

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 6, 2017**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman  
Michael Stebe, Secretary  
Timothy Bergin

Alternate Members Sitting: Julian Stoppelman  
Patrick Kennedy

Absent: Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman  
Jessica Scorso  
Teresa Ike

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

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing at 7:07 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice for the application when the call was made.

GERALD M. CATOLANE – For a 2-lot resubdivision at 98 Bush Hill Road – Resubdivision (2017-051)

Attorney Stephen Penny, Manchester, CT spoke on behalf of the applicant. Attorney Penny described the subject property and the boundaries. In keeping with the subject parcel, he explained, the entire area is zoned Rural Residence; neither public water nor sewer is available to the site. He explained that the property is owned by the applicant and a copy of the deed is in the Planning Department file. Attorney Penny noted that the parcel is currently developed with the applicant's own single-family home. He described wetlands on the site; however, the wetlands are on the site of the existing residence, and will not be disturbed by the creation of this lot, he said.

Taking a broad overview of the subdivision, Attorney Penny stated, the applicant is requesting a two-lot subdivision, with the original rear lot being one lot and another lot at the end of Martin's Manor. He explained that the applicant is seeking subdivision approval for the two lots, both to accommodate single-family residences. The lots are consistent with Art. II, Sec. 2.01.01 of the Rural Residence zone regulations, and the development would match the existing surrounding development, he stated. Attorney Penny stated that access to the new lot would be via a cul-de-sac at the end of Martin's Manor.

Both lots meet the dimensional requirements of the regulations of the Rural Residence zone, Attorney Penny noted, which require the minimum lot area to be at least 30,000 sq. ft. for a

single-family house. In this case, the lots are 194,802 sq. ft. and 62,219 sq. ft., he said. Attorney Penny explained that the existing lot is a rear lot with 289 ft. of frontage, and Lot 2 would also have 289 ft. of frontage, measured at the building line. He stated that no lots are permitted on a cul-de-sac in Manchester unless the regulations allow measurement of the lot frontage at the building line. Attorney Penny reported that this methodology is permitted in the definition of lot frontage set forth in Art. I, Sec. 2 of the regulations. Interestingly, he noted, the Commission approved utilizing the methodology of measuring the frontage at the building line in two cul-de-sac fronting lots of the seven lots in the Olivia Estate subdivision on North Main Street.

In summary, Attorney Penny stated that the applicant is requesting the Commission make a finding that the measurement of lot frontage at the building line at Lot 2 is appropriate in this circumstance.

Mr. Andrew Bushnell, Project Engineer and Land Surveyor, Bushnell Associates, 563 Woodbridge Street, Manchester, introduced himself. Mr. Bushnell demonstrated and explained the topography of the site. As Attorney Penny mentioned, he said, there is a wetland area that cuts through the property, though he characterized it as an intermittent water course. There are no public utilities in the area and the homes in the area are served by on-site septic systems and on-site wells, he said. Mr. Bushnell reported there were test holes performed with the Town of Manchester Health Department, both for the existing house to show the area for reserve, and also the proposed lot. He also reported there is an on-site well proposed on the lot with a 75 ft. radius. Mr. Bushnell demonstrated the site plan and proposed improvements. He noted there will be no traffic impact from the single-family home.

Mr. Stebe pointed to the 75 ft. well radius for the proposed subdivision. The radius is showing 45, but there is no radius showing 36, he noted.

Mr. Bushnell explained that the revised plan demonstrates that information.

Attorney Penny discussed open space. As indicated by Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner, in her memo, for parcels of land larger than five acres (the subject property is 5.9 acres), Sec. 4.07 of the Subdivision Regulations requires that the applicant dedicate no less than 10% of the total land area to the Town as public open space, or pay a fee in lieu thereof, he stated. The regulations require that the dedicated land abut a street or have direct access to the street through a 20 ft. wide right-of-way dedicated to public use, he explained, and may require an area for the parking of vehicles to serve such public access. Attorney Penny stated that the relatively small size of the subject parcel, its configuration, the lack of direct access to a street or room for parking, the fact that it is mostly surrounded by single-family residences, the presence of significant open space in the form of Manchester Land Conservation Trust land in the immediate area, and, as highlighted by the Senior Planner, the relative amount of wetlands and upland review area on the subject parcel, all militate in favor of a fee in lieu of a dedication of land for open space. He requested that the Commission find this to be the case.

In conclusion, Attorney Penny reiterated that there are no outstanding staff comments that would preclude an approval, the project design meets all the criteria of the zoning and subdivision regulations, and the proposal is compatible with the lot sizes, frontages and Rural Residence zone, single-family character of the area.

Mr. Prause requested clarification as to open space. He pointed out that the applicant has land abutting the Land Trust land, and wondered if it would make sense to dedicate 10% of the land to open space.

Attorney Penny responded that the applicant would not be able to do that and meet the technical requirements of dedicated open space land, and dedicating land to open space does not make sense from a physical standpoint.

Ms. Bertotti stated that Staff has reviewed the application and there are three Staff members with outstanding comments. She reported that Ms. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, commented on the first set of plans, which has since been reviewed, and Staff will be looking at the revised plan. Ms. Handfield's comments, at the first revision, were minor and technical in nature and she would recommend approval subject to the plan modifications, she noted. Ms. Bertotti referred to a second comment from the Chief Sanitarian, who requested that septic systems and wells on abutting properties be delineated on the plan; this is also a plan modification that can easily be accomplished, she said. Thirdly, she said, Matthew Bordeaux, Environmental Planner, made a comment regarding erosion and sedimentation control during construction of the single-family residence. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control Certification application was not filed with the current application, signifying that, according to the engineers, there is less than a half-acre of disturbance, which eliminates that requirement, she stated. Ms. Bertotti explained that the area has been subjected to erosion during construction of the subdivision, and Staff has advised the applicants that it would be prudent to implement erosion controls regardless of the fact that it is not necessary to get the plan certified.

Ms. Bertotti reported that she and the Environmental Planner looked into the open space provision and agreed that payment in lieu of open space dedication would be the best option. She reminded the Commission that the motion is drafted to allow the frontage of the proposed lot to be measured at the building line; if the Commission finds that not appropriate, a subdivision cannot be approved, she said.

Mr. Prause asked if the Town agrees with the interpretation that the applicant presented about the lot line.

Ms. Bertotti agreed that the lot frontage can be measured at the building line and the Commission has the jurisdiction over where it can be measured. The Commission recently allowed the same in another subdivision, she said.

Mr. Prause questioned whether the existing DeSouza subdivision has been completed to plan.

Ms. Bertotti replied that, though she is not certain, in her opinion the subdivision has been built entirely.

Mr. Prause reported that, when driving in the area, he did not note any open lots for construction.

Ms. Bertotti stated she was under the impression that the entire development was built.

Mr. Prause opened the meeting to the public and there was no one in attendance to speak.

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to close the public hearing on this application. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

CHR CAPITAL, INC. AND COMMUNITY HEALTH RESOURCES, INC. - For a 13-unit multi-family residential building and a single-family home at 698 and 694 North Main Street, and 50, 51, 60, 70, and 71 Kathleen Way. – PRD Zone Combined Preliminary and Detailed Site Development Plan (2017-059)

Attorney Tim Hollister, Hartford, CT, introduced himself. Attorney Hollister noted that the applicants are fairly well-known in Manchester as the owners and operators of several residential programs and facilities. He noted there was procedural compliance with the published and mailed notices. Attorney Hollister thanked the Town Staff for their assistance in the process. He stated that the Commission should have all of the application materials.

Attorney Hollister stated that the application is for a combined preliminary and detailed site plan approval in a PRD zone for one building containing 13 residential units on 2.4 acres fronting on North Main Street. He explained that the site plan will merge six lots that were approved in 2011 and 2012 into one lot. The building would be accessed from the frontage of 694 North Main Street, he reported. Attorney Hollister reported that the seventh lot, 698 North Main Street, is proposed at this time to remain a single-family home, not part of the CHR residential program.

Attorney Hollister pointed out that the application is not for a zone change. The property was rezoned to PRD in 2011, he relayed, and the Commission has been provided with the minutes from the 2011 meeting. The rezoning at that time was not conditional; this is not a floating zone, Attorney Hollister conveyed. Multi-family use is a permitted use as of right in the PRD zone, he related. He read from the regulations at Art. II Sec. 7.01.01, “A PRD is a medium density residential district” that “allows a mixture of various types of housing including multi-family;” at 7.01.02, “A PRD zone shall be established with a view toward conserving the value of buildings, encouraging the most appropriate use of land and the reasonable consideration of the character of the neighborhood;” and at 7.05.01, “Approval of a preliminary site development plan shall establish a planned residential zone.” Attorney Hollister emphasized that the application is for a site plan and, therefore, the Commission’s review is to determine compliance with the objective standards stated in the regulations at Art. II Sec. 7.02.03 for multi-family dwellings and 7.04 for site development.

There have been several rounds of Staff reviews, Attorney Hollister mentioned, and there have been no reviews stating that the site plan does not comply with any section of the zoning regulations. He stated the Connecticut Supreme Court has explained the nature of a site plan and it is not a review of the site plan. Attorney Hollister referred to an important court case, TLC Development, from 1990, which he read into the record:

“The use of site plans in zoning matters is authorized by General Statutes 8-3g. It provides in part ‘The Zoning regulations may require that a site plan be filed with the Commission to aid in determining the conformity of a proposed building use or structure with specific provisions of such regulations. A site plan may be modified or denied only if it fails to comply with requirements already set forth in the zoning regulations.’

Furthermore, with respect to the reasons based on off-site traffic considerations, the Commission's decision was inconsistent with the fact that the plaintiff's application was for site plan approval of a use that conceivably was already fully permitted under the zoning regulations. This being the case, the result here comports with our earlier stated proposition, 'The designation of a particular use of property as a permitted use establishes a conclusive presumption that such use does not adversely affect the district and precludes further inquiry into its effect on traffic, municipal services, property values or the general harmony of the district.'"

Attorney Hollister related that the PRD regulations provide for a preliminary and detailed site plan. Back in 2011, the Commission reviewed the PRD in conjunction with a preliminary site plan for a single-family subdivision, and there is an application process to change that, he reported. Attorney Hollister reiterated that the applicant is pursuing a permitted use and if the application meets the regulations, the applicant is entitled to an approval.

Attorney Hollister reported that, in January 2017, CHR made a preliminary inquiry with the Zoning Enforcement Officer, Mr. James Davis, who issued a letter confirming that a multi-family use in one building is a permitted use in the PRD zone. In February 2017, he reminded the Commission, there was a pre-application meeting based on CHR's agreements to purchase just five of the lots involved, with the proposed building being accessed by Kathleen Way. At that meeting, concerns were raised regarding that access and the relationship between the CHR program and the single-family homes on North Main Street, Kathleen Way, and Carolyn Lane, Attorney Hollister stated. In response to those concerns, he reported, the applicant put under contract 694 and 698 North Main Street, making the frontage lots on North Main Street, resulting in a revised site plan with access only to North Main Street, and making the temporary cul-de-sac on Kathleen Way permanent.

Attorney Hollister explained the proposed use, a permanent supportive house comprised of 13 units, which breaks down to 12 residential units and one unit for a 24/7 program supervisor on site. The target range is ages 18 to 24, currently homeless, he noted. The program is not transitional or transient housing, alcohol or drug addiction recovery services, Department of Children and Family placement, or Department of Correction placement, he said.

Attorney Hollister also reported that the applicant is requesting a waiver of visitor parking spaces, as the residents will not likely have vehicles. Even at 26 spaces, as required by the regulations, the site has far more parking than its resident population and supervising staff will ever need, he explained.

Mr. Will Walter, Professional Engineer, BSC Group, Glastonbury, CT, introduced himself. Mr. Walter reported that he has been licensed as a Professional Engineer since 2003 in Connecticut and practicing since that time. He displayed the proposed site plan and noted there are no wetlands on the site. The site was previously approved as a seven-lot subdivision, he explained, and the cul-de-sac, Kathleen Way, is a temporary cul-de-sac. Mr. Walter demonstrated the main, only entrance off North Main Street, 24-foot wide per regulations, leading to a one-way circulation in a counterclockwise manner. He showed that the building would be situated on the back of the property, and pointed to sidewalks, drop-off areas, and parking. Mr. Walter

reiterated Attorney Hollister's point that there are 26 parking spaces and two handicapped spaces that are required with 26 parking spaces. Considering the 12 residences and supervisor, visitors and minimal deliveries, there will be more than enough parking, he noted. The traffic impact from this application will be minimal, and will certainly be less than would be generated by the seven single-family lots that are currently approved.

Mr. Walter informed the Commission that water and sanitary will come from North Main Street and natural gas and power will be extended to the site through the Kathleen Way right-of-way. There will be an access and utility easement, he said. The drive and turning radius has been designed for emergency vehicle access, he noted, which has been reviewed by the Fire Department. Mr. Walter described the landscaping and explained that the real focus of the landscaping will be on screening and buffering adjacent to the residences. The existing landscaping will be supplemented with shrubs that will grow to six to eight feet, which will be under-story screening for the large trees currently on the site, he said, in addition to several species of evergreens that will grow to 30 to 35 feet tall with screening from the top to the bottom.

Mr. Walter described the lighting as 12-foot high light poles, shoebox full cut-off downward, which will not project light onto the residences or into the sky. Storm water management has been designed in conformance with Town standards, he stated, and the Town Engineer has accepted the design. The building and impervious coverage is within the requirements of Zoning, Mr. Walter reported.

Mr. Walter reported there have been two to three working sessions with Town Staff after submitting the original application, and the applicant has responded to all comments. The plan set in the Commission's possession is fully approved by the Town Staff from a technical perspective, he said.

Ms. Susan O'Dell, Architect with Paul Bailey Architects in New Haven, Connecticut, introduced herself. Ms. O'Dell provided the background of the architectural firm. The firm's previous experience in Manchester includes three other projects for CHR in the last seven years, which are grouped on Center Street, she noted. In addition, Ms. O'Dell reported, the firm is nearing completion of the rehabilitation of 375 housing units and a new community building at the Squire Village complex on Spencer Street.

Ms. O'Dell provided a 3-D rendering and explained that, in order to blend the building visually into the existing neighborhood, the firm worked to break down the scale of the building. She projected and explained the proposed building, the style of which will complement the overall massing, all of which are residential elements.

The interior floor plans were projected and described by Ms. O'Dell. She presented the site elevations, the front facing Main Street, the right side facing the industrial site, the rear elevation, and the left elevation, which faces Kathleen Way. Ms. O'Dell exhibited the tree line barrier and berm that will separate Kathleen Way from the property. The right-of-way will be cleared to allow the utility trenching, she explained, and will be planted once construction is finished.

Ms. O'Dell referred to what is allowed on the property and what the applicant is proposing. There is a 10 ft. side yard regulation on the property, she explained, which could result in a wall 10 ft. from Ms. Lanossa's property line. The proposed building will be 42 ft. off the property line, she stated. Ms. O'Dell disclosed the wall that could be 10 ft. from Ms. Lanossa's property line is allowed to be 40 ft. tall and three stories. The proposed building will be 27½ ft. tall and is two stories, she noted. In addition, she reported, the front yard is 450 ft. back from Main Street. She pointed out that there is a 35% maximum buildable area allowed on the lot; the applicant is building on 7%.

Ms. Heather Gates, President and CEO of Community Health Resources, introduced herself. She reported that CHR is the State's most comprehensive provider of mental health, substance use, and primary care services. CHR served more than 24,000 children, families and adults over the past year, she noted. Ms. Gates explained that CHR employs more than 800 staff from a variety of disciplines. In addition to treatment programs, CHR has extensive supportive housing services and foster care, she stated, and the services reach communities across more than half the state. Ms. Gates described a long history of serving Manchester and the surrounding communities, beginning in 1986 through the Genesis Center. Over the past year, she reported, CHR served 4,400 children, family and adults just from Manchester. CHR has also invested in the community by establishing its flagship office building and two supportive housing sites on Center Street. In addition, CHR has been a leader in the fight against the opiate dependent crisis, bringing new services to the area and saving lives as a result, she stated. Ms. Gates noted that CHR served more than 500 adults and families in supportive housing programs in 2016, throughout more than half the state.

Ms. Gates stated that, in an effort to address homelessness in the Manchester area, CHR is proposing an apartment building for young adults experiencing homelessness. The proposed site is on North Main Street and is convenient to the bus lines and other amenities, she explained. The apartment building, Promise House, she described, will include a modern, welcoming design that complements the neighborhood, with 12 efficiency units as well as a common area. Ms. Gates related that tenants can receive services from CHR to become self-sufficient through case management, job training, education, life skills and more. The goal is to increase their income and linkages to existing services, she explained. Potential tenants, Ms. Gates stated, are largely homeless as a result of challenges with their families, upbringings and their ability to sustain themselves economically.

Ms. Gates reported that all residents will meet the State's criteria for homelessness as well as the need for supportive services. Referrals will come from the Coordinated Access Network, she explained. Cases are reviewed and matched to a housing resource based on a common assessment tool, she described, put in place by the Department of Housing. Ms. Gates reported that tenants will have their own apartment and lease, and will be expected to follow all the rights and responsibilities of a lease. Tenants will pay no more than 30% of their monthly adjusted income for rent, she noted. Ms. Gates explained that some of the units will be subsidized and others will not. There is no age out, she described, as this will not be a transitional living facility. She stated that the 13<sup>th</sup> apartment will be for a house parent who will provide 24/7 on-site support and supervision of the tenants, which is a new model the Department of Housing has been researching and has requested as part of this proposal. Maintenance of the building will be

provided by a property management company, DeMarco Management Company, she explained. The residence will not be a work release program or house individuals referred from the Department of Corrections, she stated, and it will not be a drug and alcohol rehabilitation facility. Ms. Gates said the apartments are planned for young adults who are 18 and older.

Ms. Gates noted that CHR sent letters to some of the residents of Kathleen Way and North Main Street to introduce the development on August 28<sup>th</sup>, notifying neighbors of the public hearing and describing the proposal. She reported that she is more than willing to meet with any neighbor to address questions about the proposal.

Attorney Hollister enumerated the reasons for approval:

1. The proposal meets all the standards and requirements for a multi-family use in the PRD zone.
2. It is one multi-family building, which is less development, less density, less tree clearing, and less traffic than six single-family homes.
3. The building is well below the allowable limits for height coverage and stories.
4. Rezoning the PRD in 2011 as a matter of law conclusively establishes there will be no adverse impact on the neighborhood.
5. CHR has responded to the earlier concerns about protecting Kathleen Way.

As a matter of land use planning, Mr. Hollister reported, multi-family use often serves as a buffer between single-family neighborhoods and industrial or commercial uses, and the proposal serves that purpose.

Attorney Hollister described the building as well-designed with quality materials, and said that CHR is offering a program that addresses an important need in society. He noted that there were final engineering comments from September 1<sup>st</sup> that were reviewed and CHR is in complete agreement that those will be conditions of approval. Mr. Hollister summarized that CHR has worked very hard to further its mission, but to do so in a way that respects the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Stoppelman asked to view the individual apartments' layouts. Ms. O'Dell explained that they are efficiency apartments and meet the square footage requirements in the zoning regulations. She then displayed several floor plans. Attorney Hollister explained that the Commission has paper copies of the floor plans.

Mr. Stoppelman expressed to Ms. Gates that he was not on the Commission when CHR's first building on Center Street was approved. He understood there were objections from neighbors at that time. However, there were no objections to the second building on Center Street from the neighborhood, he stated. He questioned the relationship with the neighbors in the Center Street area. Ms. Gates stated the relationship has gone exceedingly well.

Ms. O'Dell disclosed that the minimum square footage for an efficiency is 400 sq. ft., and the efficiencies in the proposed building will be 450. The one bedroom minimum is 600 sq. ft., she stated, and that apartment will be well above that.

Mr. Prause requested clarification of the supportive housing aspect of the proposal. He asked if there will be a supportive housing counselor on site 24/7 in the one bedroom apartment. Ms. Gates stated the goal is to recruit a couple to reside on site 24/7, and there will also be a case manager on site to aid in life skills.

Mr. Prause reiterated Ms. Gates' statement that no one will be removed from the site until they are ready to move. He questioned the length of the typical stay. Ms. Gates explained that, in other supportive housing, the length varies quite a bit. However, the expectation is that individuals may live there for long periods of time, she stated, and the goal is to create a mixture to create stability within the complex.

Mr. Prause questioned the referral strategy and what input goes into that referral. Ms. Gates responded that State housing law must be followed in order to make a referral. The team that does it is not CHR; it is a group of providers and Department of Housing staff, she explained, who review referrals on an ongoing basis and make referrals to supportive housing all over the area.

Mr. Prause reiterated that this is not a substance abuse clinic and not related to DCF; however, he questioned what would drive the referral to this site. Ms. Gates explained there are several factors; i.e., community of origin and the degree to which they are homeless as a result of economics vs. another issue best addressed through another program. Homeless youth are one of the largest growing homeless populations, she stated, and it is economically driven, as this is an expensive state to live in, especially without family assistance.

Mr. Prause expressed that the CHR programs in this town have been very successful. However, this is the first time the Commission has reviewed a facility in close proximity to single-family homes. He questioned what State requirements need to be met.

Ms. Gates reported that, when developing property for offices, intensively-staffed residential programs or supportive housing, CHR seeks attractive locations and access to public transportation, and this site being located adjacent to an industrial area adds value by creating a better buffer. Having one building on this location, she explained, is preferable to the original approved site plan.

Mr. Bergin requested clarification about the parking waiver, and whether CHR is seeking to waive some of the 26 parking spaces featured, or if the site plan is in anticipation of approving the waiver. Mr. Hollister responded that the site plan is in anticipation of the waiver. Therefore, there are 26 spaces, but the four visitor spaces are not shown on the plan. Mr. Bergin reiterated that 30 spaces are required. Mr. Walter explained that zoning for the 13 units requires two per unit and four visitor spaces, bringing the total required number of parking spaces to 30. He noted that the Commission has the ability to waive the four visitor spaces, and 26 spaces would be significantly more than what would be needed.

Mr. Bergin accepted the premise that new tenants may not have vehicles, though while in supportive housing, the residents may progress to purchasing a vehicle. Mr. Walter replied that if each tenant and the supervising staff member had a vehicle, it would be 13 vehicles. He noted

that, even if most of the residents had vehicles, this project would generate less traffic than the originally approved seven single-family homes.

Ms. Gates reported that in other supportive housing, the number of cars is very small. Unlike a program with numerous staff, this design only has the house parent along with the case manager arriving. Ms. Gates reminded the Commission that there is generous parking for the efficiency apartment, two spaces for a 450 sq. ft. efficiency apartment.

Mr. Stoppelman asked whether it would be fair to assume that some tenants would be aging out of foster care, making them homeless. Ms. Gates responded that when aging out of foster care, individuals would enter another CHR program. Many of the prospective tenants are presently “couch-surfing” with friends or living on the streets.

Ms. Bertotti stated that Staff reviewed the application and currently there are two staff members with outstanding comments; however, both recommend approval with plan modifications. On technical merits, Staff has no concerns with this application, she reported. Ms. Bertotti explained that when the Commission approved the original PRD zone with the preliminary plan, the only considerations at that time were specific to that plan of development. She noted that this hearing is to review the current proposal and whether it is suitable for the area and how the two-story building housing 13 units compares to the previously-approved six houses. The Board must consider whether the multi-family proposal is suitable as a transition between single-family properties, industrial property, and the railroad, she reported.

Mr. Kennedy questioned the request in Ms. Bertotti’s memo to take into consideration the Plan of Conservation and Development’s findings on the consistency of the proposed change of the plan. He noted that would be appropriate for a change in zoning regulations or change in zone, but questioned why that would be appropriate in this case.

Ms. Bertotti replied it would be prudent as this type of application is dual, and each time a preliminary plan is modified, effectively an underlying zone is somehow modified. Though the zone name remains a PRD, she stated, because it is intimately related to the Plan of Development, it becomes modified with the plan itself. Ms. Bertotti recommended the Commission consider the Plan of Conservation and Development, though it is the Commission’s prerogative to decide whether to consider it.

Mr. Prause requested clarification that this application would not qualify as a special exception, and Ms. Bertotti confirmed that it would not. Essentially, she expressed, the property could be sold and could become an apartment building, not administered by CHR. In that case, she said, because the Commission would not regulate ownership, occupancy, or tenancy, the only thing that would come before the Commission would be if that change somehow affected the parking waiver. If the Commission finds that a parking waiver is appropriate tonight under these circumstances and they then end up changing, then perhaps that would be appropriate to go in front of the Commission, she explained.

Mr. Prause referred to Attorney Hollister about the Commission’s scope and the TLC Development vs. Planning and Zoning Commission ruling from the Connecticut Supreme Court.

He expressed that it would have been helpful for the Commission to look at the ruling prior to the meeting. Mr. Prause said it appeared to him that the reason the decision was in favor of the applicant had more to do with the fact that the zoning in Branford was vague in general, and the language provided was unique in the site plan section, and that was one of the inconsistencies that gave that section of the Branford zoning regulations less authority. The Branford regulations only provided for modifications to a plan, he said, but Manchester's zoning regulations are clearer and more consistent from section to section, and call out the Commission's right to approve, deny or modify a preliminary plan and to review it against the Plan of Conservation and Development, Mr. Prause said. He questioned whether the TLC Development decision is applicable to Manchester's zoning regulations.

Attorney Hollister responded that the decision is applicable. TLC Development was issued 27 years ago, and he only recently found the decision after reviewing the petition stating that one of the adverse impacts will be negative impacts on property values. He stated he had no intention, until today, of referring to property values, as he did not feel it was relevant. Attorney Hollister informed the Commission that TLC has been cited often by other courts, including the Connecticut Supreme Court, as stating the general rule in the State of Connecticut – not applicable just to the Town of Branford, not based just on the wording of Branford's zoning regulations – that when a zoning commission, anywhere in Connecticut, establishes a permitted use, it puts to rest the issue of whether the permitted use is compatible with the neighborhood, whether there are impacts on traffic or whether there are impacts on property values. He reported that he met with Mr. Anderson, Ms. Bertotti and Attorney O'Neil and had several discussions about the regulations. Attorney Hollister stated that he understands that the regulations rezone PRD based on a preliminary site plan, and it makes sense that when a change is proposed from a single-family subdivision to a multifamily use, the Commission would want to look at the design and all the criteria; however, he said, the site was already PRD before and it is still PRD, and that takes certain things off of the table. Attorney Hollister stated that he had shown that the site plan meets the regulations and is compatible with the neighborhood. As a matter of land use law, the Commission cannot remove the PRD from 2011 and start over, he said.

Mr. Prause confirmed when approving the PRD, the Commission only considers the use and plan provided at the time; it does not try to consider every type of a PRD that would be allowed under that kind of density or that kind of building setbacks. The Commission's scope is to make sure the Plan of Conservation and Development is maintained and to provide buffers when necessary.

Attorney Hollister interjected that when the property was originally rezoned to PRD, the Commission received a PRD rezoning application and a preliminary site plan for seven lots; those were approved as a package. In approving the PRD in conjunction with the seven-lot subdivision, Attorney Hollister said, the Commission can't decide that a preliminary site plan for 7 lots is the only part of the PRD zone regulations it wants to consider. The PRD zone is a diverse, multi-use zone and the Commission cannot pick and choose to rezone property for one purpose but not another, he said. The applicant has submitted a complying application taking advantage of what the PRD zoning allows, he said.

Mr. Anderson stated that there have been numerous phone discussions with the applicant and attorney. The staff attorney has been consulted, and Staff agrees to disagree on that point. The

PRD zone joins the zone and the preliminary plan, he explained, and when reviewing a preliminary plan, the review reverts back and the Commission would approve the entire application as a package. In the past, that was termed a zone change, and perhaps the terminology needs to be changed in the regulations, he explained.

Mr. Stoppelman stated he does not see a reason for a PRD zone unless it is linked to a specific site development plan; they are intertwined and whenever the site plan is changed in a major way, the applicant must come before the Commission. He explained that he prefers to maintain this requirement.

Attorney Hollister expressed that the applicant is not resisting the procedure. The staff asked the applicant to file for a preliminary site plan in a detailed and combined manner, he reported, and the applicant has complied. With the application is Attorney Hollister's opinion letter, which Attorney O'Neil has reviewed, wherein Attorney Hollister stated that conditional zone changes are not allowed in Connecticut or any other state. He stated a zone change to a PRD cannot be for just one plan and then be reversed; it is a zone change.

Mr. Stebe stated that the original site plan consisted of individual houses, in which case the frontage was measured and assessed in a different manner. However, there is a frontage requirement for a multi-family dwelling of 50 ft. on an improved and town-accepted street, Mr. Stebe pointed out, and in this plan there is only 26 ft. Attorney Hollister responded that frontage can be measured off of Kathleen Way, which is significantly more than 50 ft. Mr. Stebe reminded Attorney Hollister that the frontage is not of Kathleen Way; the town-accepted street is North Main.

Attorney Hollister reported that the property fronts on two streets, but on North Main there is more than 50 ft. of frontage with the easement. The frontage on Kathleen Way qualifies it as a lot for use in the PRD zone, he explained, though the easement could be widened to achieve 50 ft. on North Main Street.

Mr. Stebe requested a technical clarification. He stated he was putting the technical issue on the record because it is part of the plan.

Ann Marie Burney, Director/Owner, Wee-Care Day Care, North Main Street in Manchester, introduced herself. She questioned whether another town was considered for the project and asked if CHR could guarantee that the housing project will remain as originally planned. Ms. Burney read a note from a parent who recommended the residence be built in another area away from a day care facility. The parent stated that she had chosen Ms. Burney's day care based on her child's safety, and if the residence is built, she would question her child's safety. Ms. Burney reported that a few years back, group homes were built on Woodland Street, none of the neighbors were notified, and there was a notification that registered sex offenders would be housed at those sites. She further expressed her concerns and those of her customers about the facility being located in the proximity of a day care center. Ms. Burney stated she is concerned about the future of her day care facility. She also questioned whether Manchester is receiving a kickback from CHR.

Ms. Kristen Lanossa, 45 Kathleen Way, introduced herself. Ms. Lanossa stated that she submitted the petition signed by all residents of Kathleen Way, Carolyn Drive and many residents in close proximity on North Main Street. The petition expressed the non-support of this development, she reported. Ms. Lanossa detailed the concerns raised on the petition. She stated that the residents feel this plan would be better suited in another area. Ms. Lanossa also questioned why she did not receive notification sooner, considering it appears this project has been planned for quite some time; she received a letter from the Town one week ago. She questioned what the Town of Manchester is receiving to offset the negative impact of the project.

Mr. Albert Gionet, 631 North Main Street, introduced himself and stated he is in agreement with the previous speakers regarding the notification letters. He expressed his concerns over the future use of the building.

Ms. Nancy Modeen, 743 North Main Street, introduced herself, and stated she never received a letter. She expressed her concerns about the future uses of the building and questioned the benefit to the Town of Manchester.

Ms. Kristen Chen, 30 Kathleen Way, introduced herself. She said she appreciated the goals of CHR, though her concern is the location. Ms. Chen reported hers is a family-centered neighborhood, and while she appreciates the aesthetic design, she worries about the impact to property values. She stated she is also worried about the safety of the residents and enumerated the number of children and single women in the neighborhood. Ms. Chen questioned whether there will be background checks, and if there are, considering the target age of the residents, if the records could have been sealed. She reported very few residents received notification about the meeting.

Ms. Noelle Gray, 605 North Main Street, introduced herself, and stated she received no notification. She explained her experience in the supportive housing field. Ms. Gray questioned the subsidy used by the applicants. She asked what education would be required for the on-site house parents. She wondered about a non-motivated resident who refuses to pay the rent. Additionally, Ms. Gray questioned the vetting process and whether a study has been completed regarding the impacts to North Main Street.

Ms. Marilyn Francis, 24 Kathleen Way, Manchester, introduced herself. Ms. Francis reported that Shepard Steel operates immediately behind the proposed project. The company loads trucks all day, she said, and during the winter, trucks run all night. She further questioned if the residents have been drug abusers and sex offenders. There are train tracks behind the property, Ms. Francis stated, and she was worried that the residents will utilize the tracks.

Mr. Lou Ciccalone, Kathleen Way, introduced himself. He noted that the residents may find it easier to utilize the yards in his neighborhood rather than use the sidewalk on North Main Street.

Mr. Peter Chen, 30 Kathleen Way, introduced himself and reiterated the concern about use of the train tracks for youth and the homeless. Mr. Chen also asked about handicapped parking.

Ms. Jackie Bushman, 729 North Main Street, introduced herself. Ms. Bushman stated she did not receive a letter from the Town. She conveyed her opinion that the residents will not be just homeless.

Ms. Jennifer McIntire, 630 North Main Street, introduced herself. Ms. McIntire reported that her property runs from North Main Street to the Hockanum River and abuts the other side of the Carolyn Drive cul-de-sac. She conveyed her opinion that the proposed residence will not be housing for just the homeless. Ms. McIntire said she is concerned about her young daughter, vandalism, burglaries, assaults and her personal safety. In addition, she believes the proposal will decrease her property value. Ms. McIntire suggested that one house parent will not be adequate. She further expressed that the homeless youth have not been taught morals and will not make correct decisions. Additionally, she reported that there have been many issues from people on the train tracks.

Mr. Ron Lusher, 4 Kathleen Way, introduced himself. Mr. Lusher reported that there is noise from Shepard Steel when the leaves are off the trees. In addition, he described that people use snowmobiles and motorcycles on the train tracks. Mr. Lusher referred to an earlier meeting where it was stated that the building would need an elevator for the handicapped to access the gym on the second floor. He further suggested other locations for the CHR building.

Ms. Karen Parker, 1 Kathleen Way, introduced herself. Ms. Parker repeated the concerns about property values. She stated that she purchased her home three months ago, and had she known about the proposal, she would not have bought the house. As a landlord, she attested to the difficulty with Section 8 housing with residents and their friends. Though she sympathized with the homeless, in her opinion, people do not just end up as homeless. Perhaps, the homeless were thrown out of their homes or have drug issues.

Ms. Sue Ciccalone, 34 Kathleen Way, introduced herself. Ms. Ciccalone agreed with the previous speakers. She asked whether, as this would be a multi-family residence, the tenants could allow others to live with them or if the apartment would be solely for one individual. Ms. Ciccalone also questioned whether the individuals would have a structure to their days. She reiterated the concerns about safety.

Ms. Karen Gionet, 631 North Main Street, introduced herself. She stated she is in complete support of her neighbors, and is very concerned about her safety. She took exception to the architect's statement that the property values will not be affected.

Mr. Mike Cappucci, 706 North Main Street, introduced himself. Mr. Cappucci explained that, however well intended this proposal is, the site is not a good location. He reported that recently, Lot 1 and Lot 7 were sold and improvements made to the house on Lot 1, with the intention that the two lots would then be one. In prior meetings, he stated, there was an issue regarding the frontage for the house to be built on Lot 7, and he questioned the change to the frontage from a prior meeting. Mr. Cappucci reiterated the concerns for the future of the proposed building.

Mr. Jeff Luckbill, 14 Kathleen Way, introduced himself. Mr. Luckbill explained what individuals consider when purchasing a home and suggested CHR should make the same

consideration. He also expressed his concerns for the safety of the neighborhood. The residents would have appreciated being a part of the process involved in this proposal, he noted. He further reiterated the prior speakers' concerns.

Mr. Jim Mineo, 655 North Main Street, introduced himself. Mr. Mineo questioned whether the sidewalk proposed a year ago was tied to the CHR project, and if it was, why the information is just coming to light. He noted the information relayed regarding the landscaping of the property, but little discussion about the residents. He conveyed his opinion that the property values will definitely go down. Mr. Mineo also reiterated the statement that CHR chose the property because it would be an area where the residents want to live.

Ms. Gates attempted to address many comments. When CHR searches for properties, they look into zoning; Manchester had the proper zone, and would not require a zone change, she reported. CHR has tried to design a house that is consistent with the neighborhood, she said. Ms. Gates described the individuals who would reside in the residence. The prospective tenants, she reported, do not have many options. Ms. Gates informed that the residents will not have serious drug addiction issues, will not be sexual predators and do not have a history of violence. She reported the screening process is conducted by the management company that has been used for their other properties. The individuals that CHR services in Manchester are not any more violent or aggressive than anyone else in the community, and in fact, there is evidence they are less so, she explained.

In addition, Ms. Gates stated, letters were sent to all 10 abutters as required. It is the Town's responsibility to post a formal notice of a public hearing, not CHRs, she noted. She reiterated the proposed residence will not be a homeless shelter; it will be a permanent home for the residents. Ms. Gates noted that the sidewalk was planned long before CHR looked at the property. The development process, she explained, involves a Department of Housing RFP specific to the program, and CHR responded to the RFP in December 2016. Ms. Gates also stated that CHR does not engage in conversations with the community until the process is completed and DOH awards the funding.

Unfortunately, CHR cannot address the noise from the railroad and other industrial areas, Ms. Gates reported. She conveyed that there have been many studies done around the country that demonstrate that property values do not decrease when supportive housing is put into various neighborhoods, and in some cases they go up.

Ms. Gates explained that there will be a lease with each resident. There will be certain rules related to living in the residence, she reported, and if a resident violates a rule, they will be evicted. Additionally, the home will be managed to ensure a safe environment for all residents, she explained. Ms. Gates said there will be a mixture of men and women, depending upon the needs of the homeless. The staff living in the facility and working in the facility, she testified, will be trained in the many treatment models CHR uses.

Subsidies, Ms. Gates described, are a combination of five Section 8 vouchers and the remainder will be subsidized by CHR through the operating funds.

Attorney Hollister responded to the comments asking for a guarantee about the future of the property. He stated that the specific use that is part of this application is the only thing that would be approved and compliant with the zoning approval, if that is issued. If there is a change to the use, such as a change to a multifamily residential use that is not affiliated with CHR, there would then be a formal application to the Commission and a public process. The only use that could be conducted on this property is what is being presented today, if approved, he said.

Ms. Gates clarified that, because CHR receives funding from the State of Connecticut for housing developments, there is a period of time that CHR is required to maintain the use; otherwise, the money would be required to be returned to the State. In this case, the period is 10 years, she stated. Ms. Gates further testified that with the time, effort and funds invested, CHR would not turn around and sell the property.

Attorney Hollister responded to the owner of the day care center that he was confused about how a child in its care would be at risk from the facility. In addition, he responded to the concerns about the railroad tracks and industrial use; they are existing conditions. Attorney Hollister addressed the concerns about notification and noted that CHR has followed the regulations and the Commission staff has followed the regulations. He further attested that CHR was before the Commission in February, on community television, and has not been secretive. Attorney Hollister reported that there was an internal staff meeting in early June to understand the requirements, and then the submission in July. He then addressed the benefit to the Town of Manchester, which will be a program for the homeless population in the area. Attorney Hollister also pointed out the handicapped parking on the plan, and informed attendees that there will be handicapped units. Regarding property values, he reported that in many studies of similar supervised, managed facilities, property values are not impacted. He stated that if seven homes were built on the property, there would be far less tree buffer.

Ms. Bertotti reported that the public hearing has been advertised as required under the Connecticut State Statutes. The first legal ad was published on August 21, and the second a few days following, within the timeframe required, she said. However, notices are mailed only to abutting neighbors, which she described as only those that share a common boundary with the property in question. Ms. Bertotti stated that the letters are not required, though they are sent as a courtesy, and they are mailed concurrent with the first legal ad.

Mr. Prause questioned the timeline of the sidewalk plan.

Ms. Bertotti replied that she does not have any current information regarding the progress. However, the Planning and Zoning Commission meets every five years and adopts a formal sidewalk and curb plan for the Town, she explained. That Planning document assigns areas in town which will have either an added sidewalk, sidewalk extension or sidewalk removal, Ms. Bertotti said. The North Main Street sidewalk project was done in conjunction with the street repair, she explained, as well as the added section of sidewalk plan adopted three and one-half or four years ago.

Mr. Anderson added that the new sidewalks are part of the sidewalk plan that the Town Board of Directors and Public Works Department adopted long before this project.

Mr. Prause stated that, since the proposal is a combined preliminary and detailed plan, the plan is more mature than typically seen on a zone change.

Ms. Bertotti described the plans, if approved, as construction-ready. The storm water management plan has been fully designed and approved with minor comments from Staff, she reported; the traffic report has been reviewed; all the plans have been reviewed including the detailed landscaping plan; all of the zoning requirements have been met. In response to Mr. Stebe's question and the access questions, she said, the applicant is allowed to count frontage on Kathleen Way, though the access will be on North Main Street. Ms. Bertotti referred to a comment regarding a variance granted to Lot 1 or Lot 7 previously and said that it was a special exception approval to create a rear lot.

Attorney Hollister submitted property value studies into the record.

Ms. Lanossa appreciated the responses to the comments about notifications. Staff mentioned that abutting property owners were notified by CHR, she reported; however, she did not receive notification. She referred to the property value studies, though without notification, property owners were unable to prepare information in that regard.

Ms. Ciccalone reported they did not receive notification. She referred to a question that has remained unanswered regarding a structured routine for the residents.

Mr. Mineo questioned how the Commission views this building. Attorney Hollister replied the building is a multi-family use.

Mr. Mineo asked how a family is defined. In his opinion, this will be a federally-funded boarding house. He further mentioned CHR's comment about serving over 10% of Manchester. Mr. Mineo asked how many of those serviced were Manchester residents and whether individuals are brought to Manchester from other communities. He asked whether the residents will be allowed to have overnight visitors and whether the individuals would be permitted to get married and have children in the apartments.

Ms. Parker declared that Attorney Hollister was speaking about property values currently. She reiterated that, had she known about the proposal, she would not have bought her home. Ms. Parker noted the prior proposal was for seven single-family lots and questioned whether the property is zoned single-family, multi-family, or both.

Mr. Prause explained that the property is in a Planned Residential Development Zone, which can mean multi-family homes, one building with more than one unit. The PRD can be a subdivision with individual homes or can have multi-family homes or apartment buildings.

Ms. Parker commented that the proposal does not fit in a single-family area and she would rather have six single-family homes on the property.

Ms. Gray noted that a colleague in the supportive housing field is reluctant to work with the homeless because of past experiences. She also reported housing a homeless individual years ago and the problems she encountered. Ms. Gray questioned the screening process and whether there will be a budget for an eviction process.

Ms. Gates responded that the individuals will be engaged in job searches, education and personal development. However, the residence is not a treatment program, which is very structured, but this is a home, she explained. Ms. Gates reported that any new applicants will be screened consistently.

Mr. Prause questioned whether the Commission members would like to review studies, legal briefings or any other data, as an aid to decision-making.

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to close the public hearing on this application. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion. All members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER – For renovations to Verplanck Elementary School at 126 Olcott Street. – Special Exception Modification (2017-058)

Mr. Randall Luther, Partner, TSKB Studio Architects, introduced himself. Mr. Luther presented the last piece of the Board of Education’s Phase I School Improvement Program. He described coming before the Commission in January to present the initial concepts for the site. At that time, he reported, feedback was ordered. Mr. Luther described meetings in April with the Board of Directors where additional guidance was offered, in June with the Board of Education, and with the abutters.

Mr. Luther described the issues with the existing school site including the bus loop, which is shared with parking, stating that the parking in general is inadequate for the school’s population, service load at the building, the playscape area, the school entrance location, and the lower level, which has no connection with the remainder of the building.

As part of the project, Mr. Luther explained, the student population will rise from approximately 400 students currently to about 585, which will require adding 19,400 sq. ft. to the existing building footprint. Additionally, 130 parking spaces will be added, he explained. Mr. Luther reported that, as the plan evolved, a planning diagram was developed, and he explained the three zones on the property. He went on to display the proposed service area that would occupy the lower level of the school. In addition, Mr. Luther showed the shift of the play area to the back, south end of the site, thereby allowing the building to serve as a buffer between the general public and the students. He demonstrated the realignment of the existing driveway, making it opposite Falknor Drive. Mr. Luther explained the proposed outlet from the site to Thompson Road.

Mr. Luther displayed the site plan and gave a detailed explanation of the plans, including the proposed stand-alone bus loop and new construction. Regarding the exit to Thompson Road, there was considerable discussion from the Commission at the January meeting, he noted. The consensus at that time and after discussions with neighbors, he reported, resulted in proposing a

one-way exit only, which will serve to alleviate congestion at the end of the school day. The exit will be gated during the day, and only opened at the end of the school day, he reported. Mr. Luther discussed the changes to the interior of the building.

Mr. Tom Shiel, Landscape Architect, Milone and MacBroom, introduced himself. Mr. Shiel explained that he has been assisting with site design aspects of the plan. He displayed the topography and the planned landscaping details, which are to support the visual changes to the building. Mr. Shiel also exhibited the extensive pedestrian system of sidewalks.

Mr. Prause requested a motion to extend the meeting past 11 P.M.

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to extend the meeting past 11 P.M. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Mr. Darren Overton, Milone and MacBroom, Licensed Professional Engineer, introduced himself. Mr. Overton stated that he has been supporting the architectural team regarding the utilities. He displayed the existing stream on the south end of the site. There are proposed improvements, particularly the connection to Thompson Road, that are within the regulated 100 ft. upland review area, he said. Mr. Overton displayed the site plan detailing the utilities and storm water management. He explained that storm water management is being introduced in order to meet Town regulations, as there will be an increase in the impervious areas, from 2.9 acres to 4.3 acres. Mr. Overton displayed and explained the erosion control plan and storm drainage configuration. He further pointed out that his firm submitted a response letter to all Staff comments.

Mr. Dave Sullivan, Traffic Engineer Manager, Milone and MacBroom, introduced himself. Mr. Sullivan explained the traffic study process and findings. He reported that, when studying traffic, existing conditions are reviewed, including percentage of bus students, walkers and those driven to school, as well as the characteristics of staff parking. In addition, he stated, intersections nearby are counted, and there is a level of service analysis for the operating conditions, particularly considering the increase in the student and staff population.

Mr. Stoppelman stated it appears as though there is only one art room. Mr. Luther responded there are 28 teaching spaces and one art room.

Mr. Stoppelman questioned the average class size. Mr. Luther replied the average class size is approximately 900 sq. ft. Mr. Stoppelman clarified that he meant in terms of students. Mr. Luther stated the Board of Education's target enrollment is between 20 and 23 students. He explained that 584 students would be the peak enrollment, which is the number the district uses to generate funding formulas for the State, which utilizes the highest projected number over a 10-year period.

Mr. Stoppelman inquired about music classes and the location of the auditorium. Mr. Luther responded that there will be two music rooms that are located directly behind the stage, and the auditorium will continue to be the gym.

Mr. Bergin questioned the height of the landscaping between the southerly addition and between the school and the play area. Mr. Shiel described the proposed trees between the playscapes, which will be varied in height, with the goal of creating some definition of space.

Mr. Bergin inquired whether the function is to prevent distraction in the classrooms while children are in the play area. Mr. Shiel replied that the area is very large and, in terms of the school function, the landscape will create spatial quality between the walkway and the building. He explained the area is also enclosed by a fence system.

Mr. Bergin asked if the trailhead would be obstructed by the fence. Mr. Shiel explained they can work with Planning to see how that could be addressed. At this point, the trailhead has not been cut off.

Mr. Stebe sought to view the plans relating to the 100-year review space for the outlet. He questioned what will be the need to create the road access, i.e., grading.

Mr. Overton displayed the site and described the plan for the road access.

Mr. Stebe noted there would be resetting the connections to the 54 drain. Mr. Overton confirmed the resets.

Mr. Prause inquired whether the playscapes will be inside the fenced area, which Mr. Luther confirmed they would. Mr. Prause asked about a plan for after hours.

Mr. Luther replied that the after-hours use has not been specifically addressed as part of this project. There are two options being currently entertained for the project, he reported, not under their scope. He explained the two options: the relocation of the existing playscape, which is old, and the utilization of the Waddell School playscape which is currently stockpiled. Mr. Luther recognized the need for a play structure for the neighborhood after hours, though it is not part of this project as the State will not fund it, since it is not specifically for school function.

Mr. Prause acknowledged that there is usually a gate to a school playscape; however, the gate is never locked making it accessible to the neighborhood.

Mr. Luther advised there is a meeting scheduled with local responders to talk about issues such as after-hours use and security concerns.

Ms. Bertotti informed the Commission that there are three components to the application and she deferred to Mr. Bordeaux regarding the comments on wetlands and determination of significance. She stated that Staff has reviewed the plans, and there are currently two staff comments from the Engineering Department, Michelle Handfield and Ray Myette, Water & Sewer Department, which are minor and technical in nature, and currently outstanding. She reported that both recommended approval subject to the plan modifications. In addition, there is an e-mail from Rob Topliff, Facility Manager, Parks and Recreation Department, with questions, which should be responded to in writing. Staff has no technical problems with the application.

Mr. Prause requested Mr. Bordeaux's opinion on the impact to the wetlands.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that after the original submittal, it was determined there is a regulated resource on the south side of the property. The applicant responded quickly, and as all the activity will be in the upland review area and grading will be minimal, there does not appear to be a need for a retaining wall, he stated. Mr. Bordeaux specified he does not anticipate a great deal of impact to the water course, which is essentially a naturalized drainage ditch.

Mr. Prause noted there were no members of the public requesting to speak.

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy made a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION – To revise Art. IV, Sec. 13.05.05 to prohibit corrugated plastic signs. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2017-055)

Mr. Anderson reminded the Commission that there was a prior workshop regarding the issue. In the workshop, discussion revolved around prohibiting certain types of signs, he detailed. Currently, the regulations require durable, rigid, opaque material, such as metal, wood or high-quality plastic or vinyl, Mr. Anderson explained. He stated that he has been noticing corrugated plastic signs, especially downtown. In his opinion, those signs are not an acceptable material and do not fit the definition, and the Commission felt it would be acceptable to prohibit those signs specifically. Mr. Anderson noted that, during the workshop, there was a comment regarding political signs in windows, and that will be excluded from the regulation.

Mr. Bergin inquired whether corrugated signs will not be allowed anywhere in town, or anywhere in town except for novelty and window signs.

Mr. Anderson responded that corrugated novelty window signs are allowed in town.

Ms. Bertotti reported that Planning was in receipt of a letter in support of the application from Ms. Mary Fish, which was submitted on September 5<sup>th</sup>. She read, “I support the changes made to Art. IV, Sec. 13.05.05 of the zoning regulations pertinent to managing the types of signs posted in Manchester.”

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 11:31 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

November 6, 2017  
Date

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