

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
JUNE 17, 2013**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Andy Kidd, Acting Chair  
Horace Brown, Secretary

Alternates: Susan Shanbaum (sitting)  
Julian Stoppelman (sitting)

Absent: Eric Prause, Chair  
Mike Stebe  
Chirag Thaker  
Anthony Petrone

Also Present: Mark Pellegrini, Director of Planning  
Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner  
Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner  
and Wetlands Agent  
Ginger MacHattie, Recording Secretary

Time Convened: 7:07 P.M.

**MOTION:** Mr. Brown moved to amend the agenda to move Item 4, Adoption of Resolution to Delegate Authority for Certain Administrative Approvals to the Wetlands Agent, from New Business to Old Business. Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**ADOPTION OF A RESOLUTION TO DELEGATE AUTHORITY FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE APPROVALS TO THE WETLANDS AGENT**

**Resolution to Delegate Authority to Wetlands Agent**

Whereas, the Inland Wetlands Agency of the Town of Manchester adopted a 100-foot non-wetland regulated upland review area; and

Whereas, in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes 22a-42a(c)(2), the Inland Wetlands Agency of the Town of Manchester may delegate to its duly authorized agent the authority to approve or extend a permit for an activity that is not located in a wetland or watercourse when such agent finds that the conduct of such activity would result in no greater than a minimal impact on any wetlands or watercourses; and

Whereas, the Inland Wetlands Agency may delegate such authority to its duly authorized agent provided such agent has completed the comprehensive training program developed by the Commissioner of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection pursuant to section 22a-39 of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Therefore, be it Resolved...

that the Inland Wetlands Agency of the Town of Manchester delegate the authority to its duly authorized agent, the Environmental Planner/Wetlands Agent, having completed the comprehensive training program developed by the Commissioner of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, to approve or extend an activity when the activity is not in the wetlands or watercourse and when such agent finds that the conduct of such activity would result in no greater than a minimal impact on any wetlands or watercourses. Such activities shall include, but not be limited to the maintenance, replacement or installation of utility infrastructure; cleaning, clearing and reshaping of man-made drainage ways and basins; and new construction of, alteration or additions to accessory structures; and be it further

Resolved, that notwithstanding the provisions for receipt and processing applications prescribed in Section 5 of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, such agent may approve or extend such an activity at any time following consideration of the factors set forth in section 22a-41 of “the Act” and shall provide the Agency with a report of all decisions; and be it further

Resolved that the Inland Wetlands Agency shall, at its discretion, sustain, alter or reject the decision of its agent or require an application for a permit in accordance with Connecticut General Statutes Sec. 22a-42a(c)(1).

\* \* \* \* \*

Mr. Bordeaux explained that staff is proposing a resolution to delegate additional authorities to the Inland Wetlands Agent to review and approve certain activities when proposed in upland review areas. The Inland Wetlands Regulations oversee activity that occurs in and around the wetlands. Manchester’s upland review area is 100’, he said. Currently, authority delegated to the Agent is limited to activities proposed by a residential property owner. The proposal is to expand the authority to all properties in Town when the proposed activity will create no greater than a minimal potential impact on the Inlands, Wetlands or Watercourses. Anticipated types of approvals include utility infrastructure improvements, improvements or construction of small accessory structures, and activities related to stormwater infrastructure. A report would be provided to the Agency following any decision by the Agent. Town staff would still review applications and provide comments.

In response to an issue raised by Ms. Shanbaum, Mr. Pellegrini explained that State Statutes require that decisions must be published. Advertisements will be run together with decisions of the Planning and Zoning Commission. If the Commission were to receive a report of action taken by the Agent and does not approve of the action, the Agent will be required to notify the applicant.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Bordeaux explained that once beyond the scope of an accessory structure, more review is required of an application. Mr. Brown asked if any members of the Commission would be against striking the word accessory and none were.

**MOTION:** Mr. Brown moved to adopt the resolution to delegate authority to the wetlands agent dated June 12, 2013 with the modification to remove the word “accessory” in the fourth paragraph of the resolution. Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor. The reason for the approval was the proposed resolution is in compliance with Section 22a-42a(c)(2) of the Connecticut General Statutes and with Section 6 of the Town of Manchester Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations. The authority to be delegated in the proposed resolution will become effective on June 18, 2013.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

555 MIDDLE TURNPIKE, LLC – for a proposed parking lot for an adjacent property at 555 Middle Turnpike East, Special Design Commercial zone – Special Exception (2013-020) – Request for Extension; Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2013-021) – Request for Extension

Special Exception (2013-020) – Request for Extension

**MOTION:** Ms. Shanbaum moved to accept a 65 day extension to open a public hearing on the Special Exception application. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2013-021) – Request for Extension

**MOTION:** Ms. Shanbaum moved to accept a 65 day extension to certify the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**APPROVAL OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE BROAD STREET REDEVELOPMENT PLAN:**

Mr. Pellegrini explained that the item before the Agency is an amendment to the Broad Street Redevelopment Plan. The Redevelopment Plan was adopted by the Redevelopment Agency in 2009. At that time, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the Plan and found it consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development in effect at that time.

Mr. Pellegrini said the Agency proposed revisions to the Broad Street Redevelopment Plan previously, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed that amendment and found it was consistent with the new Plan of Conservation and Development, Manchester 2020. However, in the intervening period, there was some testimony at a public hearing held by the Board of Directors objecting to including the property located at 357 Broad Street. As such, this is the second time the Planning and Zoning Commission is seeing the first amendment to the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Pellegrini reviewed the vision of the Redevelopment Plan and the Design Principles, which have not changed. He reviewed some changes to the Land Use designations, which would add descriptions for Mixed Use with Civic Options and Residential with Civic Option land use designations. This will allow for more flexibility. Amended language would clarify that the Agency can acquire property or property rights. Two properties were added to the Plan as well; 416 Middle Turnpike West and 296 Broad Street. The revisions are consistent with the current Plan of Conservation and Development, Manchester 2020.

**MOTION:** Mr. Brown moved to support the First Amendment to the Broad Street Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The Planning and Zoning Commission supported the proposed revisions to the Redevelopment Plan because they do not materially or substantially change the original intent, purpose, or goals of the adopted Broad Street Redevelopment Plan, and strengthen the ability of the Agency and the Town to implement the Redevelopment Plan.

The Commission found the Redevelopment Plan is consistent with the Town Plan of Conservation and Development's Growth Management Principle 3: Redevelop and Revitalize Existing Commercial Centers and Areas of Mixed Land Use:

**Goal I: Redevelop and Invest in Existing and Potential Corridors and Activity Nodes**

**Goal III: Enhance Connectivity Between Housing, Amenities and Services**

**Goal IV: Increase the Supply of a Diverse Housing Stock to Meet the Needs of All Residents**

#### **CHR CAPITAL:**

Pre-application review to discuss a proposed development concept at 20 Hartford Road, Residence AA zone.

Ms. Heather Gates, President and CEO of CHR, explained that she and her colleagues would like the Commission's input on some proposed development. CHR is a leading provider of behavioral health services with a \$42 million budget, serving 14,000 people per year and employing over 650 people. CHR recently built supportive housing on Center Street, which has been recognized by Governor Malloy, she said.

Mr. Paul Bailey, architect, explained that CHR plans to purchase a portion of the site located at 20 Hartford Road and restore the existing building. It will contain six residential units and offices for CHR. An addition will provide nineteen more units, for a total of 25 units. He displayed photographs of the current building for the Commission. The 25 year old addition will be torn down and the original brick will be exposed, he said. He intends to save as much of the interior woodwork as possible.

Mr. Bailey said the existing site is seven acres in size. The property will be divided and the driveway widened and a turnaround added. Parking will be added, with much of it being added in the rear. The green space in front will be saved. Mr. Bailey displayed a proposed first floor plan concept drawing. The zone would need to be changed to PRD, but this is an excellent site for PRD zoning, he said.

In response to several questions from Mr. Stoppelman, Mr. Bailey said the addition will be 9,000 to 10,000 square feet. The property is currently owned by the church and is not subdivided. Roughly half will be supportive units and the other half will be affordable units. The set up will be similar to Center Street. Staff will be on site to provide counseling, case management and care coordination during weekday business hours.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Pellegrini said there are guidelines from the Interior Department on how to add onto historic properties.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Bailey said the addition will not be exactly like the original building but will have the style and feel of the original building. It will be approximately the same height.

Ms. Shanbaum expressed concern with tripling or quadrupling the footprint.

Mr. Brown wondered if there was a way to push the addition back at all. When all is said and done, people driving by will see the addition and not the original house, he said. Mr. Brown said in the history of the Cheney District, there has never been an addition like this. He would suggest the mansion be a little more visible.

Mr. Pellegrini said he is hearing the Commission is reluctant to have the addition follow the line of the existing building. In addition, some parking should be shifted toward Hartford Road. He asked the Commission members if there are any other issues besides the architecture.

Ms. Shanbaum said she is concerned with 25 additional units on Hartford Road, which is extremely busy. She would like to look carefully at a traffic study.

In response to a question from Mr. Kidd, Ms. Gates explained that some of the individuals living here would have previously been homeless. For the most part they will not have cars. The remainder of the apartments are affordable and those residents would be more likely to have a car. The goal is to have all residents seek or retain employment. Staff would have vehicles. The advantage of this location is the accessibility to other services such as employment, grocery stores, and a bus line, she said.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Pellegrini said the Cheney Historic District Commission is advisory to the Planning and Zoning Commission. If members were very upset and thought this proposal was unreasonable destruction of the Mary Cheney House, the Historic Commission could intervene.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:**

Mr. Pellegrini announced that the 2020 Survey went out and so far 50 responses have been received out of 220 sent out. Kyle Shiel is prepared to put it on the web page and Manchester Matters.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

April 3, 2013 – Business Meeting

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

May 20, 2013 – Business Meeting

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

**RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:**

MANCHESTER CHICKEN, LLC – Special Exception (2013-038) – for a proposed restaurant with drive through at an existing building at 199 Spencer Street, General Business zone.

VH, LLC – PRD Zone Change and Preliminary Plan of Development (2013-040) – for a zone change from Rural Residence to Planned Residential Development and a preliminary plan of development for one single family home and 16 multi-family units at 594 Tolland Turnpike.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:47 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

October 7, 2013  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric Prause, Chairman

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