeting and a public hearing
106 are very important and have led to confusion and certain misunderstandings.

107
108 1. The Planning and Zoning Commission never contacted any of the neighbors.
109 Unlike the political process, the PZC operates under strict statutory procedures to
110 ensure that everyone is treated equally. The PZC cannot arbitrarily send notices
111 to individuals. There is a structured process to inform the general public (multiple
112 notices in the legal section of the newspaper), the Town website, and a
113 requirement that the Applicant contact abutters directly and provide proof that
114 they have done so. In fact, this hearing was opened at our last meeting, and then
115 continued to tonight, because the Applicant hadn't completed their required
116 abutter notifications.

117
118 2. When attending Zoom meetings parties were not listened to. On February 5th
119 (when the Grove Street 8-24 review was on the agenda) a neighbor to the Grove
120 Street project attempted to use the public comment period to bring up issues
121 concerning that proposed project. Public comment periods (as clearly stated on
122 the agenda) are for items that are not on the agenda, nor the subject of any
123 pending Planning and Zoning application or action.

124
125 Public Hearing:

126 The Special Permit public hearing that begins tonight is focused on two submitted
127 plans (not concepts) and is the only legally appropriate time for the PZC to
128 receive verbal and written comments from all stakeholders.

129
130 As is my practice with all public hearings we begin with the Applicant making their
131 presentation, followed by Commissioner's comments and questions, and then I
132 open the meeting for public commentary. There may be some back and forth as
133 the Applicant attempts to address questions raised by the public and I will
134 moderate those exchanges to ensure they are orderly and responsive to the
135 testimony we receive from the public.

136
137 I recognize that the Zoom format can be daunting. If you wish to be recognized to
138 speak use the raise hand function and keep your hand raised until you are
139 recognized.

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

140 Do not use the chat function to make any comments or have any offline
141 conversations. The chat function is to be used solely for you to communicate with
142 land use staff concerning difficulties in using the Zoom format.

143
144 Please identify yourself by name when you speak, and please slowly spell out your
145 last name for the recording secretary. This is especially important as not all
146 people are clearly identifiable by their Zoom handles.

147
148 Thank you for your cooperation.

149
150 Chair Klemens mentioned five letters of correspondence were received from members of the public.
151 Three letters of support from Philip Oppenheimer, Lisa Sheble, and the Salisbury Affordable Housing
152 Commission (SAHC); and two letters of concern were received from Robin Roraback and Dr. Natalia V.
153 Smirnova.

154
155 Vice President of the Salisbury Housing Trust (SHT) Jenn Kronholm Clark and Vice President of the
156 Salisbury Housing Committee (SHC) Jocelyn Ayer joined the meeting to present the application. Ms. Clark
157 mentioned Engineer Pat Hackett was also present for assistance with site plan questions. Ms. Clark
158 provided a brief background on the SHT, an independent non-profit organization founded in 2002 that
159 leads local families towards home ownership opportunities. Ms. Clark explained the SHT works to retain
160 ownership of land to then sell improvements on the land to qualified applicants in Town. Ms. Clark
161 added the ideal applicant is a household making 80% of the area median income. The applicant must
162 apply and qualify for a traditional mortgage to fund purchase of the home, then pay a modest land lease
163 fee on a monthly basis to the SHT.

164
165 Ms. Clark provided a brief history of the site located on Undermountain Road, which was identified as an
166 ideal location for affordable housing in 2007. In 2018, the Salisbury Affordable Housing Plan was
167 adopted. In that plan, this site was listed, calling for construction of up to four houses on the lot. Ms.
168 Clark explained two public information sessions attended by over one-hundred citizens were hosted in
169 2018 to provide the public an opportunity to view concepts of what might be constructed on site. The
170 Town revised the Salisbury Affordable Housing Plan in 2023. In the 2023 Plan the site remained listed,
171 but the number of houses was reduced from four to two or three. Ms. Clark explained in August of 2023
172 an exhibition was hosted at the Salisbury Association regarding affordable housing in Town where
173 concepts of this site were featured. Ms. Clark said after working directly with the Litchfield County
174 Center for Housing Opportunity later in 2023, the SHT became aware of funding opportunities to
175 potentially pursue construction of houses on this site.

176
177 Ms. Clark explained the SHT chose to move forward with the process, and reached out to neighbors of
178 the site alongside pursuing the 8-24 review. Ms. Clark explained after the 8-24 review, it was found that
179 the concept with two homes constructed and open space in the rear was consistent with the Town's
180 Plan of Conservation and Development. The SHT then began to work on a site plan with Engineer
181 Hackett. Ms. Clark explained that after hearing concern from citizens regarding loss of parking, two site
182 plans were created. The first site plan retains a parking lot at the front portion of the site with two
183 houses in the middle and open space in the rear. The second site plan has one house in front facing the
184 street with the second house immediately behind, with open space included in the back portion of the
185 lot. Ms. Clark explained the second plan more closely aligns with the 8-24 review findings. She added

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

186 that the SHT believed the second plan will more closely fit with the current neighborhood's existing
187 character. Ms. Clark presented a revised site plan composed by Engineer Hackett.

188

189 Chair Klemens asked if the site is located within the Multi-Family Housing Overlay District. Ms. Clark
190 replied yes. Chair Klemens asked if a density bonus was requested alongside this application. Ms. Ayer
191 replied a density bonus is not needed and the request for two houses built on one lot is a multi-family
192 application that requires a special permit. Chair Klemens asked if the open space and access road will be
193 maintained by the Town, Ms. Ayer replied yes.

194

195 LUD Conroy mentioned this property is located in the R20 Zone. She added the Assessor's report shows
196 the site as two parcels, but the applicant confirmed the site is one parcel only. LUD Conroy explained the
197 applicant proposed development that will fall under typical Zoning standards as opposed to an
198 application that requires the Multi-Family Housing Overlay District to provide additional density
199 bonuses. LUD Conroy explained the property is within the Aquifer Protection Overlay District but a
200 special permit is not required as the proposal did not request more than 30% of the lot to be impervious.
201 Chair Klemens asked if the first site plan option with a parking lot will exceed the impervious surface
202 requirements. Engineer Hackett replied the parking lot will not be paved and remain a gravel lot that is
203 functionally impervious. Ms. Ayer added the parking lot will not be under control of the SHT. The parking
204 area would remain Town owned for continued maintenance responsibilities. Ms. Ayer explained the SHT
205 would prefer to avoid constructing homes in between two Town uses and reiterated their preference for
206 the second site plan option. Ms. Ayer reiterated the SHT came to the Commission for assistance to
207 identify which of the two concepts is most consistent with the Zoning Regulations.

208

209 Chair Klemens asked Commission members to provide comments or questions. Commissioner Cockerline
210 asked if the house use areas in both site plan options are identical. Engineer Hackett replied yes.
211 Commissioner Cockerline asked where citizens who use the existing parking lot will park their vehicles if
212 the parking lot is eliminated. LUD Conroy mentioned under the Town's use tables, multi-family housing
213 and municipal uses are allowed with a special permit. LUD Conroy explained even though this lot is a
214 residentially zoned parcel, a special permit could be granted for those desired uses. Vice Chair Shyer
215 suggested identifying who is utilizing the parking area daily to better determine the parking lot's use. She
216 mentioned hearing that a number of employees from the White Hart Inn will park at this location. LUD
217 Conroy reiterated structures are protected with regard to setback, but lot coverage/uses are not
218 protected. Ms. Clark mentioned the SHT reached out to representatives of the White Hart Inn. She
219 explained they are not opposed to losing the additional parking on this site and expressed support for
220 inclusion of affordable housing.

221

222 Chair Klemens opened the floor to the public for comments and questions.

223

224 Member of the public Mary Oppenheimer joined the meeting and expressed support for construction of
225 affordable housing on this site, and mentioned her personal preference for the parking lot to be
226 retained. Ms. Oppenheimer explained the Town has a shortage of public parking and believed this lot is
227 an asset for the public and employees and patrons of nearby businesses.

228

229 Member of the public Robin Roraback joined the meeting and explained that she is the owner of an
230 abutting property on Grove Street where she has lived for twenty years. Ms. Roraback explained that the
231 public parking on site is used daily by employees of local businesses and is often utilized as overflow

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

232 parking for Town special events, such as the Artisan’s Fair and Fall Festival. Ms. Roraback mentioned her
233 statements in a recent article posted by the Waterbury Republican, and explained she felt frustrated
234 that her point of view was not considered. She added that construction of affordable housing will result
235 in a much more crowded and noisier neighborhood. Ms. Roraback explained the site’s location is
236 treasured by the local community because it provides a quiet space in an urban area. Ms. Roraback
237 mentioned in 2008 George Kiefer commented that paving and driveways should be limited to preserve
238 the native White Oak trees located on the property. Ms. Roraback said these trees are important to the
239 Town and asked how the SHT planned to preserve them. Ms. Roraback added in 2008 she was reassured
240 that future development of this site would not occur and would remain a public park. Ms. Roraback
241 explained in October 2023 she wrote to the SHT directly and did not receive a response. Ms. Roraback
242 commented that she does not consider this process to be transparent for the public and believed this
243 transition will be a great loss to the neighborhood.
244

245 Member of the public Kelly Whelan joined the meeting and explained she has rented a home on Grove
246 Street for eighteen years. Ms. Whelan expressed appreciation to the SHT for providing affordable
247 housing with a design option that retained open space. She explained her brother was previously
248 employed at the White Hart Inn and confirmed staff members are encouraged to park on the site. Ms.
249 Whelan expressed concern about paving and access to Town sewer and asked if the SHT will be taking
250 conservation efforts into consideration. She asked if a playground space would be retained to provide
251 outdoor space for children as originally intended by the Town. Ms. Whelan asked if this site was
252 combined from two lots into one after becoming Town property.
253

254 Members of the public Dmitri and Erika Fedorjaczenko joined the meeting and explained they are not
255 opposed to inclusion of affordable housing in Town, but are concerned about the preservation of the
256 site’s natural space. Mr. Fedorjaczenko explained the site has sufficient historic value, and the houses
257 proposed to be built are in the immediate vicinity of two three-hundred-year-old White Oak trees. He
258 said sewer, water and utility systems associated with construction could result in possible loss of these
259 historic resources. Mr. Fedorjaczenko referenced an interview with George Parsons of the Salisbury
260 Association regarding the ecological sensitivity of this location. Mr. Fedorjaczenko mentioned additional
261 affordable housing units are proposed at other locations in Town including Salmon Kill Road, Railroad
262 Street and potentially a large area in Lakeville. He asked if one or two units constructed in a historic area
263 of downtown will have a positive impact on affordable housing.
264

265 Member of the public Ethan Casey joined the meeting and expressed opposition to the applicant’s
266 proposal. Mr. Casey explained he does not own property abutting the site, but believes opinions of local
267 residents are not being considered. He expressed concern about the environmental impact of this plan
268 and mentioned white oak trees located on site should be preserved. Mr. Casey added additional
269 affordable housing sites are being developed elsewhere in Town and believed further construction in a
270 historic portion of Town does not make sense. Mr. Casey suggested the Town should make an effort to
271 further develop the existing parking lot and open space instead of pursuing affordable housing. He
272 added that this change would substantially increase congestion and traffic at this location and traffic
273 flow must be improved.
274

275 Member of the public Holly Leibrock joined the meeting and explained she owns an abutting property on
276 Undermountain Road. Ms. Leibrock is opposed to both proposed options and found them to be short
277 sighted. She believed this lot could be developed into more efficient use, such as expanded open space

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

278 and improved public parking. Ms. Leibrock expressed this lot serves a vast majority of the community
279 due to lack of open space in Town. She added that open space in front of the White Hart Inn is heavily
280 used by residents as a public park but is dangerously situated between two main roads. Ms. Leibrock
281 recommended speaking with citizens who may have ideas for this site that can better serve the
282 community located nearby. She said as Town development continues, the perfect way to complement
283 increasing residential and commercial density is open space. Ms. Leibrock mentioned she is a volunteer
284 EMT at Salisbury Ambulance and noted they often utilize this site for meetings and parking. She added
285 that parking is also utilized for events that promote the community and commerce within the Town. Ms.
286 Leibrock concluded she is not in favor of either option, but found the first plan to be offensive and
287 believes it does not adhere to Zoning Regulations.

288
289 Member of the public Elizabeth Mastopietro joined the meeting and explained she has owned a
290 property across the street from this lot for twenty-seven years. Ms. Mastopietro said she has observed
291 this parking lot in use daily, is in agreement with previous comments made by Ms. Leibrock, Mr. Casey,
292 and Mr. Fedorjaczenko, and does not believe either option proposed is suitable for this site. Ms.
293 Mastopietro asked how the open space proposed behind the units would be found and comfortably
294 accessed by citizens.

295
296 Member of the public Hannah Pouler joined the meeting and explained she is a nearby resident of
297 Prospect Street in Lakeville. Ms. Pouler expressed support for both proposed options equally, and was
298 surprised to hear previous concern regarding lack of quiet space and open space in Town. Ms. Pouler
299 mentioned Scoville Library, the bike path, Pope Preserve, and various hiking trails nearby as additional
300 public outdoor space conveniently located in Town. She added that these two units are not out of
301 character from nearby existing dwellings in Town. Ms. Pouler explained her greatest concern is the
302 alternative to inclusion of affordable housing. She said lack of housing could lead to local businesses
303 struggling to hire employees, retirees unable to afford downsizing, and young families unable to afford
304 moving into Town. Ms. Pouler added there are over one-hundred citizens on the waiting list for
305 affordable housing, and ten new units at Sarum Village will not solve this problem. Ms. Pouler asked
306 members of the public to take these issues into consideration as recent comments have been focused on
307 trees and personal views versus vitality of the Town.

308
309 Member of the public Mike Abram joined the meeting and explained he is a nearby resident of Racetrack
310 Road in Lakeville. Mr. Abram expressed support for Ms. Pouler's comments and reiterated the existing
311 Plan of Conservation and Development states at least one-hundred units of affordable housing is needed
312 in Town. Mr. Abram said if you put together all proposed units in the SHT's currently proposed plans, the
313 Town still does not reach the goal of one-hundred units. Mr. Abram explained affordable housing is a
314 greater priority than preserving a parking lot, and appreciated proposed option two because it has a
315 larger majority of open space and could be more attractive than a gravel parking lot. Mr. Abram added
316 that businesses in Town do face a parking problem, but that concern should not be solved on the backs
317 of citizens who need affordable housing. He added the White Hart Inn has been reliant on a free
318 opportunity for parking, and respectfully asked for the business to address their need for additional
319 parking individually.

320
321 Member of the public Louis Tomaino joined the meeting and explained open space preservation should
322 be prioritized in Town and this site should remain undeveloped. Mr. Tomaino expressed admiration for
323 the citizens of Grove Street for speaking to their own interests and did not find their perspectives

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

324 unsympathetic. He admitted the SHT must experience difficulty locating areas for citizens who are
325 unable to live in Town. Mr. Tomaino believed this site is a buffer zone for the busy area nearby and is not
326 in favor of either proposed option. Mr. Tomaino suggested the Town should pursue addition of
327 affordable housing in pre-existing buildings instead of newly developed properties.
328

329 Member of the public Margaret Monaco joined the meeting and reiterated previous public comment
330 that there is a shortage of affordable housing in Town. She expressed support for the proposed plans.
331 Ms. Monaco questioned if the first option was pursued, would banks be able to issue a mortgage to
332 homeowners with a public parking lot located on site.
333

334 Member of the public Judy Gafney joined the meeting and explained she is a resident of Wells Hill Road.
335 Ms. Gafney wished to remind the public that this site is 0.9 acres with two proposed units and a small
336 park. She added there are few locations for affordable homeownership opportunities in Town. Ms.
337 Gafney explained families on the SHT wait list are valuable citizens that are already invested in the
338 community in roles such as nurses, EMTs and educators. Limited income, costly rent, and expense of
339 raising children are prohibitive to purchasing the average home in Town. Ms. Gafney reiterated this site
340 is modest and has the right amenities to provide these families security so they may continue to serve
341 and work within the community.
342

343 Member of the public Claudia Barnum joined the meeting and explained she is a resident of Grove
344 Street. Ms. Barnum expressed discomfort with both proposed options. She was in support of additional
345 affordable housing in Town but believed this site is too small to accommodate open space and two units.
346 Ms. Barnum mentioned she was part of the study group in 2008 where lack of space was discussed,
347 including a lack of room sufficient for snow to be plowed and relocated in the winter. Ms. Barnum
348 believed this site would not be a proper solution for affordable housing and larger projects currently
349 being established by the SHT should be prioritized. Ms. Barnum added the process of this application has
350 been confusing and apologized if any comments made were interpreted as antagonization towards the
351 Commission.
352

353 There were no further comments or questions from the public.
354

355 Chair Klemens asked Engineer Hackett to present the site plans and indicate where the two mature
356 White Oak trees are located. Engineer Hackett identified the locations of both trees and mentioned one
357 of the trees appeared to be in poor health. Option one has one tree abutting the parking lot and another
358 a housing unit. In option two both trees are abutting both housing units. Engineer Hackett explained he
359 spoke with Town Arborist Mat Kiefer who will return to the site after leaves have emerged to better
360 determine the tree's health. Chair Klemens suggested an alternative to this plan might be to relocate the
361 open space and park to the front of the property, and move the two units to the back. Engineer Hackett
362 mentioned this choice would be less favorable for utility access from Undermountain Road, but for the
363 purpose of preserving the trees, this change could be sensible. Chair Klemens explained additional
364 information is required from the Town Arborist to determine the health of the White Oak trees.
365

366 Chair Klemens requested to view the Zoning Map to understand the relative acreage of the surrounding
367 lots and better determine if this site measures up with the surrounding development pattern. Engineer
368 Hackett explained nearby lots have comparable acreage to the applicant's proposed site. Chair Klemens
369 asked if the SHT has researched if construction of a parking lot would create an impediment to mortgage

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

370 access. Ms. Ayer explained after discussion with Whitfield Bancorp, accessing a mortgage with parking
371 on site would be possible.

372
373 All Commission members expressed interest in an alternative site plan with both houses in the rear and
374 open space in the front. Commissioner Riva explained this change would encourage additional privacy
375 for homeowners and the public, and help preserve the trees on site. Ms. Ayer asked if a flipped version
376 of both site plan options should be composed and brought back to the Commission. Chair Klemens, Vice
377 Chair Shyer, Secretary Whalen, and Alternative Member Wells voiced support for a site plan without a
378 parking lot. Commissioner Riva said he preferred the parking lot to remain. Commissioner Cockerline
379 wished to continue discussion and questions to an upcoming meeting.

380
381 LUD Conroy explained two email correspondences from members of the public Elizabeth Mastopietro
382 and Theodore O'Neil. Chair Klemens explained a continuation of the hearing will commence at an
383 upcoming meeting to address site plan changes and a proper understanding of the health of the white
384 oak trees on site.

385
386 Chair Klemens opened the floor to the public for additional comments and questions.

387
388 Member of the public Holly Leibrock joined the meeting and explained flipping the houses to the rear of
389 the site would be less consistent with Zoning Regulations. She believed this placement is not worth
390 considering as it does not match the neighborhood's pattern of development. Ms. Leibrock added
391 abutting properties have pre-existing non-conforming dwellings nearby that would result in the area to
392 be densely populated.

393
394 Member of the public Judy Gafney joined the meeting and reiterated that this application involves home
395 ownership, which differs from rental properties such as Sarum Village and Dresser Woods.

396
397 Member of the public Robin Roraback joined the meeting and suggested a fourth option is to avoid all
398 development. Ms. Roraback explained as an abutting property owner she would be heavily impacted by
399 houses relocated to the rear of the property. Ms. Roraback explained she was an EMT on Salisbury
400 Ambulance team and worked at Salisbury Central School.

401
402 Vice Chair Shyer withdrew her request to the SHT to investigate a third site plan option. Secretary
403 Whalen, Commissioner Riva, Commissioner Cockerline and Alternate Member Wells expressed interest
404 in the SHT returning with a third site plan option and perspective from the Town Arborist. LUD Conroy
405 suggested that the SHT not pursue the third option if the white oak trees are determined to be in poor
406 health. Commissioner Cockerline requested a full assessment be completed by the Town Arborist to
407 identify if succession is in place.

408
409 Ms. Clark addressed that two homes are planned to be built on this site due to the lack of home
410 ownership opportunities elsewhere in Town, and explained all other proposals in progress by the SHT
411 are rental properties. Ms. Clark reiterated this site is ready to be built on and a viable funding stream is
412 available. She explained the SHT has nine qualified applicants on the waiting list for home ownership,
413 and this proposal could be optimistically built within one year.

414
415 Ms. Ayer addressed suggestions from the public to investigate and utilize alternative properties in Town

SALISBURY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

June 3rd, 2024 6:30PM

Remote Meeting by Live Internet Video Stream and Telephone

416 for affordable housing. Ms. Ayer encouraged members of the public to send site suggestions to the SHT
417 for exploration. She said the property must be owned by the Town or by the SHT in order for them to be
418 investigated and developed. Ms. Ayer addressed concerns regarding eliminating open space and said the
419 Town of Salisbury has over ten-thousand acres of permanently protected open space. Ms. Ayer
420 reminded the public that both open space and affordable housing are needed in Town.

421
422 Members of the public Dmitri and Erika Fedorjaczenko joined the meeting and suggested Commission
423 members visit the lot and investigate the area around Grove Street.

424
425 Member of the public Kelly Whelan joined the meeting and restated her previous comment regarding
426 the rear portion of the property with a park gifted to the Town. Ms. Whelan asked that any iteration of a
427 plan continue to include public park access.

428
429 Chair Klemens provided a closing statement and explained that the Hearing will remain open.

430
431 **Motion:** To continue the public hearing to Monday June 17, 2024 at 6:45pm via Zoom.

432 Made by Cockerline, seconded by Riva.

433 Vote: 5-0-0 in favor.

434
435 The hearing was continued at 9:02PM.

436
437 **Public Comment**

438 8. Public Comment - Public Comment is restricted to items that are neither on the agenda nor the subject
439 of any pending Planning & Zoning application or action and are limited to three minutes per person.

440
441 There was no Public Comment.

442
443 **Adjournment**

444
445 **Motion:** To adjourn meeting at 9:02PM.

446 Made by Shyer, seconded by Riva.

447 Vote: 5-0-0 in favor.

448
449 Respectfully Submitted,

450 Erika Spino

451 Secretary of Minutes