

MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
AUGUST 17, 2015

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chair
Horace Brown, Secretary
Michael Stebe
Susan Shanbaum

Alternates: Teresa Ike (Sitting for 2015-050,051,052 for Mr. Stebe)
Julian Stoppelman (Sitting)

Absent: Andy Kidd, Vice Chair
Patrick Kennedy

Also Present: Mark Pellegrini, Director of Planning
Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner
Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner
Karen Logan, Recording Secretary

Time Convened: 7:30 P.M.

HIGHLAND OAKS CORPORATION – for a 35-lot development of one-family and duplex-type homes at Castle Hill and Collingridge Drive. - Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significant Impact (2015-050); Inland Wetlands Permit (2015-050); Re-Subdivision in PRD Zone (2015-051); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2015-052)

Mr. Prause opened the Business Meeting by asking the project engineer, Mr. Rob Hellstrom, to describe the project with regards to impact on the wetlands area. Mr. Hellstrom indicated that there was no planned construction activity in the wetlands area.

Mr. Prause asked how far to the north the wetlands extend. Mr. Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner, said this area is a heavily wooded red maple swamp through which a headwater stream of the Bigelow Brook flows. A Conservation Easement has been in place since the original subdivision approval. Markers have been installed along the perimeter of the Conservation Easement to mark the clearing limits and erosion controls include a perimeter of silt fence and/or hay bales on each lot. Mr. Bordeaux confirmed there is no activity proposed in the wetlands and said he provided a figure for

the amount of activity in the upland review area, which does touch Lot 41B.

Mr. Prause asked that the engineer describe the erosion and sedimentation control measures planned for the project. Mr. Mark Reynolds, Project Engineer, responded that there were plans in place for silt fencing and anti-tracking pads, as well as catch basin protections. Beyond that, the site has mild grades with very little chance of erosion.

Ms. Shanbaum said there is already a wetlands permit in effect for this area and asked how that relates to this application. Mr. Bordeaux responded that the wetlands permit being considered tonight is limited to the lots 20, 23 and 24 which contain the only areas where there are wetlands. He said the existing wetlands permit related to the wetlands as a whole in the subdivision, but this is a new PRD application which requires new wetlands approval for the activity proposed. Ms. Bertotti noted that this proposal was also different from what was originally approved.

Ms. Shanbaum then asked the applicant why there is no impact anticipated on the wetlands for this project. Mr. Hellstrom replied that there is no activity planned in the wetlands for Lots 20, 23 and 24.

Mr. Prause asked if there were any comments from staff. Ms. Bertotti indicated that there were outstanding staff comments from Derrick Gregor, Assistant Town Engineer, that were technical in nature and could be addressed on the final mylars, should the Commission decide to move forward with this request.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significant Impact (2015-050)

MOTION: Mr. Brown moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the Inland Wetlands Permit application 2015-050 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2015-050)

MOTION: Mr. Brown moved to approve the inland wetlands permit with modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, P.E., Assistant Town Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval was the proposed activity does not disturb the natural or indigenous character of the land by significant impact or major effect. The approval is valid for 5 years. The work in the regulated area on each individual lot must be completed within one year of commencement.

Re-Subdivision in PRD Zone (2015-051)

Mr. Stoppelman asked for confirmation that this vote was simply for the re-subdivision, including roads and general overall design, and not for the design plans. Mr. Pellegrini

said, according to the agenda, the Commission is being asked to approve the re-subdivision, as well as the detailed plan of development. This includes the building elevations and the floor plans that were handed to the Commission earlier that evening. Ms. Bertotti said the resubdivision and detailed plan are one and the same application.

Mr. Brown commented that the elevations and floor plans which were sent to the Commission in advance and were not the same as those presented tonight. He asked if the Commission chose to act on the detailed plan, it would be approving the materials that were passed out earlier in the evening. Mr. Pellegrini confirmed.

Mr. Pellegrini noted that if the Commission did not feel it had enough information or had not had enough time for a proper review, the application could be tabled.

Ms. Shanbaum noted that, if the Commission approved the elevations and floor plans submitted at the meeting, they would not be approving anything for the single family homes since no revised plans had been provided for the single families, only for the duplexes. Mr. Pellegrini said the reason that the PRD zone requests floor plans is to establish the bedroom count, which is used to establish the open space requirements, but only for multi-family projects. The Town typically doesn't dictate the internal floor plans and bedroom counts for single family and duplex style homes. The more important thing is to establish the exterior design, materials and architecture. Mr. Stoppelman noted that the Commission had not received any samples of the exterior materials.

Mr. Brown remarked that he felt it was troublesome that there were 35 units that all looked the same except for the difference in dormers.

Ms. Shanbaum stated that if the Commission was being asked to approve a Detailed Plan of Development, there was not enough detail being provided. The Commission would need more information about what the single family homes would look like, more time to review the revised drawings of the duplexes, and a better understanding of what construction materials would be used, such as roofing and siding.

Mr. Prause noted that the Commission could not hear more input on the application since the public hearing had been closed, but that the item could be tabled.

MOTION: Ms. Shanbaum moved to table the application. Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2015-052)

MOTION: Mr. Stoppelman moved to approve the erosion and sediment control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, P.E., Assistant Town Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

From this point forward in the meeting, Mr. Stebe was voting and Ms. Ike was present as an Alternate.

RICHARD P. HAYES, SR. – For normal site preparation and grading for future development at 1555 Tolland Turnpike. – Inland Wetlands Permit - Determination of Significant Impact (2015-063); Inland Wetlands Permit (2015-063); Erosion and Sedimentation Control (2015-064)

Mr. Wes Wentworth, P.E., Soil Scientist with Wentworth Civil Engineers, provided a description of the proposed activity which would prepare this parcel of land for future development. The proposal focuses on the front two acres of the vacant lot, which is proposed to be cut on the west side, leveled off, and filled to create a flat commercial pad so the property can be marketed. A man-made rip rap swale classified as an intermittent watercourse is located in the southwest corner of the site and will be filled. The applicant is proposing to abandon the open swale and replace it with a 24” reinforced concrete pipe to convey the storm water flow to a proposed catch basin before it is conveyed easterly to the Town’s system.

Mr. Stebe asked if there was a freestanding wall on the western edge of the property. Mr. Wentworth responded no, that is a 2:1 slope, not a wall. In response to Mr. Prause, Mr. Wentworth confirmed the proposed pipe would be buried.

Mr. Prause asked if Mr. Bordeaux had any additional comments. Mr. Bordeaux responded that this is approximately 110 linear feet of a shallow swale that is rarely wet. The functions and values of this manmade intermittent watercourse are minimal – collecting sediment and debris, slowing erosion from heavy flow.

Mr. Prause asked why Mr. Wentworth doesn’t anticipate much erosion and he replied there is very little water running off of neighboring properties onto the site, if any.

MOTION: Ms. Shanbaum moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the Inland Wetlands Permit application 2015-063 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2015-063)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the inland wetlands permit with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, P.E., Assistant Town Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval was the proposed activity is a reasonable alternative that will provide the same functions as the existing manmade rip rap swale. The approval is valid

for 5 years. The work in the regulated area must be completed within one year of commencement.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2015-064)

MOTION: Mr. Stoppelman moved to approve the erosion and sediment control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, P.E., Assistant Town Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

CENTRO BRADLEY MANCHESTER I, LLC – For changes to building façade and outdoor seating at 440 Buckland Hills Drive. - CUD Detailed Plan Modification (2015-070)

Attorney John Knuff, of 147 North Broad Street, Milford, appeared before the Commission, representing the applicant, to provide the specifics regarding site changes being proposed at 440 Buckland Hills Drive. The applicant is requesting a non-material change to the Detailed Plan, which consists of a change to the existing façade for a portion of the building where Sleepy's is currently located. Iparty used to be the tenant in that space. The new tenant, Smashburger, will occupy about 2,500 sq. ft. of the western end of that building, and will build a 480 sq. ft. patio for outdoor seating. Attorney Knuff noted that, even though retail and restaurants require different amounts of parking, there is still sufficient parking on the site.

Mr. Steve Iovanna, Architect from BL Companies, reviewed the changes being proposed. He presented a floor plan and elevations of the proposed Smashburger location, as well as the existing retail space occupied by Sleepy's. The gable element for Iparty will be removed and existing materials and coloring (cream with a red stripe) will be extended across the building. A new aluminum storefront will be added in between the Sleepy's and Smashburgers for a future tenant. A new tower element is proposed for Smashburger on the northwest and south corner of the building. The tower element will be reddish brown split-face Concrete Masonry Unit at the base, new EIFS, and aluminum storefront. On the side, there will be a patio with exterior seating, with the same materials coming across the northwest/west façade. Mr. Iovanna noted that Smashburger is still working on their construction documents, so the plan provided from them is not complete. However, what is being proposed in the elevations is what will be built and the interior layout will be modified to match the exterior proposal, he said. He provided materials sample of the red paint color and cream/khaki EIFS.

Mr. Brown asked what the black rectangle over the door represents on the plans. Mr. Iovanna replied that it is a black fabric awning. Mr. Brown asked where the main door is located. Mr. Iovanna indicated the location of the door on the plans, under the black awning. He said it's a single door with a side light, but there is also a side door that goes out onto the patio. Mr. Brown asked if the outdoor seating area will be fenced in and if

so, what kind of fencing materials would be used. Mr. Iovanna responded that the patio would be fenced in with a stainless steel guard rail.

Ms. Shanbaum asked what the approximate length of the middle section of the building was. Mr. Iovanna replied that that section of the building is roughly 60 to 75 feet long.

Mr. Prause verified that there are no changes to the landscaping other than the construction of the patio and Mr. Iovanna confirmed his understanding.

Mr. Stebe asked what the signage would look like and Mr. Iovanna stated that Smashburger submit their own request for signage. Ms. Bertotti noted the sign permit would be approved by staff because sign permits are issued by the Zoning Enforcement Officer.

Ms. Bertotti indicated that there were comments from the Zoning Enforcement Officer and Design Engineer which were minor and technical in nature, which could be addressed on final plans if the Commission chose to act on the proposal.

Mr. Stebe asked if there was access for deliveries on the back of the building. Mr. Iovanna replied there are access doors, but there is no loading dock.

CUD Detailed Plan Modification (2015-070)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the CUD Detailed Site Development Plan Modification with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer dated August 13, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner; and
2. Bernard Kalansuriya, P.E., Design Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti.

Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER – For additions and renovations of Bennet School, Cheney School and Boiler Buildings at 1151 Main Street (Including 11, 39, 41 and 47 School Street, 11&13 Vine Street, 49, 55 and 63 Wells Street). - Special Exception Modification (2015-065); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2015-066)

Mr. Christopher Till, Town of Manchester Facilities Division, introduced Mr. Joe DiSanti, construction manager; Mr. Matt Geary, Superintendent of Schools; and Mr. Randall Luther of Tai Soo Kim Partners Architects, who presented the proposal to the Commission.

Mr. Luther said this project began a year and a half ago when Manchester decided to upgrade existing school buildings, and the lynchpin of the entire multi-stage project is the incorporation of 5th grade into the existing 6th grade academy. There are currently 500 6th graders and 500 5th graders. The current size of cafeteria could not accommodate the additional load which is why the cafeteria addition is proposed. The Cheney School building and Boiler Building were vacant, and the Cheney building could house 5th grade

with minor additions, so the architects created a new multi-story addition that connects the Cheney Building to Boiler building, allowing that entire facility to act as a 5th grade house. The new main entrance is in this new addition between the buildings. Three of the four walls of the Boiler building will remain, as will the chimney, because the State Historic Preservation Office considered them historic resources. There will be an exterior corridor that comes in at grade and ramps up to a slightly elevated entrance level. The 500 students break out into 21 classrooms in clusters of three. Corners are specialty spaces such as the nurse's office and staff room. Small additions on the Boiler building were needed to allow the square footage of classrooms to be consistent with the Board of Education's policy on classroom size. To connect the Cheney/Boiler complex to the Bennet building itself, rather than have students walk across street outdoors (which poses a security issue), there will be an overhead pedestrian bridge over School Street. Mr. Luther displayed the elevation on School Street. The Cheney building will stay mostly the same but will be cleaned and restored; windows will be replaced and existing doors will be replaced with something consistent with what was there originally. The Boiler Building shell will remain, with the front wall remaining as screen in front of that ramp. The existing roof of the Boiler Building will be removed and a new structure will float over the top of the existing walls.

Mr. Luther displayed the North building elevation and noted that it is really a building elevation which is not visible to anyone because it is recessed inside the "U" shape of the building. There's a privacy fence close to the back of the building; new additions are fairly opaque because of that. He showed a rendering of the complex from the Southeast corner looking back at the Cheney building, showing the façade of existing Boiler building, and the connecting bridge. He displayed the cafeteria addition floor plan and said there it is a proposed addition in the courtyard of the existing Bennet Academy, not visible to anyone beyond the building. Mr. Luther showed a rendering of the cafeteria addition.

Mr. Luther displayed the site plan and said it was found that the 83 existing spaces are adequate for current day to day use but never enough for event parking, and the school's population will double. The proposal provides additional parking, up to 183 spaces. He noted that the proposed new parking is currently a play field, but conversations revealed it doesn't get much use. Most of the crosswalks in courtyard are removed in this plan, to provide large open grassy area for limited outdoor activities.

Mr. Luther said School Street is proposed to be closed to the public, with gates that will be opened only for buses to drop off students. Buses could come from either side and drop off students to either side. At the end of the day when buses queue, he said 10-12 buses are anticipated. The gates would be open and buses would queue. Parents would queue along Wells Street and the drop-off lane which will be one-way. During daytime, this will be visitor parking, Mr. Luther said. There will be privacy fencing the entire length of the site to the north and east, and on both sides of the parking lot. Vine Street has been closed and it will be reopened for two-way circulation. It will provide access to the parking lot and access for residents of School Street heading westbound.

Mr. Luther introduced Ms. Stephanie White, Landscape Architect, of Fuss & O'Neill, who presented plans for Erosion and Sedimentation Control. She said this plan is in compliance with State of Connecticut DEP Guidelines for Erosion Control and Construction Stormwater Permit Regulations, as well as Town of Manchester Improvement Standards. The architects have planned for a series of soil conservation measures, such as silt fencing, silt sacks, wrapping in all the catch basins on-site, as well as hay bales and anti-tracking construction entrance aprons located within the project site. Finally, there is a soil stock pile area lined with silt fencing.

Mr. Luther said the State Historic Preservation Office approved this concept plan on July 7th, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance on July 29th for the rear yard encroachment, and on August 13th the Cheney Brothers National Historic District Commission recommended approval and provided some comments on areas to review.

Mr. Prause asked Ms. White to expand on the Landscaping Plan. Ms. White noted that the majority of the Landscaping Plan focused on the parking lot area. The perimeter of the parking lot is heavily planted with deciduous shrubs, grasses and large evergreen spruce trees and some hedging. The parking lot has privacy fencing, as well. There are also a few new street trees in the parking areas.

Mr. Brown stated that he has followed the evolution of this project with great interest and he felt a great deal of good work has gone into the plan. He understands that these things evolve over time. But he was surprised to find that the plans include the closing of School Street, and this was the first he heard about that. He indicated that the East Side neighborhood is served by only two east/west through streets – Oak Street and School Street. Now School Street is being closed. This has a significant impact on the residents using these through streets, in addition to the changes in the traffic patterns. He stated that he is not necessarily against the closure of the street, but he expressed concern over this change and the impact it will have on residents and that neighborhood. He questioned whether signage should be erected to direct traffic, and whether the street should be closed permanently or just during school.

Mr. Luther introduced the Traffic Engineer from Fuss & O'Neill, Mr. Matthew Skelly. The study Fuss & O'Neill conducted found that the majority of traffic in this area is local residents who will quickly learn the new traffic pattern, so the plan does not include any additional signage. If there is a need in the future, that could be addressed. The plan calls for a permanent closing of School Street in that area, so people traveling that street would know that it is permanently closed, thereby providing a safe area for the students.

Mr. Till said the question of closing School Street was discussed at meetings that included the Public Works Director, Town Engineer, Town Traffic Engineer, and police and fire department staff, and it was concluded that this was the best option for addressing the problem and providing a safe environment for the students.

Mr. Brown asked if it had ever been publicized and Mr. Till indicated that it had not.

Mr. Prause asked about the Traffic Study conducted by Fuss & O'Neill and the recommendations it contains, specifically to provide a police officer to assist drivers making left turns onto Main Street during peak school hours. Mr. Skelly explained that the suggestion to provide a police officer was a temporary situation during peak school hours when the Academy expansion is completed and first opening.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if the students have physical education class outside at Charter Oak Park. Mr. Till replied that no, there is no outside physical education.

Ms. Shanbaum asked about the height of the privacy fence around the parking lot being proposed and what type of materials would be used. Mr. Till responded that it would be a 6' high chain link fence with slats.

Mr. Stoppelman asked about the traffic study and the 270 additional trips projected. He wondered how many of these trips would be parents dropping off students. Mr. Skelly explained that the data he used to determine the additional trips was reported as a combined use of all trips and he did not have an exact proportion, but he felt it would be a large percentage.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if there was enough space for parents to drop off and pick up students. Mr. Skelly assured him that there was, and added that an area currently used as a bus-only drive will be opened up to parents.

Ms. Shanbaum commented that logistically, the 5th graders will be in the Cheney Building, so they will have to walk over to the front of the Bennet Academy to meet up with their parents. Mr. Skelly replied that her assumption was correct, but that the school plans for a staggered release, and the wide open design of the area would allow people to arrive and leave from any direction, and enable parents to find the closest area for student pick up. Ms. Shanbaum asked if parents arriving in the afternoon could only come through the one-way drive to Bennet Academy and Mr. Luther replied that yes, 5th graders would need to cross to Bennet Academy, but it would be up to the school whether to have them cross the street at the crosswalk or use the elevated walkway.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if the buses would be headed in both directions in the area on School Street. Mr. Skelly answered that was correct.

Mr. Stebe noted that he understood the logistical issues with traffic around the dropping off and picking up of students by parents. There will need to be a lot of parental education regarding traffic flow during peak hours. Generally, he approved of the plans as presented, but requested more information about the exterior materials being used in the renovation and building addition. Mr. Luther responded that according to the requirements of the State Historic Preservation Office, additions to historic buildings should be different from the original building in order to distinguish the historic part of the building from the addition. So, the addition is essentially a glass box in contrast to the historic masonry. The front of the Boiler building will be as it is today except windows will be gone and two feet above the top of the existing wall there will be a new plane

hovering over the top of the wall; below that, open to the air, is a walkway that navigates the current grade up to the new lobby elevation. Glass separates the new roof from the existing walls. The front is primarily the existing condition and behind the existing wall there will be a glass box set back about 6 feet from the existing building so that it is not prominent. The streetscape remains essentially as it is today. The cafeteria is brick similar to what is there now, limestone trim and panels, and storefront windows with added sun shades.

Mr. Brown asked if the design of the new walkway was intended to provide the same look and feel from the existing walkway between the Bennet buildings and Mr. Luther responded that was the intent.

Mr. Prause noted that the design is a great example of adaptive reuse. A lot of effort has gone into the design and a lot of creativity has gone into the project. He noted that Mr. Pellegrini had provided a memo summarizing the input from the Cheney Commission. Mr. Luther said they had promised the Cheney Commission that they would look at the issues they raised.

Ms. Shanbaum expressed concern about the handicapped ramp being open and exposed to inclement weather and asked what kind of flooring would be in that location. Mr. Luther responded that it would be bluestone, to match existing spaces, which would provide traction on the gentle slope of the ramp. He said he was not concerned about snow or rain accumulation since the overhand extends well beyond the opening. He noted that windows would need cleaning, would be vulnerable to breakage, and would decrease visibility in the area.

Ms. Bertotti mentioned that there were no concerns reported by the Town Traffic Engineer. The outstanding comments were technical and minor in nature and could be addressed on final mylars if the Commission decided to move forward with the vote.

Mr. Stoppelman commented that there were compromises in the plan and what may be gained may be worth it.

Mr. Prause asked for clarification of why the application was a special exception modification. Ms. Bertotti replied that the existing school is in a zone where schools are permitted, but the parking is proposed in an area where schools are allowed as a special exception; since the parking is accessory use to school, it requires the special exception modification. Mr. Pellegrini added that schools were not regulated as special exception uses until a recent amendment. Previously, schools were permitted in residential zones, and when the regulations were amended, existing schools were grandfathered in. When there's an addition or modification to a preexisting approved school, those changes are treated as modifications to a special exception even though the original school didn't need a special exception. Mr. Pellegrini said the Commission is considering the additions and the changes to the site plan, not what was there before, but they should consider all the special exception criteria.

Mr. Prause asked if the decision to locate the buses on School Street could be explained more thoroughly. Mr. Till responded that the design engineers had come up with four or five alternatives and, after much debate, the consensus was that the closing of School Street was the best alternative.

Mr. Prause noted that a great deal of good work has gone into the design of this project and he wanted to commend everyone who was involved in creating the proposal. He said space constraints made it difficult to find a good place for the buses and he agreed that the proposed blocked off bus area would be more secure than the alternatives.

Mr. Stebe added that he wanted to echo the Chairman's words. He had served on the Cheney Commission and had seen firsthand all of the work involved in this project and he felt that this proposal was the result of a lot of hard work.

Special Exception Modification (2015-065)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the special exception modification with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, P.E., Assistant Town Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner;
2. James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer dated August 13, 2015 to Renata Bertotti; and
3. Michelle Govoni, PE, Civil Engineer dated August 14, 2015 to Renata Bertotti

Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2015-066)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the erosion and sediment control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, P.E., Assistant Town Engineer dated August 12, 2015 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner;
2. James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer dated August 13, 2015 to Renata Bertotti; and
3. Michelle Govoni, PE, Civil Engineer dated August 14, 2015 to Renata Bertotti.

Ms. Shanbaum seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Ms. Bertotti said two lot line revisions had been approved administratively. The first was for 394 and 400 Tolland Turnpike, where two triangular portions of land were exchanged between the properties. The other was between 280 and 302 Adams Street, where a portion of the lot at 280 Adams Street was transferred to 302 Adams Street.

Mr. Bordeaux said he had administratively approved a proposal by the Town of Manchester to reconstruct 700 linear feet of Bush Hill Road from Miller Pond Road east. The purpose of the reconstruction was to address the problem of drivers heading east on

Bush Hill Road being unable to see oncoming cars due to humps in the road. The second hump will be cut down to address the issue. There will be 0.7 of an acre of disturbance and no activity in the wetlands area, just in the upland review area.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

July 6, 2015 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Brown moved to approve the minutes of the July 6, 2015 – Public Hearing and Business Meeting. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

1. **THE EDGE FITNESS CLUBS – CUD Detailed Plan Modification (2015-078)** - For installation of a temporary sales office trailer at 49 Pavilions Drive.
2. **WEST MIDDLE TURNPIKE REALTY, LLC – Certificate of Occupancy (2015-080)** – For a new parking lot at 8 and 14 Middle Turnpike West, in an Off Street Parking zone.

Mr. Stoppelman moved to adjourn the Business Meeting and Ms. Shanbaum seconded. All members voted in favor.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 10:25 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

October 7, 2015
Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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