

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
DECEMBER 5, 2011**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Joseph Diminico, Chairman  
Kevin Dougan, Vice Chairman  
Andy Kidd, Secretary  
Eric Prause  
Horace Brown

Alternates: Anthony Petrone  
Susan Shanbaum  
John Chaput

Also Present: Mark Pellegrini, Director of Planning  
and Economic Development

Time Convened: 7:00 P.M.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**MANCHESTER HALE ROAD, LLC – 50 Hale Road – to review building elevations under Article II Section 25.03 for a restaurant in a Design District Overlay zone, Business V zone. – Design Overlay (2011-142)**

Attorney Leonard Jacobs represented the applicant and reminded the Commission that the proposed Chipotle restaurant to be located on the subject site had already received a special exception and erosion and sedimentation control plan approval at a previous meeting. Although the Commission discussed the exterior architecture and materials of the proposed building at the special exception meeting, action on the exterior architecture in accordance with the design overlay zone was not on that agenda. Attorney Jacobs said the applicants are before the Commission for the design overlay zone approval.

Mr. Keith Bettencourt, project architect, said several revisions to the originally submitted plan had been made by his firm in consultation with Chipotle to address some of the concerns or suggestions raised by the Commission at the previous meeting. He said these included changing the roof line so there is some variation in the height of the building; additional brick detailing; extending the roof screen horizontally and vertically so it occupies more of the roof area and becomes a more prominent feature; adding metal awnings over the storefront windows; and adding a planter bed on the sill of the wall of the outdoor patio.

Mr. Brown said the applicants were basically submitting the same building. He noted the Commission had been provided with examples of other Chipotle restaurants which were dramatically different than the current proposal. Mr. Bettencourt said many of those

photographs, which he had also seen, were retrofits of existing buildings and were completed before Chipotle developed its new prototype buildings. Mr. Bettencourt explained the new building plan is designed around the interior layout. He said the storefront windows and the side window are meant to provide great visibility into both the customer area and the cooking area. The interior layout is designed to manage the flow of customers through the ordering and food pick-up process. He did say that there are variations for exterior materials, which include the brick being proposed for Manchester or an exterior insulated finish system that resembles stucco.

Mr. Kidd said he thought the variation to the roof line and height of the building was an improvement, but he would prefer a solid awning instead of the open awning proposed. Mr. Bettencourt said the intent of the awning design was to provide not only some more dimension and detail to the front of the building but to create shadows across and in front of the building. Mr. Kidd also asked about the proposed foundation planting shown at the rear of the building on the renderings that were on display as part of the presentation. Mr. Bettencourt said those could not be planted because that is the dumpster area. Mr. Kidd also asked if the sign lettering and style can be different than what is proposed, again referring to some of the lettering styles that were seen on some of the other Chipotle buildings. Again, Mr. Bettencourt said this is the new franchise lettering style and colors that Chipotle is proposing.

Mr. Brown and Mr. Kidd both questioned whether the rear portion of the building was in fact not only a lower height but recessed in from the front. Mr. Brown said the renderings appear to indicate that the rear portion of the building was not a continuous plane but rather setback, apparently a few feet, and from the customer service portion of the building. Mr. Bettencourt said in fact the building is a uniform plane and there is no recess or articulation between the front and rear portion of the building. He said he believed the artist's rendering was intended to show a shadow line based on the greater height of the front portion of the building.

Mr. Prause asked why brick was chosen as opposed to the exterior finish system and why the building could not have more articulation. Mr. Bettencourt said that the brick material was chosen because it seemed to be the dominant material in the immediate area. He said because of the relatively small size of the building there is not much opportunity to create articulation, although he said it may be possible to recess the rear portion of the building 12 to 18 inches on either side. Mr. Pellegrini noted this is a relatively small building, about one half the size of the McDonald's restaurant on Deming Street and much smaller than some of the buildings on Hale Road such as Ethan Allen and Raymour and Flanigan.

Mr. Dougan said in his opinion the building looked different than the other restaurants but was still in keeping with the general architecture of the area and he would be in favor of approving this plan. Mr. Diminico noted the rendering showed three colors of brick, including black brick, while the samples provided by the applicant and the previous renderings showed a uniform brick color. Mr. Diminico said he felt the colors shown on the rendering would be more attractive than the brick samples submitted with the special exception.

Design Overlay (2011-142)

**MOTION:** Mr. Prause moved to approve the design overlay application with the condition that the color of the exterior brick match or closely approximate the color on the renderings submitted with the application, to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission Chair and Planning Director, and the modification that elevation labels be corrected on the renderings. Mr. Brown seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

November 7, 2011 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

**MOTION:** Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Kidd seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:**

**HAYES-KAUFMAN TOLLAND, LLC** – 1046-1066 Tolland Turnpike – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2011-140); Special Exception Modification (2011-141) – to construct a 4,600 sq. ft. retail building on site.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:15 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

January 18, 2012  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Diminico, Chairman

**NOTICE:** THE CASSETTE TAPE RECORDING OF THIS PUBLIC HEARING CAN BE HEARD IN THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL TAPE NO. 1141