

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
NOVEMBER 6, 2017**

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Jessica Scorso

Alternate Members Sitting: Patrick Kennedy
Teresa Ike

Absent: Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman
Timothy Bergin
Julian Stoppelman

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning
Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner
Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary

The Chairman opened the Business Meeting at 7:17 P.M.

NEW BUSINESS:

WORKOUT HARDER FITNESS – For a recreational facility at 134 Pine Street, a.k.a. 136½ Pine Street. – Special Exception (2017-081)

Mr. Stebe expressed that the proposal is a good use for a building which is not currently fully utilized. There will be no impact on utilities or traffic, he stated, and it will not be a noise nuisance. He recognized that there will be no lights on the sign and, therefore, it will not be a light nuisance. Mr. Stebe said he believes the business will be a nice addition to the neighborhood given the proximity to the Mills and to Main Street.

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the special exception under Art. II, Sec. 18.03.05 for a recreational facility at 134 Pine Street, a.k.a. 136½ Pine Street, with the modifications as specified in Staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated November 6, 2017, to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

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

The reason for the approval is that the proposal meets the special exception criteria.

Mr. Prause agreed with Mr. Stebe that the application seems to meet all the special exception criteria; it is a suitable use for the location, it would not be a nuisance to the neighbors, and there is an existing parking lot with adequate space. As the location is an existing building, there will be no drag on public utilities, emergency access or environmental concerns, he reported.

Mr. Prause questioned the beautification and landscaping and whether the Commission could ensure that is completed.

Mr. Anderson agreed that there is no specific plan. He supposed Staff could request the landscaping be included on the plan that will be submitted. The Cheney Commission discussed the landscaping, and he asked several times if they had other items to add to the recommendation. He reported the Cheney Commission did not include anything in the recommendations.

Mr. Kennedy noted his only issue is that the Planning Commission could have discussed it during the Public Hearing with the applicant.

Mr. Stebe echoed Mr. Kennedy's statement. He understood from the public hearing that the applicant will be cleaning and maintaining the landscaping, not necessarily adding or rearranging landscaping.

DARRELL LUPACCHINO – To remove fill and stabilize slope in response to Notice of Violation, and request a jurisdictional ruling regarding the agricultural use of the regulated area at 555 Lydall Street. - Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-090); Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-090); Request Jurisdictional Ruling (2017-097)

Mr. Darrell Lupacchino, Akita Acres Farm, 555 Lydall Street, introduced himself. Mr. Lupacchino reported that he proposes to protect and remediate the area depicted on the site plan. He described the area highlighted on the plan and said that it is outside the wetlands area, but is in the regulated upland review area. Due to the current stability of the area and lack of disruption to the intermediate water course, the improved slope and nothing causing pollution, Mr. Lupacchino proposes to leave that highlighted area unchanged. He reported that he plans to terminate any other additional filling, grading or leveling of that site, and remove any material deposited on the lower portion of that site.

Mr. Lupacchino explained that will be done from the top of the upland review area with a tractor and pull-chain; he will not be entering the wetland area with heavy equipment. He proposed to remove the tree stumps, pieces of asphalt and a piece of concrete. Along the highlighted slope area, he reported, there are four trees in excess of four inches and he will remove the wood chips accumulated around the trees and pull them back so the material does not girdle the trees. He will also install erosion control at the base of the bank, which will be hay bales spiked in place with wooden stakes. The current wooded condition of the slope in the wetland area will be maintained, he described, and all mature trees will stay in place. Mr. Lupacchino explained that he will leave approximately 4" of wood chips in place on the bank as they will be less

susceptible to erosion than if the slope were loamed and seeded. He would like to loam and seed the flat part of the upland review area. Mr. Lupacchino pointed to the site plan and described the lower rotational pasture, which is where the leveling occurred. As explained to Mr. Bordeaux at the site inspection on August 29th, the cleanup and leveling of that site was done in order to utilize the upper flat area, he reported, as he never had any intent to move the livestock into the wetlands or onto the slope of the area. He described using round pen panels in the lower rotational pasture to prevent eroding any one particular area as the panels are moved constantly. Mr. Lupacchino reminded the Commission that he is seeking a jurisdictional ruling on Sec. 3.1 of the Inland Wetlands Regulations to allow him to use the lower rotational pasture.

Mr. Stebe questioned where the spiked hay bales will be used.

Mr. Lupacchino described his proposal, though he acknowledged that he will be working closely with Mr. Bordeaux throughout the process and will follow his recommendations. He depicted on the site plan where the spiked bales will be placed as an additional layer of protection for the wetlands area below.

Mr. Stebe asked if there is a barrier or berm at the top of the slope where the pasture is.

Mr. Lupacchino explained that the area is similar to a berm.

Mr. Stebe inquired where the lower pasture drains, or if it seeps into the soil.

Mr. Lupacchino reported that rain water drains very well into the soil. He noted there is a tremendous amount of gravel in the soil to enable drainage.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that Mr. Lupacchino's activity was brought to his attention in May or June. He noted that there was never a direct fill in the water course or the lower wetland area, and the notice of violation required the processing of an application rather than a cease and desist to remediate the activity. Mr. Bordeaux felt that, due to the nature of the fill placed, it could be left without an effect on the water course. His original plan after the first visit to the site was to withdraw all the wood chips and then loam and seed the exposed area. After discussing that plan further with the Assistant Town Engineer, it did not make sense under a tree canopy on a steep bank without engineered slope stabilization, which would be more work than necessary to provide a stable situation. Mr. Bordeaux said that mulch material is used in slope stabilization as a best management practice. In his opinion, the area could be cleaned this fall and he recommends seeding in the spring during growing season as the area is under a tree canopy currently. He reported that he will be in contact with the applicant when activity begins, though he will have to revisit hay bales at the base of the brook as the wood chips are stable.

Mr. Prause referred to Mr. Bordeaux's original memo noting concern that the wood chips might absorb and retain moisture, which may compromise the integrity of the tree bark, leading the trees to rot and die, and the death of the trees on the embankment could cause the slopes to fail. Mr. Prause questioned whether the revised plan of wood chips is preferable or if there will still be a risk of the trees rotting.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that part of the plan is to hand rake away the wood chips around the base of the tree. If the bark becomes saturated, it can lead to rot and death of the tree, he explained. This can cause accelerated erosion, which would be worse than the current situation, he said. Regarding the jurisdictional ruling, the lower pasture area is used for rotational grazing for the applicant's livestock. Although it is unrelated to the request for jurisdictional ruling, the improvement of the lower area with loam and seed is because he rotates the livestock in that area. Pointing to Sec. 3.1 of the regulations, Mr. Bordeaux noted that grazing is the first noted item permitted as an as of right activity, so he recommended the activity be allowed, and no application would be necessary going forward.

Mr. Prause reiterated that Mr. Bordeaux finds the activity does not require a permit.

Mr. Bordeaux concurred because that is how the regulations are written.

Ms. Ike stated that in the Notice of Violation, it mentioned that the fill material extends into the adjacent property. She questioned how that will be addressed.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that, because the fill did exceed the property boundary, which was not intentional, and as it occurs in the regulated area, it needs to be withdrawn as part of the plan. Therefore, permission from the adjacent property owner is required, he reported.

Ms. Ike reiterated that the applicant does not have permission at this time.

Mr. Bordeaux reported it is not part of the application.

Ms. Ike questioned whether it would have to be noted.

Ms. Bertotti said the Inland Wetlands Agency must set up a Remediation Order for the applicant, which can be presented to the adjacent property owner so that the applicant can ask permission to access the site and execute the plan. Without Agency's action, the applicant would have nothing to present to the neighbor to ask permission to work on the property, she explained. All the activities are regulated, she related, so the applicant must obtain a permit.

Mr. Kennedy stated that presumably if the applicant were not able to obtain permission from the neighbor, he would have to come back to the Commission for a modification of the permit.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that was correct. As it would still be a permit, there could be a new request, he noted.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-090)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to find the proposed activity at the above-referenced location as shown on the inland wetlands permit application 2017-090 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and, therefore, will not require a public hearing. Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Mr. Prause requested clarification from Staff that there are two separate permits at the same address.

Mr. Bordeaux replied that the permit for remediation requires a determination of significant impact and a decision on the permit itself. Separately, at the same address, in the same regulated area, there is a separate request for a jurisdiction ruling to have the livestock graze in that area.

Mr. Prause reiterated that there are two separate activities.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-090)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the inland wetlands permit to remove fill and stabilize the slope in response to the Notice of Violation at 555 Lydall Street. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity will remediate fill in the regulated upland review area and mitigate potential impacts to a regulated resource.

The approval is valid for five years. Removal of fill shall occur before year's end and loam and seed shall be installed during the spring 2018 growing season.

Jurisdictional Ruling (2017-097)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to find that the proposed operation and use (grazing) shall be permitted in the upland review area, as of right, and that no permit is required to conduct this activity in accordance with Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations Sec. 3.1.(a). Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Correspondence

Ms. Bertotti noted that she had e-mailed the Commission correspondence received from Ms. Fish, who was present at the meeting. She reported Ms. Fish's concerns regarding signs. Ms. Fish, as an avid walker, notices signs that are out of compliance with the recently-adopted regulations, Ms. Bertotti explained. She stated that Ms. Fish has been in contact with the Zoning Enforcement Officer. According to Ms. Fish, Ms. Bertotti reported, the Zoning Enforcement Officer has enforced a number of her complaints, though after his request to address the sign, after some time the business restarts use of the unpermitted sign.

Ms. Bertotti noted that, as she understood it, the nature of the problem as Ms. Fish views it is that Zoning Enforcement lacks the follow through under the ordinance allowing fines.

Mr. Kennedy questioned whether this refers to violations or pre-existing nonconforming uses.

Ms. Bertotti replied that she is unsure. Staff has a list from Mr. Davis highlighting some of the signs, she reported, and those are violations with existing or past enforcement actions. She

assumed he had not looked into all signs on the list, though he may not have received complaints against all the properties.

Mr. Prause noted that Ms. Fish pointed out Art. IV, Sec. 13, stating that novelty signs are allowed only for a short period of time. He questioned whether that has been defined.

Ms. Bertotti reminded the Commission that novelty signs were the gist of the entire regulation amendment. Novelty signs are allowed for a specific period of time, she described, one per business, and limited to a certain sign area to be displayed for a specific number of days per year. The regulation is very specific about the time the signs are allowed as well as the number a business may have, she noted.

Mr. Prause questioned how the Zoning Enforcement Officer makes that assessment.

Mr. Anderson surmised it is not easily enforced; i.e., how many days a sign has been up. That is one of the challenges, he explained. If there has been a complaint about a sign, that may be tracked, according to Mr. Anderson.

Ms. Bertotti explained that the ZEO issues permits. Novelty signs require sign permits, she stated, and that information is entered into a spreadsheet.

Another question, Mr. Anderson posed, is whether flashing “open” signs are intended to be regulated by the regulations.

Mr. Kennedy did not recall that subject being part of the discussion.

Ms. Bertotti reported that she did not remember “open” signs being part of the discussion. The zoning regulations have a section that prohibits flashing signs, and presumably they are not allowed, she said.

Mr. Anderson expressed that in reading the regulation, they are not allowed.

Mr. Kennedy commented that “open” signs were not specifically addressed. He noted that if the Commission allowed them, that would require a carve-out, but he said he did not recall that being part of the discussion.

Mr. Stebe interjected there was a brief discussion of that topic in one of the workshops. Mr. Pellegrini addressed scrolling signs, he reported. At that time, Mr. Stebe stated, Mr. Bergin had asked, if the sign is not in the window but next to the window, if that counts. That was the extent of that discussion, he conveyed, and there was no real answer. Mr. Stebe does recall the blinking lights were addressed prior to the amendment. Again, Mr. Bergin had discussed the liquor store lights for the various brand names, he reported, which are technically inside the building and not subject to the regulation.

Mr. Prause recalled a gas station that planned on changing the prices depending on whether a patron had a membership card, and Mr. Pellegrini questioned whether that should be addressed as the sign would have been changing constantly.

Ms. Bertotti related that the gas station sign was denied by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Anderson questioned enforcement. He reported that he has an upcoming meeting with the Town Attorney and noted the subject of enforcement is to be addressed. As Ms. Bertotti mentioned, a citation ordinance had been reviewed previously and perhaps that should be addressed, as the ZEO would prefer to take more action than writing the letter, he stated.

Ms. Bertotti reiterated the question of whether the Commission would like to take any action in response to Ms. Fish's letter. She questioned whether the Commission would like to take time to review this subject, schedule a conversation at some point, or, in view of the recent amendment to the sign regulations, deem that this does not call for another conversation.

Mr. Stebe questioned Mr. Anderson about the scope of the discussion he will have with the Town Attorney.

Mr. Anderson stated the scope of the discussion for the upcoming meeting is how to better enforce the zoning issues that are typically difficult to enforce. The signs will be brought into the discussion, he explained, though signs are not the basis of the discussion. The meeting will center on how the Town can enforce zoning regulations with the current staffing, the scheduled hours and the current tools, he explained. Mr. Anderson plans to examine whether there are other tools outside of the toolbox that the Town may need to explore.

Mr. Stebe stated that he would be interested in a synopsis of that upcoming meeting.

Mr. Kennedy noted that, strictly speaking, the Commission writes the regulations, but enforcement is outside of the Commission's purview. In his opinion, the matter comes down to resources. If the Town had enough staff to work many hours, enforcement would be much easier, Mr. Kennedy asserted, but that is not available at this time. The regulations can always be revised if businesses believe they are causing a problem in some way or another, he maintained, but they would have to come to the Commission.

Mr. Anderson addressed the staffing issue. The Town has one ZEO, it is a large town, and there is nobody to enforce the regulations when the ZEO is not available, he said.

Mr. Prause thanked Ms. Fish for the work she had done. He stated that it is a good letter and he agreed with the substance of the letter. As Mr. Kennedy said, the Commission sets the regulations and did so recently, and they are appropriate at this time, Mr. Prause declared. It may be something to pass to the Board of Directors, he suggested, and they may determine it is an issue and requires an ordinance, but they should be made aware of this matter.

Mr. Anderson reported that he had a number of topics to discuss briefly. He wanted to inform the Commission about items that are in the pipeline and some that Staff is reviewing, as well as receive feedback on other matters.

Solar Regulations

Mr. Anderson explained that the solar regulations are ready to be filed. He will have one more discussion with the Cheney Commission about how this will be handled in the Historic zone. He reported he will have that meeting next week and, soon after, the solar regulations will be filed.

Farms and Agriculture

Mr. Anderson questioned whether the previously-discussed workshop date has been set.

Mr. Bordeaux reported that the workshop will be on November 20th.

Ms. Bertotti indicated that the December 7th meeting will not be necessary as there will be a workshop on November 20th.

Mr. Anderson said that Staff is in the process of or has already invited the agricultural community to be part of the conversation. He explained that the intent is for a preliminary conversation rather than specific ideas to be identified.

Overlay Zone

The subject was brought to the Commission and Staff's attention, Mr. Anderson reported, primarily because of a current project on Main Street near North Main Street. The question was whether the Town has design control over that particular location and why the rehabilitation was allowed to commence without design control. Mr. Anderson explained that the short answer is that Depot Square was removed from the Design Overlay zone proposal when it came out. There were subsequent discussions or public hearings about expanding the overlay zone, he described, and it may be time to review the overlay zone and whether that tool can be used where design is important. Mr. Anderson stated that his understanding is that at times the Commission has expressed a desire to be able to review sign design and have not been able to, and questioned whether the Commission would like to address this.

Mr. Prause stated that the Commission's history with the Design Overlay zone has been that when an area has a unique character, the Town would try to keep that area intact. The other areas in town that have been looked at do not have a cohesive appearance, he reported, making it difficult to find examples of what must be met. That is why the areas have been limited, though the Commission did review the Depot Square area in the past, he explained, but backed off due to response from the businesses.

Mr. Anderson surmised that that is one topic to hold off on. He questioned the topic of signs and whether the Commission would prefer to have purview over this area. Currently, the

Commission's oversight includes changes to buildings and view from the street, but signs are not mentioned.

Ms. Bertotti affirmed that the Design Overlay zone limits what the Commission is allowed to review to changes to buildings, new buildings, and building additions.

Again, it is a balance between being business-friendly and addressing aesthetics, Mr. Anderson noted.

Mr. Kennedy expressed that, with the recent revision to the sign regulations, the Commission should not add anything new for the Design Overlay zone.

Notification Procedures

Mr. Anderson reported that he had a conversation with Ms. Bertotti and the Town Attorney about adding additional abutters to the Planning Department's abutters lists. The consensus was that that can be addressed procedurally, he stated, and the Department is pursuing that.

Mr. Stebe requested clarification about additional abutters and the next step in that process.

Mr. Anderson reported that, internally, the Planning Department can add another ring of abutters. There was discussion about notifying abutters and abutters to abutters, he reiterated, and GIS can be utilized. He stated that is another group that will be notified, though that will never solve all the notification issues. Mr. Anderson reminded the Commission that there has to be a standard. He reminded the Commission that the Planning Department does more than the statute requires.

Mr. Prause asked if that is covered by a Department policy or if that is something from the regulations.

Mr. Anderson related that there are rules of procedure for the department. Those will be changed, he noted, and letters will be sent to the additional group.

Mr. Prause agreed that the abutters to abutters method was discussed, as well as a set foot radius.

Mr. Anderson concurred and questioned whether the Commission had an opinion.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the Commission had suggested notifying additional abutters within a 500 ft. radius because of the concern about huge pieces of property.

Mr. Anderson questioned the Commission's opinion.

Mr. Kennedy suggested notifying abutters up to 500 ft.

There has also been discussion about publishing the agendas to Manchester Matters, Mr. Anderson reminded the Commission. Another idea is to forward the future agenda to the Board

of Directors, Mr. Anderson stated, not in terms of the specific applications but a general idea of what is upcoming.

Mr. Anderson reported that Ms. Bertotti is continuing her research regarding signs.

Ms. Bertotti explained that she has not completed the information regarding signs. She stated that she will send the Commission members the information she has accumulated thus far.

Downtown related items

There has been discussion about revising the design guidelines downtown, according to Mr. Anderson, as they have not been revisited since 1991. He explained that this will be reflected in his budget request this year, hopefully in partnership with the Special Services District and downtown businesses.

Mr. Anderson related that there is new terminology that the Planning Department tries to keep abreast of, such as art studio design, maker spaces, and creative uses. He plans to review the regulations and determine where language could be added to ensure that art-related activities can continue, as currently individuals can create products to sell in a retail environment.

Mr. Anderson explained that “places of worship” are defined by the building, i.e., a place of worship is a place where worship regularly occurs. More and more, he related, religious groups are looking to meet in spaces that were not necessarily built for religious purposes. He questioned whether the Town is unnecessarily prohibiting groups from meeting in spaces that were meant for meetings by saying they are places of worship. Downtown, for example, there are the Army & Navy Club, the Elks Club, and locations where people are holding meetings, he explained. Mr. Anderson questioned whether it would make sense to allow temporary meetings of any kind, religious uses or not.

Mr. Stebe questioned what would stop a private owner with a large hall space from allowing an individual to hold religious meetings currently.

Mr. Anderson reported that, based on his conversations with the Zoning Enforcement Officer, that would be classified as a place of worship by regulation.

Mr. Stebe assumed it is because the space is used for one meeting.

Ms. Bertotti replied it was not for one meeting. If a space is hired for a place of worship on a regular basis, she noted, then it becomes a place of worship.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the real issue for places of worship is parking. It may make sense to not separate out religious meetings from secular meetings; there may even be constitutional dimension in that regard, he surmised.

Mr. Anderson responded that the parking comment is true. Downtown has an abundance of parking, he explained.

Mr. Prause referred to downtown sign approvals that are entered administratively between him and Mr. Anderson. For most minor plan alterations, if Mr. Prause and Mr. Anderson do not approve, the proposals go automatically to the Planning and Zoning Commission as a plan modification, he said. However, specifically for the downtown signs, there is no appeal process currently, and there has been discussion about adding language to the regulations that would allow applicants to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals if a sign is denied.

Mr. Anderson responded that that can be done before the downtown design guidelines revisions. He sought clarification from Mr. Prause that he was stating that the denial would be appealed to the Zoning Board of Appeals, not to this Commission.

Mr. Prause stated that it could go either way and questioned how the members of the Commission felt. Currently, signs are reviewed by himself and Mr. Anderson, he said. If they agree, it is approved; if not, there is no path for appeal.

Mr. Anderson said it is something that can be discussed.

Mr. Stebe referred to Eleganza Moda, which was not a large enough issue to hit the entire Planning and Zoning Commission to be handled administratively. He reported it would be an appeal of an interpretation of a zoning regulation, in his opinion.

Mr. Kennedy disagreed, stating it would not be an appeal of a Zoning Officer's enforcement decision. He said it is similar to a plan coming before the Commission to determine if it meets the regulations; many things are submitted to Planning that clearly meet the regulations and are administratively approved. Mr. Kennedy disclosed that, if the plan is arguable, whether or not it meets the regulations, the matter should go to Planning and Zoning. In the appellate function of the ZBA, for example, the Zoning Enforcement Officer issues a Cease & Desist Order and it is appealed to the ZBA. It is comparable to a site plan, he stated.

Mr. Prause stated that was the ZBA's opinion. He stated that when he spoke with the ZBA, they questioned whether the ZEO enforced the decision correctly, and they could not make a decision on meeting the regulations. Generally, Mr. Prause explained, the ZBA's scope is looking at zoning enforcement issues.

Manchester 2020

Mr. Anderson reported that this has been discussed and over the summer, Staff updated a matrix of the upcoming plans. The Staff brainstormed everything done in recent years since the plan was approved that addresses those actions, he explained. Mr. Anderson stated it is impressive, in his opinion, to look at what has been addressed. He relayed that it is easy to point to what has not been done. What Staff does on a daily basis, including Public Works and other departments, address much of what was recommended in that plan, he stated. Mr. Anderson said he will be drafting a formal report for the Commission to review in order to set priorities. He reported that the Planning Department is changing the Performance Measures to directly address how many objectives have been reviewed on a quarterly basis.

Business/Industrial Zone Updated Terms and Uses: Clarify new terms that may be undefined.

Mr. Anderson stated that he has asked Mr. Shiel to review the Business and Industrial zones to see if there are newer terms that may be undefined, i.e., technology businesses, bioscience, and those that were not thought of when Planning defined the regulations.

Doggy Daycare

A variance was recently granted for a doggy daycare on Tolland Turnpike, Mr. Anderson explained, and there was a recent inquiry for the same type of business. He noted that doggy daycare is not defined in the regulations.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the Town should have a definition and referred to Camp Bow Wow in South Windsor, which is in an area of mixed general commercial and industrial, and has never caused a problem. The idea that the Town is handling these businesses by variances is ridiculous, he said.

Mr. Anderson concurred and stated that Staff will work on that.

Ms. Scorso questioned whether doggy daycare encompasses boarding.

Mr. Anderson questioned whether there is a kennel regulation.

Ms. Bertotti stated that the Town does not have a kennel regulation. The Town does not either define or allow commercial kennels, she reported, but they are all use variances.

Mr. Prause assumed they can only be in the Rural Residence zone.

Ms. Bertotti said she does not believe they are permitted anywhere, and they are subject to use variances. The recently approved doggy daycare did not include overnight boarding, she explained.

Mr. Anderson agreed that what is allowed should certainly be defined.

Historic Mill Conversion: Expansion to Other Districts?

Ms. Bertotti reminded the Commission that they had spoken about this subject in a workshop addressing several properties in town that need some attention. She explained that an individual purchased the Hanshaw Furniture property and there is an interest in converting the building to a residential building. However, the site is quite limited and located in a Special Design Commercial zone, which does not allow residential use, she explained, especially a stand-alone residential use. The PRD zone regulations, Ms. Bertotti stated, do not fit either the site or the use. The Planning Department recommended the applicant review the historic mill conversion regulations to see if that would fit their use, she noted. Ms. Bertotti reported that Planning would probably include more than that one site, but she is waiting to see if there is something in the regulations that needs to be tweaked to fit this use.

Mr. Anderson questioned whether there are other topics that have not been addressed in this meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

September 6, 2017 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

September 18, 2017 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

October 2, 2017 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:

1. **TOWN OF MANCHESTER – Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-092)** – For dredging of Center Springs Pond at 99 Edgerton Street.
2. **TRUSTEES OF NORTH METHODIST CHURCH – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2017-098); Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-098); Resubdivision (2017-099); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-100)** – For resubdivision of two parcels into five lots with reconstruction of existing roadway at 40 and 41 Farmington Street.
3. **EL REINO UN MINISTERIO NUEVO – Special Exception (2017-101)** – For a place of worship in the lower level of an existing tenant space at 485 Hartford Road.
4. **CHURCH OF PENTECOST, INC. – Special Exception Modification (2017-102)** – To establish church activities in the existing basement for use by the congregation after church hours at 748 Tolland Turnpike.

Ms. Bertotti explained that the Planning Department has cleared the agenda for November 20th for a workshop. However, an applicant for the current public hearing did not attend, and the 65 day deadline to open a public hearing on that application would be shortly after November 20th. She and Mr. Anderson discussed the situation and agreed that Ms. Bertotti will reach out to the applicant to ensure that they attend the next meeting. At the very minimum, she noted, Planning will receive an extension for the Commission for the November meeting and move the public hearing to December. Ms. Bertotti reported that the December agenda is full and she would prefer to hold that one hearing in November, followed immediately by the workshop. She recommended that the item be removed from the agenda.

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy made a motion to move ORANGE HALL CORP. – To allow a place of worship at 72 East Center Street- Special Exception (2017-083) from the November 6th meeting to the November 20th agenda. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:33 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

December 11, 2017

Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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