

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APRIL 3, 2013**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chair  
Andy Kidd, Vice Chair  
Horace Brown, Secretary  
Michael Stebe

Absent: Chirag Thaker  
Anthony Petrone  
Susan Shanbaum  
John Chaput

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

Time Convened: 7:03 P.M.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

THE CONNECTICUT WATER COMPANY – to replace existing water mains along Redwood Road, Ralph Road and Galaxy Drive, Rural Residence zone – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2012-125)

Mr. Phil Forzley, professional engineer, spoke on behalf of the applicant, Connecticut Water Company, which submitted an application for an Inland Wetlands Permit and an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Permit. He said he was presenting testimony for determination of significant activity and will only present the portion of the project pertaining to the wetlands application. After a site walk he said he was able to make some adjustments to the original plans, pulling out of the regulated area quite a bit. Mr. Forzley pointed out Hillstown and Redwood Roads on the plan. Connecticut Water will be replacing all water mains in the entire neighborhood due to their age, he said. Piping will be placed right along the old piping. This application is to determine whether activities in the vicinity of the water course he pointed out were significant. The watercourse is lined in blue with blue highlighting for the 100' upland review area. In pink are the regulated activities, which consist of installation of a silt fence, installation of two sections of water main within Redwood Road and paving of a driveway apron.

Mr. Forzley explained that Connecticut Water has an access way that requires driving over a curb to get down to the well site, which serves the neighborhood. He said it is in a wooded area with a lawn area and a gravel driveway. He said Town Engineering staff requested the access way be formalized by making a curb cut and paving an apron up to the sidewalk. The driveway is already paved and will not be touched.

Mr. Forzley said a construction entrance was shown by the road but there is really no reason to place it there. It will be moved down into the portion of the site where the pavement ends instead. This is all outside the regulated area, he said. In the original application, a storage area was proposed to store materials during construction. Instead, Connecticut Water suggested using an area already used for storage of sand and millings. He said this is outside the regulated area as well. Stockpile areas will be cleaned up and revegetated when the project is complete. Mr. Forzley does not think the activities meet the definition of significant activities as defined in the regulations.

In response to a question from Mr. Kidd, Mr. Forzley explained that currently trucks drive over the curb and dirt entrance. A curb cut will be made in this area and the dirt area will be paved over up to the sidewalk.

In response to a question from Mr. Prause, Mr. Forzley said a tracking pad will be placed farther down into the site where the pavement ends; the tracking pad is called out on the new plan.

Mr. Bordeaux said the revisions made to the plans have adequately reduced the overall disturbance of the area.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2012-125)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kidd moved to find the proposed activity would not cause a significant impact to the wetlands and will not require a public hearing. Mr. Brown seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

HAYES & HAYES, LLC – for construction of self-storage buildings, parking and associated site improvements at 169 Red Stone Road, General Business zone – Special Exception (2012-128) – request for extension until April 15, 2013; Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2012-129) – request for extension until April 15, 2013

Special Exception (2012-128) – request for extension until April 15, 2013

**MOTION:** By consensus the Commission granted the request for extension until April 15, 2013.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2012-129) – request for extension until April 15, 2013

**MOTION:** By consensus the Commission granted the request for extension until April 15, 2013.

HAYES FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIP – for excavation, site preparation, and grading for future development at 75 Buckland Street, Business V and Design Overlay zones – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2013-001) – request for extension until April 15, 2013; Excavation Permit (2013-002) – request for extension until April 15, 2013

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2013-001) – request for extension until April 15, 2013

**MOTION:** By consensus the Commission granted the request for extension until April 15, 2013.

Excavation Permit (2013-002) – request for extension until April 15, 2013

**MOTION:** By consensus the Commission granted the request for extension until April 15, 2013.

## **APPOINTMENTS TO CAPITOL REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION:**

**MOTION:** By consensus the Commission recommended the appointment of Mr. Brown as a regular member and Mr. Stebe as an alternate member to the Capitol Regional Planning Commission.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:**

### Bed & Breakfast Establishments and Inns

Ms. Bertotti reminded Commission members that on January 7, Mr. Gary Sweet made a presentation of his proposal to add bed and breakfast establishments as either permitted or special exception uses in certain residential zones. The Commission asked Town staff look into some of the questions members had during the discussion held that night. Ms. Bertotti provided a table and map in members' packets. The table shows how other Towns handle bed and breakfast establishments in their regulations and the map shows the Manchester lots that meet minimum area requirements for their zoning district, with one color for lots located on arterial and collector roads and another depicting those lots throughout the entire Town.

Ms. Bertotti explained that Manchester currently allows bed and breakfast establishments in the Historic Zone with certain criteria. Mr. Sweet proposed that bed and breakfast establishments be allowed in additional zoning districts. She said most municipalities allow bed and breakfast establishments in residential zones, most commonly as a special exception. There are many limitations such as the number of rooms or parking requirements. She said she had not found much information regarding inns in her research. Generally, they are regulated by being considered similar to a small hotel. Currently, Manchester's smallest hotel has to have sixteen rooms. She said the current regulations have a gap between the six rooms allowed for a bed and breakfast establishment and the sixteen room minimum requirement for a small hotel.

Ms. Bertotti said she is comfortable recommending bed and breakfast establishments in residential zones as a permitted use if certain requirements are met, such as minimum lot sizes and being located on collector or arterial roads. She recommended treating inns as hotels. They function more in a commercial way and she would not recommend them in residential zones.

Mr. Brown commended Town staff for its research. He said the bed and breakfast establishment recommendation was a fine idea but did not think regulations for inns need to be any different than they are now. He expressed concern about one complete bath for every two guest sleeping rooms and suggested that be changed to one complete bath for each sleeping room or suite. He also said a 30,000 square foot lot would be better than an 18,000 square foot lot, and a special exception should be considered rather than a permitted use.

Mr. Kidd said he would lean toward a special exception as well but would settle for a permitted use. He said the Commission should consider closing the gap between bed and breakfast establishments and small hotels.

Mr. Stebe said, in his experience with bed and breakfasts, he had never seen an issue with having one bath per two guest rooms. He said it is very clear to patrons that they may be sharing and are willing to pay a premium if a private bath is required. Changing to one bath per guest room will price most houses out of the market because of the cost of renovations. Mr. Stebe also said bed and breakfast establishments should be allowed as a special exception use.

Mr. Brown said if a bed and breakfast has six guest rooms and all are occupied, that means there will be six cars on the property. In addition, six guest rooms will likely mean twelve people, which means the owner can have no more than two children.

Ms. Bertotti said the maximum number of people allowed to spend the night on a property is sixteen, including the owner and family members. Limiting the number of occupants is fairly common, she said.

Mr. Pellegrini said the current regulations do not address the number of baths in relation to the number of rooms. He said the language proposed by Mr. Sweet is more specific and may be more limiting. He asked Commission members if bed and breakfast establishments should be located on an arterial or collector street.

Mr. Stebe said he did not see that as a major issue. He said the larger issue is ensuring setbacks and including parking requirements within the regulations. Mr. Pellegrini said it is a good idea to regulate parking to the rear or side of the property. Mr. Stebe added that he would not push for pavement as it takes away from the idea of a bed and breakfast establishment.

Mr. Prause noted the number of potential properties indicated by the map. He said the characteristics of the neighborhood matter in the decision making process. A bed and breakfast will change a property from residential to a commercial enterprise. He said there are some houses that would be appropriate to operate a bed and breakfast that are not located on an arterial or collector road. He suggested taking the road type off and making this a special exception approval.

Mr. Pellegrini said special exception approval criteria, such as traffic, utilities, neighborhood compatibility and impacts would all have to be studied. A site plan review would provide the Commission a middle option, he said.

Mr. Brown said the Commission should be careful when making decisions about bed and breakfast establishments. He said bed and breakfasts are nice from a tourist's point of view but the impact to neighbors needs to be taken into consideration. Neighbors would not be notified unless a special exception is required. He said a large lot should be required, and it would be better if bed and breakfast establishments were limited to arterial or collection roads.

Mr. Kidd said he was sensitive to the neighbor issue and neighborhood compatibility. He wondered if special exception approval could be required unless the proposed bed and breakfast were on an arterial or collector street. He said he liked the suggestion of cars being parked only in the rear or on the side of the building.

Mr. Pellegrini said the number of bedrooms and the number of spaces will be dictated by the house and amount of land. Mr. Brown said the point was well taken that parking will be used as a major control. The regulations need to relate parking to the number of rooms and the size of the lot.

Mr. Pellegrini summed up the Commission's discussion and suggested a draft amendment go to public hearing that carries over the Historic District requirements. He said the Commission seemed to be more comfortable with bed and breakfast establishments being approved as a special exception in a RR or AA zone, meeting minimum lot sizes for the zone but not limiting them to arterial or collector streets.

Redevelopment Plan Amendment

Mr. Pellegrini explained that the Redevelopment Agency is proposing amendments to the Broad Street Redevelopment Plan (Plan). The agency is negotiating with property owners to secure land to enable the Agency to issue an RFQ for a master development. This will require acquiring rights to certain properties, he said. The parking lot in front of the Parkade Cinemas is not specifically identified in the Plan and needs to be added to it. He said in considering amendments, the Agency noticed some things that could be clarified, which he reviewed for the Commission. None of the amendments substantially or materially change the Plan itself, he said. Mr. Pellegrini said Commission members will receive a memorandum explaining all proposed amendments.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

November 27, 2013 – Public Hearing

**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:**

**TOWN OF MANCHESTER PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2013-015); Inland Wetlands Permit (2013-015); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2013-016); Flood Plain Permit (2013-017) – to reconstruct approximately 6,200 LF of road to provide geometric, safety and drainage improvements; and sidewalk replacements along Spring Street from S Main to Dartmouth Road, Lewis Street, Comstock Road & Arvine Place.**

**KEYSTONE NOVELTIES DISTRIBUTORS, LLC – CUD Detailed Plan Modification (2013-018) – to erect a temporary tent for the sale of fireworks from 6/26/13 through 7/06/13 at 120 Slater Street.**

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:12 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

June 17, 2013  
Date

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

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