

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JUNE 5, 2017**

ROLL CALL:

Members Present:	Eric Prause, Chairman Andy Kidd, Vice-Chairman Michael Stebe, Secretary Jessica Scorso
Alternate Member Sitting:	Teresa Ike
Alternates:	Julian Stoppelman Patrick Kennedy
Absent:	Timothy Bergin
Also Present:	Gary Anderson, Director of Planning Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary
Time Convened:	7:25 PM

NEW BUSINESS:

KATHLEEN ARTEAGA – Request a zone change from Residence AA Zone to Rural Residence Zone at 278 Hackmatack Street. – Zone Change (2017-035)

Mr. Kidd stated he remembered when this property was zoned Rural Residence and the Commission was reluctant to allow housing on the property due to wetlands and open space; however, the Commission did approve the change to Residence AA zone. He stated he is very familiar with the property, as he resided to the south, and in past years there were many trespassers. There are many trees that have fallen on the property due to early snowstorms, Mr. Kidd said, and clearing the trees would be an improvement. In his opinion, given the nature of the proposal and the planned buffer to the nearby residences, the zone change seems reasonable. He said wetland concerns would be dealt with in the future.

Ms. Scorso said she would also be in favor of approval. She appreciates the consideration of clearing and keeping the horses separated from the more developed properties, as well as the barrier to the south.

Mr. Prause commented that with the abutting Rural Residence properties, in his opinion it would be appropriate to change back to Rural Residence. The allowed uses in the zone are low nuisance and do not impact the residences in the area, he stated, and the allowable uses are

appropriate to meet the suburban definition of the Plan of Conservation and Development. Mr. Prause commended the applicant's design to maintain a buffer for nearby properties.

Zone Change (2017-035)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the zone change from Residence AA Zone to Rural Residence Zone at 278 Hackmatack Street.

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

The reason for the approval is that the proposed zoning map amendment is consistent with the surrounding zoning and with the Manchester Plan of Conservation and Development.

The zoning map amendment will be effective on June 23, 2017.

SHOPPES AT BUCKLAND HILLS, LLC/GENERAL GROWTH PROPERTIES – For construction of solar photovoltaic canopies over an existing paved parking area at 150, 170, and 260 Buckland Hills Drive. – CUD Detailed Site Development Plan (2017-032)

Ms. Bethany Bartlett, Attorney with Sherin and Lodgen, 101 Federal Street, Boston, Massachusetts, represented Safari Energy. She introduced Mr. John Towle from Safari Energy. The application is to install parking canopies at the Buckland Mall, Attorney Bartlett stated. The applicant submitted plans and received comments on the initial application, she said, which prompted revised plans. Attorney Bartlett projected the general site plan and pointed to the proposed location of the parking lot canopies, Lot 20 and Lot 21. She informed the Commission that an Affidavit of Merger has been filed and recorded to eliminate the setback requirements between Lots 20 and 21, making one single lot. She also pointed to another area, Lot 6A. There is proposed a total of 1 megawatt generated on the parking canopies. Attorney Bartlett explained the proposed area is currently overflow parking. She said the electricity produced by the solar facilities would offset load on the mall, thereby reducing tenant rents and utility costs for the mall property owners.

There were questions during the submission process, Attorney Bartlett reported, one of which related to landscaping. A landscaping plan showed trees outlined around the area which would be removed, she said, and replaced with approximately 38 trees. Attorney Bartlett projected the landscaping plan illustrating trees around the perimeter to buffer the canopies and to replace the removed trees. There were also questions regarding the footings, she said, as cars and trucks will park underneath the facilities. She stated one of the questions involved installing the footings to prevent interference with parking; i.e., opening car doors. As part of the design concept, Attorney Bartlett stated, the footings will be either at the top or the bottom of each parking space rather than near the center which would interfere with access.

Mr. John Towle with Safari Energy stated the company is working with General Growth around the country. Safari recently received approval to install a similar system at the Brass Mill Mall. He stated there will be many such systems across the north, especially with the cost of power in Connecticut. He explained the limitations to the columns as they are dealing with a setback issue along Buckland Hills Drive. In order to honor the setback, the canopies can only be brought out to a certain point, he said, and to the extent possible the columns will be located at the very front

of the parking spaces. Mr. Towle explained that in some cases the columns will be located on the grass area in front of the parking spaces. However, he stated, there will be some conflict with the parking area.

Mr. Towle stated the proposed area is the least-used lot at the mall. As such, very few people park in the area. However, he said, the proposed parking spaces will be very desirable in inclement weather. There are a number of reasons why the facilities cannot be moved closer to the mall, such as anchor ownership and easements, he said.

Mr. Towle pointed to the site plan and depicted a storm pipe, as well as the columns, which will be relocated to the grass area to avoid a conflict. In the area where there is setback to the Ring Road, the columns will be to the front, he said, but there are areas where they are required to honor the setback line from Buckland Hills Drive. Though the area is several to many feet above the road surface of Buckland Hills Drive and there is no chance of conflict with vehicular traffic hitting the fixtures, the fixture cannot go any closer to the end of the parking spaces than what is depicted on the site plan, he explained. Mr. Towle stated there will be spaces with columns located near the drivers' doors. He reiterated the area is currently utilized for equipment storage. The only way to avoid the conflict with the columns would be a variance, though General Growth opted against applying for a variance, Mr. Towle said.

Mr. Kidd inquired whether the units will be owned by Safari and rented to the Buckland Hills Mall.

Mr. Towle stated Safari will not own the arrays. Safari will provide a turn-key project to General Growth, owner of the Buckland Hills Mall, he said. The mall is making an investment in the property's future and will own the facilities 100%, he said. Safari maintains every project they have constructed, Mr. Towle explained, and the company is invested in making sure the facilities are operating properly, are aesthetically pleasing, and are maintained properly.

Mr. Kidd asked about the lifespan of the solar panels.

Mr. Towle replied that the system components are warranted for 25 years, though they will operate much longer. He said there are systems that look substantially similar today to the way they looked when they were built 45 years ago. The technology has not changed, though the units have become more and more efficient over time, he said, although not so efficient that it would warrant replacing the panels.

Mr. Kidd stated he has seen older arrays that are not aesthetically pleasing, surmising they may have been first generation. He asked why these panels would not deteriorate similarly.

Mr. Towle informed him that the materials have improved over the years. In the past, solar panels were a utility, but today solar panels, especially solar canopies such as these, are a feature, he said. The materials to be utilized are not just a galvanized plain look; they are a painted finish, which is made to complement the properties, he said. The frame materials have improved over the years, he said. In the past, the materials were a gunmetal gray galvanized look, whereas these are black frames, according to Mr. Towle.

Mr. Kidd observed that the panels actually look better from the street than they do from overhead.

Mr. Towle stated that these renderings are quite close to the final product. He demonstrated three different canopy structures to be utilized: a full T, a long span, and a single cantilever, all designed with respect to the area to be utilized.

Mr. Kidd questioned the efficacy during the winter months, i.e., snow removal.

Mr. Towle explained that snow should never be removed, as doing so may create an ice dam; the arrays are designed to allow the snow to melt and run off.

Ms. Scorso noted that on the drawings, there are sidewalks and pavers. She questioned whether these will be part of the installation.

Mr. Towle stated that there is damage to the existing curbing which will be corrected in addition to the areas impacted due to the installation of columns.

Ms. Scorso asked if there will be lighting under these canopies.

Mr. Towle explained that any existing lighting on the lots will be removed and LED lighting will be utilized underneath the canopies. Such lighting will meet Town standards, he explained.

Mr. Stebe questioned the construction materials as they appear to be painted I-beams.

Mr. Towle stated that the materials will be an I-beam column, large steel beams bolted and welded and C purlins.

Mr. Stebe asked if the materials will be refined rather than industrial in appearance.

Mr. Towle explained the columns will not appear industrial in nature, though the top will be galvanized and appear industrialized. However, the columns in the parking area will be a painted finish.

Mr. Stebe commented that Mr. Towle had mentioned the height for emergency vehicles, and questioned the total height of the structures.

Mr. Towle pointed to the drawings and demonstrated an area which will be 13'6" on the low point as required by ordinance, 14'3" in the middle and 15' or so at the highest point.

Mr. Stebe supposed that there will be another foot or so to the structure.

Mr. Towle stated the construction is within the ordinance.

Mr. Stebe asked if the high point will face Buckland Hills Drive or the mall.

Mr. Towle responded the high side is at Buckland Hills Drive, though he could not accurately state whether the structure's high point is north, south, east or west as the arrays will be placed on a curve.

Mr. Stebe inquired about the method of capturing and delivering power to the mall.

Mr. Towle stated that in the past there would have been a central inverter with wires placed underground connecting to the electrical room; however, at this time, the industry utilizes string inverters no larger than a toaster. The inverters, Mr. Towle stated, are mounted to the structures and convert the direct current from the sun into alternating current which will be utilized by the mall. He pointed to a conduit which will be placed underground and which will connect to a panel for the mall. Mr. Towle explained the technology has evolved in terms of gathering and distribution. He further demonstrated conduit lines running from the mall out to an AC collector board near the arrays which connects the individual inverters at that point which are then delivered to the mall.

Mr. Prause requested clarification of whether the inverter is located outside of the column. He further asked if the plan is depicting a support post of the canopy.

Mr. Towle stated the inverter will be located outside the column. He explained that the fixture will be set on the top of the column.

Mr. Stebe questioned what is driving the depicted trees and shrubs around the carports.

Mr. Towle explained that the buffer is as per Town requirements. He stated the area is very well planted currently and there will be removal of trees that are in conflict with the solar arrays. There is a landscape plan requirement, stated Mr. Towle, which will include smaller plants and decorative plantings which will not shade the arrays in the future.

Mr. Prause stated that, while the intent is to provide screening, with security in mind, the landscaping may be counterproductive. He surmised the area would need high visibility as the mall is a high crime rate area.

Mr. Anderson commented that the replacement of the trees is not necessarily to provide a buffer, but to make sure the plantings themselves were replaced in some way. In his opinion, the plantings were to replace the existing trees and were not driven by staff.

Ms. Bertotti stated the Town has a parking landscaping requirement which requires a certain amount of landscaped area in particular areas of the parking lot. Therefore, she stated, if an area of landscaping is removed or reduced, it must be placed elsewhere to maintain the ratio, which is likely what generated the comment.

Mr. Towle pointed to a rendering that depicts the plantings more dense than they actually are; looking at the overhead view, the plantings appear less obstructive.

Mr. Prause stated perhaps the location of the landscaping could be altered to provide less of a buffer to the enclosed areas. He also requested clarification of the total power output being slightly over one megawatt and whether that necessitates Siting Council input.

Mr. Towle replied that Safari has interconnection approval.

Mr. Anderson asked if Mr. Towle believes the parking area will be utilized.

Mr. Towle stated he hopes that will be the case. In viewing the parking areas this evening, no cars were parked in the proposed area. He pointed to the areas which were occupied this evening. It is his hope that patrons will view the parking areas favorably.

Mr. Anderson recognized the intent is for energy purposes, not necessarily a parking structure, but the proposal will serve both purposes.

Ms. Scorso inquired whether there are structures similar to the proposed providing electric car hookup.

Mr. Towle replied that his company does have similar structures with electric car hookup. He described a structure at the Natick Mall which includes the hookups. Thought was given for the Buckland Mall location, he stated, and it is something that is being considered. However, the mall owner would determine whether the power would be provided by the mall or whether there will be a charge.

Mr. Kidd asked how rain water will be managed.

Mr. Towle responded that there is space between each panel and, therefore, there is no water buildup to sheet off the edge of the entire array. The panels are not solid sheets.

Mr. Kidd observed that rain will fall on the cars.

Mr. Towle stated that a structure the size of a large television is protecting the car, and a car will be 95% covered.

Ms. Bertotti informed the Commission that there are three minor and technical staff comments outstanding. These mainly concern the location of existing utilities in the parking lot, she said, and their relationship to the proposed electrical conduits connecting the development. The applicant is aware of the comments, which are outlined in memos from Bernard Kalansuriya and Michelle Handfield, Ms. Bertotti stated, as well as a question from Jim Mayer about whether clearance signs will be installed on the units. Mr. Mayer also notified the applicant that OSTA should be notified to verify whether a permit from OSTA will be required, she stated.

Mr. Towle informed the Commission that time is of the essence, as solar projects are incentive-driven. As such, building permits will be submitted in the next couple of weeks, he stated.

Mr. Prause noted that, on the drawing, there appears to be a mix of maple, ash and arborvitaes which can grow tall in height. He noted there appears to be dense screen in front of Lot 21, and wondered if there are options to relocate the plantings.

Mr. Towle explained the goal was to locate the replacements in the area of the removals. He informed Mr. Prause that the replacements could be placed at the direction of the Commission. If landscape replacements were deemed illogical in an area, Mr. Towle stated, the plantings could be made elsewhere on the property. He further stated that if shielding is a concern, decorative plantings could be utilized and the applicant would leave the decision to Staff.

Mr. Anderson stated Mr. Towle's proposal would be fine as the concern was over the number of replacements, i.e., one-for-one replacements. The Planning Department would be happy to facilitate such a change with the applicant, he said.

Mr. Towle stated there are areas in the perimeter that have had landscape losses over the years, and the replacements could be made in those locations.

Mr. Prause inquired whether such changes would be a modification.

Ms. Bertotti explained it could be a modification, though she requested what the parameters for the Staff would be. If the Commission is concerned regarding safety, she said, Mr. Bordeaux and Mr. Davis should review the changes with the focus on the safety.

Mr. Prause stated where there is a cluster of trees or shrubs, the plantings will grow quite tall. He informed Ms. Bertotti the goal is to reduce the density around the carports so they are visible.

Mr. Kidd asked the applicant to project a rendering and said he agreed there was a potential safety issue. He pointed to the trees in the area but stated the bushes are of more concern. The Commission, in his opinion, should focus on the bushes. In all probability, Mr. Kidd said, no one will hide behind trees, though someone could hide behind a bush. Therefore, a fair amount of bushes should be relocated for safety purposes.

Mr. Prause asked Ms. Bertotti about the modifications and if they are significant.

Ms. Bertotti replied there was nothing that cannot be addressed on the final plan. Most of the modifications deal with installation of the proposed utilities and their location in relation to the existing utilities on site, she said. There are specific minimum separation distances that must be maintained, Ms. Bertotti explained, between certain infrastructure installations and those distances are not clear, because the existing maps do not include the information. The applicant must provide plans clearly showing that the installation of the lines will be distant enough from the existing utilities to meet code.

Mr. Towle agreed that the shrubbery would block the view and should be relocated.

Mr. Kidd stated that for the record, he is in agreement with the plan. He speculated on how best to handle the motion and whether there should be a condition.

Ms. Bertotti replied that the Commission could make the removals a condition of the approval or a modification of the approval. The modification would be added to the list of proposed modifications in the motion and would require the applicant to submit a revised landscaping plan, relocating some of the proposed shrubbery that may cause a safety issue, until the plans are reviewed and approved by Staff.

Mr. Kidd requested an explanation of the difference between a condition and modification.

Ms. Bertotti explained that if there is a condition, it is published in the legal notice and it is recorded with the documentation that is recorded on this decision. A modification would remain in the file and the plans would not be stamped until the modification is made.

Mr. Kidd stated he prefers a modification.

CUD Detailed Site Development Plan (2017-032)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the site plan for construction of solar photovoltaic parking canopies on the above-referenced existing parking lots at the Shoppes at Buckland Hills with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated May 18, 2017
2. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated May 18, 2017
3. James Mayer, Traffic Engineer, dated May 18, 2017 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner

and with the modification that the applicant submit a revised landscaping plan to ensure that bushes or arborvitae are relocated to ensure better safety conditions and ensure that the CUD Zone landscaping requirement is met.

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

Mr. Kidd stated he hopes that the plan will help offset costs of the mall, making it more efficient and less costly for the shop owners, enabling the mall and tenants to be more profitable in the long term.

Mr. Prause affirmed that overall this is an exciting improvement that shows an investment in the area and may improve the viability of the mall. The project is in accordance with Town's green initiatives in the Plan of Conservation and Development. In his opinion, a CUD is an area with opportunity for this construction.

Mr. Towle stated that General Growth operates more than 35 similar arrays around the country, and Buckland Mall was recommended as a good location. Safari Energy has been encouraged by General Growth's commitment to investing in these products, he said. The units will help to make the mall more viable in a struggling and challenging retail environment, he said, as well as to encourage the retention of current tenants and the attraction of new tenants.

CASTANHO & CLOUTIER DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Request 5-year extensions of the previously approved subdivision 2012-038 and erosion control plan 2012-039 at 698 North Main

Street. – Extension of Previously-Approved Subdivision (2017-039); Extension of Previously-Approved Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-040)

Attorney Steve Penny represented the applicant and introduced Carl Castanho, a principle of the applicant limited liability company. The matter before the Commission, he stated, is a five-year extension for the subdivision approval and the accompanying Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, both of which were granted by the Commission on July 16, 2012. The property is located at 698 North Main Street, Attorney Penny stated, and is 2.258 acres in size, bounded northerly by North Main Street and easterly by an 18-lot PRD subdivision of single family detached homes, which has its access from Carolyn Drive and Kathleen Way. He further said the property is bounded southerly by land owned by the Penn Central Railroad Company and westerly by an industrial zoned parcel. The site currently houses a single family residence, is zoned PRD, and was granted approval by the Commission in February 2011. The rear lot, Lot 7, was approved as a Special Exception on May 16, 2011. Attorney Penny indicated there are no wetlands or watercourses on the site. Castanho & Cloutier Development purchased the site in March 2010, and the project was to consist of six single-family residences along with the retention of the existing house, he said. Attorney Penny informed the Commission that the subdivision was not constructed due to market conditions. He also stated he was informed that this property was the last residential subdivision approved in Manchester.

Attorney Penny informed the Commission that the public improvements required to develop the lots would be to the west of the cul-de-sac which currently exists in the subdivision to the east. Of course, that has not been done as the subdivision has not been constructed.

Mr. Prause stated that presently there is a house on the location closest to North Main Street but inquired if that was the only one.

Attorney Penny affirmed that it is, in fact, the only one.

Ms. Bertotti confirmed that the PRD zone change was approved in 2011 and the subdivision was approved in 2012, and under General Statutes, the applicant has five years to complete the construction. As no work has been done, under the General Statutes, the Commission may approve the extension up to five years for both the subdivision extension and the erosion and sedimentation control plan extension, she said. Ms. Bertotti stated the Commission has no changes or plans to review at this time. The Commission is allowed, under the General Statutes, to change the amount of bonding required, though that is the only change that can be made at this time. However, Ms. Bertotti stated, there are no bonds and there will be no bonds posted until work commences.

Attorney Penny stated that Mark Czerepuszko would determine the appropriate bond amount when it is applied for.

Mr. Kidd asked, if the Commission extends the approval, whether the five years would commence from the date of this meeting or five years from the expiration of the original approval.

Ms. Bertotti replied that the approval of a five-year extension could be from either today or commencing from the date of the original approval, July 16, 2012. Under the General Statutes, the applicant is allowed a total of 10 years, five years plus a five-year extension. Therefore, the approval can be extended to ten years from the date of the first approval.

Mr. Kidd surmised the applicant would prefer the extension to be five years from the expiration of the current approval.

Mr. Prause asserted that after five years, if the project is incomplete, there should be a review of the conditions of the area that may lead to a rejection of renewal. He questioned whether there has been anything in the area that has changed, and whether the use to the west is still industrial.

Ms. Bertotti replied that the use to the west is still industrial, a facility handling in some fashion and storing steel. In addition, the railroad property is to the rear, and to the east are single primary residential units, she stated. To Ms. Bertotti's knowledge, there have not been many use changes, and the road is slated to be upgraded. She stated that, if the applicant does not install utilities prior to the road work, and within the next five year period, the applicant will be charged a higher fee.

Attorney Penny stated he is fairly certain the utilities are available on Kathleen Way and the connection would be to the existing subdivision.

Mr. Prause requested clarification about the development to the west, and whether the two current buildings existed at the time of the approval five years ago

Attorney Penny replied that the steel company was there.

Mr. Prause explained that in looking at the BJs shopping center, two additional buildings were constructed.

Ms. Bertotti questioned if Mr. Prause was referring to Burger Fi.

Mr. Anderson stated that Burger Fi was constructed around the time of the applicant's original approval.

Mr. Prause asked if traffic impacts would be significant.

Ms. Bertotti stated that in her opinion, Burger Fi was built subsequent to the original approval. However, the Oliva Estates a subdivision is a residential project, bringing a fairly low amount of traffic to North Main Street, she said.

Subdivision – 5 Year Extension (2017-039)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 5-year extension of the previously-approved subdivision (2012-038), to July 16, 2022.

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

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan – 5 Year Extension (2017-040)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the 5-year extension of the previously approved erosion control plan (2012-039), to July 16, 2022.

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

MICHAEL & SALLY FLYNN – Pre-Application Review to discuss a possible Special Exception to allow a 30' x 50' garage at 230 Middle Turnpike West, Business II and Design Overlay zones.

Ms. Bertotti stated that Mr. Flynn is not in attendance. She asked the Commission to remove this item from the Agenda and said the pre-application will be rescheduled.

Mr. Prause inquired if the item could be tabled.

Mr. Anderson affirmed that if an item is tabled, it must be placed on the next agenda to which Mr. Prause agreed.

MOTION: Ms. Ike moved to remove Item 4 under New Business from the Agenda.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Ms. Bertotti stated that there is no current business on the June 19th agenda. However, there are several items the Planning Department contemplates bringing to the Commission in a workshop, she said. Ms. Bertotti questioned whether the Commission would be interested in holding a workshop on the following discussion items.

According to Ms. Bertotti, there is a regulation for parking at the mall in the CUD zone that, in the Planning Department's opinion, is illogical. The regulation requires more restrictive parking for larger areas of retail service.

The Planning Department has identified several historic industrial buildings, e.g., the Co-Op, Hanshaw's Furniture and the Armory, which have unique hardships, Ms. Bertotti stated. Each building has different zoning. Regardless, all the buildings have difficulty with occupancy, she said, because of parking, building code requirements, and site restrictions. She said the Planning Department is interested in brainstorming about what can be done to perhaps alleviate some of those challenges.

Mr. Anderson stated this topic was brought to light in the Manchester Green Study. There are a couple of buildings that are confined in terms of space for parking, he stated. The Department is examining how to address this area, perhaps a floating zone, Mr. Anderson suggested. The Town has a special regulation dealing with rehabilitation of the Cheney Mills, which may be a model to work from, he said, as these buildings are becoming white elephants.

Mr. Prause inquired what the issue is when trying to attract tenants, whether it was insufficient parking or that the use exceeds the location.

Mr. Anderson replied that a potential owner will look at the building and the site, and will call the Planning Department inquiring what can be done at the location. The department informs the inquirer that this is a difficult solution, primarily because of parking, he said. Residential would be an option but would be difficult, he said. The Hanshaw Furniture building has turned over several times; at least one of the owners was unable to complete their intended project due to a zoning issue, Mr. Anderson said, and the building has turned over due to tax title. Perhaps there is a way, Mr. Anderson stated, to incentivize certain uses. Parking would be one thing to examine, and density or different types of developments might be others.

Mr. Prause questioned whether applicants are stating that they do not have enough parking spaces. Mr. Anderson replied not for a specific development. Ms. Bertotti interjected that it could be.

Mr. Prause stated that in the Green area, if the business could use the Senior Center parking lot, they would meet the requirements and there would be no problem, though it sounds as if potential tenants would prefer to lower the threshold of the parking requirements.

Mr. Anderson stated, in his opinion, the issue of how the Town can incentivize the use of vacant buildings is a community issue as well as a Planning issue. In other words, said Mr. Anderson, the Planning Department is not approaching the matter as an opportunity to help a particular applicant.

Mr. Prause questioned whether this subject could go before the Zoning Board of Appeals as a hardship.

Mr. Anderson could not comment to that. He stated that any applicant could apply for a variance, though it may be challenging.

Mr. Kidd suggested looking at this issue on a broader scale, not just parking. He speculated it may make sense to bring in neutral parties with development backgrounds to give an alternate perspective.

Mr. Prause asked if Mr. Kidd was suggesting a consultant similar to the Commission's handling of Form-Based Zoning.

Mr. Kidd stated not at this time. However, he reflected on developers that have come before the Commission with concerns about the zoning regulations.

Mr. Anderson agreed that the Planning Department could reach out for feedback from consultants.

Another issue Mr. Anderson would like to discuss in the workshop is signage, specifically sign materials. He has noticed signs, particularly downtown, that appear to be low-cost plastic, not conforming to the standards that are in place. In addition, there may be an opportunity to discuss other issues that may arise as well.

In addition, Mr. Anderson stated, now that the application for the mall solar arrays has been heard by the Commission, the Planning Department intends to bring a solar regulation before the Commission.

Mr. Anderson reported there would be a joint meeting on June 15th between the PZC, the Cheney Commission, and the Economic Development Commission for a discussion of the Cheney District, specifically the mansions. The intent is to have a creative discussion about how the commissions can work together in the process; i.e., when an application comes before the PZC, what staff and commissions' roles are, the future of the district, and how it continues to be an asset for the Town as it has been for decades. Mr. Anderson stated the Planning Department reviewed the regulations and determined only four or five uses are allowed in the Cheney Mansions and this may be a topic of discussion.

Ms. Ike inquired if any part of the proposed meeting relates to the May 1st application.

Mr. Anderson stated that the May 1st meeting will be mentioned, as well as the last several applications, in an effort to promote understanding of how the process works.

Ms. Ike asked if the workshop request came from the Cheney Commission.

Mr. Anderson replied that the request is the Planning Department's idea. He specified that the Cheney Commission and the PZC have discussed the issues, including before his tenure. This is a timely issue, Mr. Anderson said, considering the recent zone changes which include breweries and inns, and indeed the Cheney Commission has concerns as well.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 17, 2017 Public Hearing/Business Meeting

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

May 1, 2017 Public Hearing/Business Meeting

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

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

KATHLEEN ARTEAGA – Zone Change (2017-035) – Request a zone change from Residence AA Zone to Rural Residence Zone at 278 Hackmatack Street.

CASTANHO & CLOUTIER DEVELOPMENT, LLC – Extension of Previously-Approved Subdivision (2017-039); Extension of Previously-Approved Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-040) - Request 5-year extensions of the previously-approved subdivision 2012-038 and erosion control plan 2012-039 at 698 North Main Street.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT – Inland Wetlands Permit (2017-041); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-042) – For reconstruction of approximately 2,100 linear feet of roadway along Edgerton Street from Center Street to Hemlock Street.

Mr. Kidd questioned why two of the new applications are listed, even though those applications were on the current agenda.

Ms. Bertotti stated that those two applications had been submitted to the Planning Department at some point between the last PZC meeting and the current meeting. The two applications did not require a complex review and, therefore, there was enough time for staff to review them and submit them to the Commission for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Kidd asked whether the Commission technically needed to accept the two applications before hearing them tonight. Ms. Bertotti said the applications had been accepted when the applicants made their presentations to the Commission. The "Receipt of New Applications" item on the agenda is just a formality, she explained. Mr. Kidd said he must have misunderstood, because he thought the "Receipt of New Applications" started a clock, and that items were formally accepted as new applications through this mechanism.

Ms. Bertotti informed Mr. Kidd that it is an automatic date set by State statutes, not necessarily an action by the Commission, which allows the Commission to act upon an application without acting on accepting an application. The list of new applications essentially shows the Commission what is coming, what applications have been accepted.

Mr. Kidd asked if that meant that the applications had been formally put into the system already and Ms. Bertotti replied that yes, they had been.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to adjourn the meeting.

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

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 9:05 PM.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

July 5, 2017

Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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