

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
JANUARY 4, 2017**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman  
Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman  
Jessica Scorso  
Timothy Bergin

Alternate Member Sitting: Patrick Kennedy

Alternates: Julian Stoppelman  
Teresa Ike

Absent: Michael Stebe, Secretary

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning  
Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner  
Katie Williford, Administrative Secretary

**NEW BUSINESS:**

TOWN OF MANCHESTER - For replacement of the bridge over Hop Brook on Hartford Road. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2016-135); Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-135); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2016-136); Flood Plain Permit (2016-137)

Mr. Jeff LaMalva, the Town Engineer, introduced members of CME consulting engineers to present the application. Mr. Dan Hoffman from CME stated that the bridge to be replaced was located on Hartford Road, between Bidwell Street and Case Drive. The bridge was constructed in the 1800s and widened in the 1930s, and there has been deterioration over time, Mr. Hoffman said.

Mr. Hoffman said that the low point of the roadway is at the bridge. Two catch basins on the bridge discharge into Hop Brook. Part of the project would be to shift the profile of the roadway and move the low point off of the bridge so runoff could be handled through catch basins with sumps and discharged properly through outlet protection. Another issue was scour issues at the center pier, so the proposed bridge would be single span to eliminate center pier.

There is currently riprap at three corners of the bridge, Mr. Hoffman said. Slope protection is proposed at all four corners, with the slope protection at the steeper northwest corner carried further. The bridge would be widened toward the south for the future Charter Oak Greenway, which would be an off-road bike trail. The channel bottom was proposed to be regraded and a five foot shelf would be provided for wildlife to pass under the bridge. The proposed structure will be founded on piles, drilled into bedrock.

During the demolition of the existing bridge and the construction of abutments, six 36-inch temporary pipes would handle the flow of the brook. Dewatering would be pumped into the

sedimentation basin. Once the abutments are constructed, three of the pipes would be removed, half of the stream bed would be graded, and the center pier would be removed. Then three pipes would be put over the new stream bed, the remainder would be regraded, and boulders would be added for fish habitat. Then the brook can be opened up to flow through the proposed channel while the remainder of the superstructure is built, Mr. Hoffman said.

Erosion control measures would include silt fence along the toe of the slopes, inlet sediment control devices at catch basins, construction entrance pads, a sedimentation basin for dewatering, riprap at the four corners of the bridge, scour holes at drainage outlets, and erosion control matting, Mr. Hoffman said.

Ms. Naomi Hodges of CME spoke about the wetlands resources in the area, which are associated with Hop Brook. The wetlands impacts of the project would be relatively minor, she said, with 3,460 square feet of permanent impacts and 1,130 square feet of temporary impacts. Wetland improvements would include clusters of boulders to promote fish habitat, channel reconstruction, and improved floodway performance.

Environmental permits that would be required included the Army Corps of Engineers General Permit Self Verification Form, CT DEEP Fisheries, State Historic Preservation Office, and local Inland Wetlands approval, Ms. Hodges said.

In response to a question from Ms. Scorso, Ms. Hodges said the temporary impacts would be the installation of the pipes, but the channel will be able to regrow and there will not be permanent impact to the aquatic life there.

Mr. Prause asked what was driving the replacement of the bridge now. Mr. LaMalva said it was the age and condition of the bridge. The state inspects bridges every two years and this bridge was rated poorly. The main issue was the underlying foundation of the bridge. There are not many other bridges in town that are from the 1800s, Mr. LaMalva said. Short term fixes and repairs were not feasible based on the original construction of the bridge, and the utilities above and through the bridge will make construction difficult.

Mr. Bergin suggested that the detour should start well in advance of the smaller neighborhood roads around Case Drive and House Drive. Mr. LaMalva responded that the detour would use McKee Street.

Mr. Prause asked how long the project would be in progress and Mr. Hoffman replied it would be for one construction season, April 1st to December 1st. Mr. Prause asked how the dam was calculated. Mr. Hoffman replied that with 6 pipes, it was based on four times the spring flow of the brook, but it would not be in place for the entire construction, just the demolition and the construction of the abutments.

Mr. Prause asked for more information about the greenway path. Mr. LaMalva replied that Charter Oak Greenway goes along Hartford Road and this section is the only area that is on the road currently. It is in the capital plan to have it be an off-road path, so the plans for the bridge replacement accommodate that project by including a 10 foot wide sidewalk that can connect into it.

Mr. Kidd noted that the key issue was the determination of significant impact. He asked how the square footage of temporary vs. permanent impact was calculated. Mr. Hoffman replied that

they were separate areas. The temporary impacts would be bounded by the temporary dam on either side and the wetlands limits. It's anything outside of that that is not permanent. Most of the channel within that area will be permanent impacts and then there are some temporary impacts for placing the pipes and constructing the temporary dams. The permanent impacts are basically between the hatched lines across on the water handling plan and the temporary impacts are north or south of that.

Mr. Kidd asked how Mr. Hoffman viewed the construction of new abutments as an impact. Ms. Hodges said the footprints of the abutments would be placed within wetlands, so that area of impact is where those wetlands will be removed. Since the bridge will be widened, it will encroach on wetlands, which would be permanent impact. The channel reconstruction is the widening, regrading, and taking out the center pier. Mr. Kidd asked why it was necessary to widen the bridge and Mr. Hoffman replied that it was for hydraulic purposes and to accommodate the bikeway. Mr. Kidd summarized that it seemed there would be impacts, but they seemed not to be negatively impacting anything.

Mr. Prause asked what goes into the State Historic Preservation Office's recommendation. Mr. Hoffman said the Historic Preservation Office had said the bridge may be historically significant, so the town had to hire a separate firm to study it. That firm had determined the bridge has no historical significance, he said.

Mr. Prause asked if there would be increased turbidity or velocity changes and Mr. Hoffman replied it should be slower.

Ms. Bertotti said that, in Mr. Bordeaux's comments on the application, he had said his opinion was that this application had not contributed to a significant impact; in fact, the impact was outweighed by the improvements to the hydraulics as well as the improvements to fishery and riparian flow which will not be affected during the temporary construction because the temporary pipes are large enough for fish to pass through. Mr. Bordeaux had no significant concerns with this application, Ms. Bertotti said. Staff also had no comments as far as revising plans, she said.

#### Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2016-135)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the inland wetlands permit application 2016-135 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Mr. Kidd seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

#### Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-135)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the inland wetlands permit. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity does not disturb the natural or indigenous character of the land by significant impact or major effect.

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

#### Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2016-136)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to certify the erosion and sediment control plan. Mr. Bergin

seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Flood Plain Permit (2016-137)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the flood plain permit. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION – To revise Art. IV Sec. 13.10.05.03 to limit the size of multiple tenant signage in business plazas. - Zoning Regulation Amendment (2016-133)

Zoning Regulation Amendment (2016-133)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the zoning regulation amendment at Art. IV, Sec. 13.10.05.03 to limit the size of multiple tenant signage in business plazas. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

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

The zoning regulation amendment will be effective on January 20, 2017.

ANTHONY G. AND PAULA C. VISCOGLIOSI – Request a special exception under Art. II Sec. 18.03.08 to operate an inn at 50 Forest Street, Historic Zone. – Special Exception (2016-116) – Request for extension until February 1, 2017

Special Exception (2016-116) – Request for extension until February 1, 2017

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the extension of time to open a public hearing until February 1, 2017. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**MOTION:** Ms. Scorso nominated Mr. Stebe as Secretary. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**MOTION:** Mr. Bergin nominated Mr. Kidd as Vice Chairman and Mr. Prause as Chairman. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:**

Mr. Anderson suggested the possibility of having a workshop to discuss zoning matters at the next meeting, since the agenda would be light. He said a possible workshop item could be the next steps after the Manchester Green workshop, or what should be the next area to look at. Mr. Stoppelman said a citizen had suggested that the Commission should look at the issue of solar panels or other energy generators, and what will be allowed in the future. Ms. Bertotti said that the Planning Department had started some research into this topic. Mr. Kidd suggested discussing solar arrays and the Manchester Green at the workshop.

Ms. Ike asked if there was any chance the Viscogliosis' application for the inn would be on the agenda in the next two weeks. Ms. Bertotti responded that it could not, because they needed a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, which would not meet until January 25<sup>th</sup>.

**RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:**

1. **Town of Manchester Planning and Zoning Commission – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2016-145)** - To revise Art. II Sec. 8 (CUD zone) as follows: To remove multi-family dwellings and high rise apartments from the list of permitted uses; to add stand-alone multi-family or multi-family above ground floor commercial as special exception uses; and to add accessory use of yards, walkways, and parking lots as a permitted use. To revise Art. IV Sec. 20 (Special Exception Criteria) to remove the reference to the CBD zone at Art. IV Sec. 20.01.01(j). To delete Art. IV Sec. 2 (High Rise Apartments).
2. **Tilcon, Inc. – Inland Wetlands Permit (2016-147)** - For removal of an existing weigh scale and building at 116 Union Street, and installation of a new weigh scale at 569D North Main Street (a.k.a. 569 North Main Street).
3. **Town of Manchester Planning & Zoning Commission – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2016-148)** - To revise Art. I Sec. 2 (Definitions) to add a definition for Outdoor Entertainment. To revise Art. II Sec. 8 (Comprehensive Urban Development Zone), Art. II Sec. 10 (Business I Zone), Art. II Sec. 11 (Business II Zone), Art. II Sec. 12 (Business III Zone), Art. II Sec. 14 (Business V Zone), Art. II Sec. 15 (Central Business District), Art. II Sec. 22 (Special Design Commercial Business Zone), Art. II Sec. 24 (General Business Zone) and Art. II Sec. 26 (Form Based Zone) to add Outdoor Entertainment as a special exception use.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:01 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

January 18, 2017  
Date

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

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