

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MAY 2, 2016**

ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS PRESENT: Eric Prause, Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Jessica Scorso

Alternate Members Sitting: Patrick Kennedy
Julian Stoppelman

Alternate Member Sitting
(For 2016-026 only): Teresa Ike

Absent: Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman
Timothy Bergin

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

Time Convened: 7:45 P.M.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION – (Continued from April 18, 2016) To revise Art. I, Sec. 2 and Art. II, Sec. 18 to allow Inns as a special exception use in the Historic Zone. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2016-026)

Mr. Kennedy noted some of the issues that had been raised about the proposed amendment, including parking, which he didn't see a problem with. He stated that the Planning and Zoning Commission should not try to restrict the types of events that might be held in the Mansion District. His main concern was that establishing a mansion as an Inn may not be feasible because of fire and building code regulations. However, some relief may be possible from the building and fire codes. But, if the regulations do not exist, it will not be possible to find out if the idea of an Inn is possible. Mr. Kennedy concluded by urging the Commission to support the revisions to the regulations.

Mr. Stebe added that Mr. Kennedy's comments made sense and he supported the revisions to the regulations to allow mansion owners to explore the possibility of establishing Inns.

Mr. Prause noted that he kept going back to the purpose of the Cheney District and what the plan is for that area. He questioned whether the Commission saw the mansions as only residential or if there could be businesses there. He said he was heartened by the fact of the Cheney Commission's favorable recommendation. He remained concerned about the potential of the nuisance factor and

how future members of the Commission might respond to requests for late night events.

Mr. Kennedy noted that no one in the Mansion District had come out to register concern. He felt there was enough flexibility in the approval process to deal with nuisance issues. He favored moving forward with the revisions.

Zoning Regulation Amendment (2016-026)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the zoning regulations amendment at Art. I, Sec. 2 and Art. II, Sec. 18 to allow Inns as a special exception use in the Historic Zone. Ms. Ike seconded the motion. Mr. Kennedy, Ms. Ike, and Mr. Stebe voted in favor. Mr. Prause and Mr. Stoppelman voted against the motion. The motion passed three to two.

The reason for the approval was that the proposed amendment is consistent with both the purpose and intent of the Historic zone and Manchester's Plan of Conservation and Development.

The zoning regulation amendment will become effective on May 18, 2016.

LAW OFFICES OF NICHOLAS T. KOCIAN, P.C. – Resubdivision to create a separate parcel for an existing law office building at 346 Middle Turnpike West (a.k.a. 356 Middle turnpike West). – Resubdivision (2016-030)

Mr. Kennedy stated he was in favor of the application and noted that it was fairly straightforward.

Resubdivision (2016-030)

MOTION: Mr. Stoppelman moved to approve the resubdivision at 346 Middle Turnpike West to create a separate parcel for an existing building at 356 Middle Turnpike West, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Derrick Gregor, Assistant Town Engineer dated April 27, 2016; and
2. Raymond Myette, Design Engineer, dated May 2, 2016 to Renata Bertotti.

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

The reason for the approval was the proposed subdivision meets the regulations.

EVERGREEN CROSSING, LLC. – Development of 135 multifamily units at 317 New State Road. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significant Impact (2016-014); Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-014); PRD Detailed Site Development Plan (2016-015); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2016-016); Flood Plain Permit (2016-039)

Attorney Stephen Penny presented the applicant's request for the development of 135 multifamily units at 317 New State Road. The 25.38 acre parcel is currently undeveloped, and the applicant is proposing to construct 135 one- and two-bedroom units in three buildings of 45 units each. Both public water and sewer are available on the site, in addition to adequate telephone, cable, natural gas and electrical service. Access to the public road network is provided through the main access drive for the Phase I parcel that fronts on New State Road.

The applicant has indicated the intent to merge 325 New State Road (Phase I) and 317 New State Road (proposed Phase II). The combined development will result in a total of 359 residential units in nine buildings. The development is designed to function in unison with a single access off New State Road and combined use of recreational facilities such as the clubhouse and the dedicated open spaces.

Mr. Robert Russo, Certified Soil Scientist with CLA Engineers, Inc. introduced himself and presented the results of the report he prepared on behalf of the applicant. The report identified three distinct regulated resources. The first consisted of a pair of isolated, manmade wetlands immediately south of the project development limits that are essentially naturalized low points in the area historically impacted by sand and gravel deposit and excavation activities. The second was a drainage ditch adjacent to the interstate that was dominated by invasive species. Mr. Russo noted that these resources provided some wildlife habitat and some water quality benefits in the form of drainage swale. The third area was a floodplain wetland which was a portion of the larger wetland system associated with the Hockanum River. This flood plain was dominated by native species such as red maple, cottonwood, and sycamore trees, as well as shrubs and herbaceous species. This wetland system, while surrounded by development, was a significant wildlife habitat as well as a recreational asset. Mr. Russo also noted that the floodplain wetlands had flood flow alteration value and aesthetic value, and contributed to the fishery value in the Hockanum River.

Mr. Russo went on to state that no wetland impact was proposed. The area of disturbance for construction came up to the edge of the two isolated, man-made wetlands. Significant vegetated buffers (typically over 100 feet) would be left along the floodplain. Approximately 57,400 square feet of upland review area would be disturbed. However, this falls predominantly within the area that was previously disturbed by sand and gravel operations. In summary, Mr. Russo noted that there was no fill taking place and given the nature of the plan and the nature of the wetlands, the plan would work very well to protect the wetlands.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if there was a plan to clean up the trash in the drainage ditches. Mr. Russo replied that because of the nature of the location, vegetation would have to be pulled out to remove the trash and that would do more damage to the environment than letting the trash stay there.

Mr. Stebe noted that the map the Commission was provided showed that the proposed development would be directly across the floodplain, and he wondered how that might be addressed. Mr. Russo answered that FEMA had miscalculated the elevation. Ms. Michelle Carlson, Civil Engineer, Senior Project Manager and Principal for BL Companies, verified that the area of the project is well above the 100 year flood elevation.

Attorney Penny returned to the podium to discuss the determination of significance. The Inland Wetlands Agency is required to make a determination of the significance of the impact of the proposed activities on the wetlands, watercourses, and/or water bodies. In making its determination, the Commission should be guided by the definition of "Significant Impact Activity" as found in the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, which means any activity which may have a major effect or significant impact. Attorney Penny summarized for the Agency a list of such activities.

Attorney Penny continued by stating that the proposed development would have no adverse impact to the flood storage capacity of the Special Flood Hazard area on the base flood elevation.

Mr. Matt Bruden, Civil Engineer with BL Companies, spoke next. He began by stating that the existing site was currently undeveloped. Three buildings were proposed, with covered carports. There would be three open space areas. Lighting was planned for the site, which would match the lighting in Phase I. In terms of the stormwater management, the plan conformed to the 2004 Connecticut Storm Water Quality Manual. There was no planned detention. Components of the stormwater system included catch basins with hoods and sumps, infiltration chambers for roof water recharge and water quality basins.

The utility connections included domestic water, fire, sanitary, gas and electric, which would all come from Phase I, connecting along the driveway. The landscaping would mimic the plans for Phase I.

Mr. Prause asked Mr. Bruden to show where the town wells were located in relation to the property. Mr. Bruden noted that the location of the wells was closer to Phase I than to Phase II.

Mr. Prause asked if the stormwater would drain to Phase I. Mr. Bruden showed that drainage discharge would drain to the existing locations.

Attorney Penny then introduced Mr. Alan Lamson, Architect with FLB Architecture and Planning in East Hartford, who presented the details regarding the proposed development. Mr. Lamson showed the basic plans for the three buildings being proposed. He showed the floor plans and the location of stairwells, as well as community space open to all the residents of both Phase I and Phase II. He showed a photograph of the existing buildings in Phase I and stated that the buildings in Phase II would look the same, with the same siding, roofing, windows and trim.

Attorney Penny then wrapped up the presentation by stating that all staff comments had been addressed and incorporated into the plans before the Commission. He then asked the Commission for their approval.

Mr. Stebe asked if the colors and materials would be the same as those used in Phase I. Attorney Penny responded that this development would look just like Phase I.

Mr. Prause asked for a description of the recreational spaces in Phase I. Mr. Lamson stated that there was a community center, including a swimming pool and a clubhouse, in addition to some open space and areas with lawns. In Phase II, the open space would include a patio and the community space. Mr. Prause followed up by asking if there were plans for any playscapes or community gardens. Mr. Lamson replied that there were not.

Mr. Stebe asked if there were any pedestrian walkways or walking trails. Mr. Lamson replied that there were some connections to the Hockanum Linear Park in Phase I.

Mr. Prause asked for confirmation that the wetlands would remain and would not be filled in. Mr. Lamson responded that was correct.

Mr. Prause asked if there had been any issues or complaints about noise from Interstate 84 and Mr. Lamson said that there had not been any complaints about noise from the highway, and that the plans for Phase II would be the same as in Phase I in terms of noise abatement.

Mr. Prause called for comments from staff. Ms. Bertotti stated that all staff comments noted in the motions were applicable to the PRD Plan of Development and that staff recommended approval.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that, in his opinion, the proposal would not have any impact on the wetlands as designed. He added that with respect to the flood plain issue, FEMA uses a very broad scale when measuring elevations. He felt that even if flood waters were to rise, they would not rise to the elevation that development would be taking place on the site.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significant Impact (2016-014)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the Inland Wetlands Permit application 2016-014 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-014)

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

1. Michelle Handfield, Civil Engineer, dated April 29, 2016 to Renata Bertotti.

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

The reason for the approval was that 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 must be completed within one year of commencement.

PRD Detailed Site Development Plan (2016-015)

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

1. Shawn Morris, Deputy Fire Marshal 8th District dated March 10, 2016;
2. James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer, dated March 16, 2016;
3. Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner, dated April 28, 2016;
4. Michelle Handfield, Civil Engineer, dated April 29, 2016;
5. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated April 29, 2016; and
6. Jim Mayer, Traffic Engineer, dated May 2, 2016 to Renata Bertotti.

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

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2016-016)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to certify the erosion and sedimentation control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Civil Engineer, dated April 29, 2016 to Renata Bertotti.

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

Flood Plain Permit (2016-039)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the flood plain permit with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Civil Engineer, dated April 29, 2016 to Renata Bertotti.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Ms. Bertotti asked the members of the Commission if they would be willing to participate in a workshop regarding the Manchester Green following the May 16th meeting. They agreed.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

March 21, 2016 –Public Hearing/Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2016 Public Hearing and Business Meeting as written. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

April 4, 2016 – Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes of the April 4, 2016 Business Meeting as written. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

BRAD BOYLE – Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-055) – For enlargement of usable lawn area, driveway retention, and back yard improvements at 52 Kent Drive.

JIN YOUNG PARK – Zone Change (2016-057) - For a zone district change from Residence B to Special Design Commercial Business Zone at 608 East Center Street.

WATERSTONE RETAIL DEVELOPMENT, INC. – Special Exception (2016-058); Erosion and Sedimentation Control (2016-059) - To construct a three-story, 103,000 s.f. office building at 434 Tolland Turnpike (formerly known as 444 Tolland Turnpike); and **Erosion and Sedimentation Control (2016-060); Special Exception Modification (2016-061)** - To expand the existing parking from 267 to 374 spaces at 428 Tolland Turnpike.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 9:18 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

June 20, 2016 _____

Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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