

• September 24, 2003

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs. Averill, Mr. Bender, Mr. Buck, Mr. Charles

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Byerly

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Mr. Rimksy, Mrs. Roberts, Mr. Sabin

STAFF PRESENT: Mrs. Hill, Mrs. Luckey

Mr. Bender called the Special Meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and seated Members Averill, Bender, and Buck and Alternates Roberts and Sabin. He noted the two items on the agenda were 1) review of the proposed scenic road ordinance and 2) publicity for the Plan of Conservation and Development public hearing on October 29, 2003.

Proposed Scenic Road Ordinance: Mr. Rimsky thought the subcommittee had done a thorough and thoughtful job on the draft. Mr. Sabin raised the following points.

- He questioned whether it was a majority of the owners along the portion of road or the majority of the owners of lot frontage along a road that was required for the submission of a petition. Several Commissioners thought the proposed wording should be clarified because it was not clear. It was pointed out, however, that the wording used was taken from the state statutes and did refer to the majority owners of the lot frontage. It was noted one or more large frontage owners could outweigh the opinion of the majority of the property owners along a road, but the language of the state statutes was not debated.

Mr. Charles arrived at this point.

- Mr. Sabin noted the draft required only one of the listed criteria to be eligible for scenic road status, which would mean virtually every road in Town could qualify. He suggested perhaps a higher standard should be set so a road would truly have to be scenic to qualify. It was noted Rt. 84 would qualify under the proposed text. Again, it was pointed out the language was statutory. Several of the Commissioners thought this wide latitude would provide all property owners the opportunity to preserve and protect the character of their roads and that this would be in keeping with the Commission's goal of preserving rural character.
- Application procedure was discussed. Mr. Sabin noted the proposed procedure did not provide for extensions. Mr. Bender noted in general, the proposed language did not match Sections 8-26d and 8-26f of the state statutes; for example, date of receipt differed and notification to adjoining towns when the proposal was within 500 feet of the Town boundary was not required. He preferred that the document state a public hearing would be held in accordance with Section 8-26d of the CGS or that the language match that of the statutes.
- Mr. Sabin suggested the term, "emergency repair," be defined in more detail.

Mrs. Hill will draft a letter, which expresses the above concerns, to the Conservation Commission and Mr. Bender will review it before it is forwarded to the appropriate people.

Publicity for 10/29 Public Hearing: Mr. Rimsky suggested several ways to publicize the hearing.

- 1) press release
- 2) publicity release with more detail than the usual press release
- 3) generic letter to newspaper reporters and/or editors describing process, asking for expanded coverage, and listing contacts
- 4) letter to Town civic organizations urging membership to attend

- 5) posters throughout Town approx. 3 weeks prior to the event
- 6) copies of the Plan to be available
- 7) sandwich board sign in front of Town Hall

Mrs. Roberts noted how difficult it is to obtain the information at the library as it is "hidden away" instead of being conveniently placed for public review. She said she would speak to Mrs. Chapin, librarian, about this.

Mrs. Roberts and Mrs. Hill will be in charge of the sandwich board sign.

It was agreed Mr. Bender and Mr. Rimsky would meet with Mr. Wood to discuss publicity in detail on Monday, 9/29 or soon after.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. By Mr. Charles.

Mr. Bender adjourned the meeting at 5:12 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill
Land Use Coordinator