

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
APRIL 2, 2018**

ROLL CALL:

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

Alternates: Teresa Ike

Alternate Member Sitting: Julian Stoppelman

Absent: Timothy Bergin
Patrick Kennedy

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

The Chairman opened the Business Meeting at 7:40 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

NEW BUSINESS:

WOODBIDGE MILLS, LLC – To revise Art. II, Sec. 22.04 to add multi-family historic mill conversion in accordance with the requirements of Art. II, Sec. 9.14.03 as a special exception use in the Special Design Commercial Business Zone. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-014)

Ms. Scorso commented that she is in support of the zoning regulation amendment. She was very excited about the proposal, and appreciated the fact that the applicant reached out to the Historical Society for their input, she said.

Mr. Kidd stated that he has not been as excited about a proposal in a very long time. He is very happy to support the amendment, and looks forward to the formal application.

Mr. Stoppelman noted that the process will not be easy, but in his opinion, this is the best proposal seen for the property.

Mr. Prause reported that the text amendment change opens up a few properties in the Special Design Commercial zone, and thus is not opening a big door. He reiterated that this is only a text amendment change to allow the property to be considered as a historic mill conversion, and reminded the developer that they will need to come before the Commission with a preliminary plan of development and be sure it matches the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the zoning regulation amendment (2018-014) to add multi-family historic mill conversion in accordance with the requirements of Art.

II, Sec. 9.14.03 as a special exception use in the Special Design Commercial Business Zone.

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

The reason for the approval is that the proposed amendment is consistent with the Manchester Green Corridor Study and with several POCD Growth Management Principles, including:

1. GMP 2 Conserve, Restore and Protect Cultural and Historic Resources – and specifically with Goal and Objective C: Adopt ordinances to protect at-risk districts and properties;
2. GMP 3 Redevelop and Revitalize Existing Commercial Centers and Areas of Mixed Land Use – and specifically with Goal and Objective B1: Incentivize adaptive reuse of vacant and underutilized sites/buildings, C1: The PZC should adopt zone changes that encourage a mix of uses at nodes and along corridors, and C4: Adopt zoning that allows/requires a mix of uses within walking distance of a transit stop.
3. GMP 5 – Expand housing opportunities and design choices to accommodate a variety of household types and needs.

The effective date of the zoning regulation amendment is April 18, 2018.

CONNECTICUT CVS PHARMACY, LLC – For modifications to the previously approved grading plans to raise the finished floor elevations of the two buildings at 1221 Main Street (formerly 1229 Main Street and 27 and 31 Charter Oak Street).– Special Exception Modification (2018-013), Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-025)

Mr. Steve Kochis, Professional Engineer with VHB, introduced himself as well as his colleague, Paul Vitaliano, Professional Engineer with VHB. Mr. Kochis explained that the original application for the site plan displayed was for a special exception, design overlay, and erosion and sedimentation control plan, which were approved by the Commission in November 2014. Subsequently, the applicant has received CT DOT encroachment permit signoff in April 2015, he reported, and most recently submitted a special exception modification seeking administrative approval in February 2018 to Town Staff.

Mr. Kochis explained that the applicant's intent is to revise the proposed site grades in an effort to reduce the overall amount of earthwork removed from the site. He pointed to the two building pads, Phase I and Phase II, with Phase I being the CVS building and Phase II planned for a bank. The Phase I building will be raised by approximately two feet, and the Phase II building by about a foot and a half, he said. Mr. Kochis reported that there have been no changes proposed to either of the buildings in terms of location and architecture, no changes to traffic circulation, the number of parking spaces, general circulation around the site, location of the curb cuts, or the overall delineation of drainage watersheds from the site to the adjoining roads.

During the February 2018 application process, Mr. Kochis noted, the applicant received comments from Town Engineering Staff and those comments have been addressed in the most current application, submitted last month. In discussions with Town Staff, there was a suggestion to make the application to the Commission instead of seeking administrative approval because of the changes to the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, which are generally moving catch basins and minor changes to the inverts. Mr. Kochis commented that the intent of the

Erosion and Sediment Control Plan has not changed; there will still be perimeter controls, inlet protection at the catch basins, and what was approved in 2014. To reiterate the history of the site, he explained the site is the location of the former Carter Chevrolet and described the plans. He reported that, as part of the February application, there was a full drainage addendum, which Town Engineering staff reviewed, that proved there are no material changes to the storm water runoff from the site to any of the adjoining streets. Town Staff recommended the applicant redo the architectural perspectives of what the buildings will look like. The plans have been revised to incorporate the proposed grading, according to Mr. Kochis.

Mr. Prause inquired why the changes are necessary.

Mr. Kochis noted that the changes are not necessary, though the intent is to reduce the overall amount of soil leaving the site.

Mr. Prause asked if the new buildings will be at a higher elevation than the current buildings.

Mr. Kochis replied that the current buildings are at a lower elevation.

Mr. Prause questioned why the plan would remove less soil.

Mr. Kochis explained that the plan would smooth and flatten the soil, noting that the eastern side of the site is higher. In raising the western side, it smoothed out the site and reduced the earthwork, he explained.

Mr. Prause inquired what the elevation change would be on the eastern side.

Mr. Kochis stated that the building would be about 1-1/2 ft. and the remainder anywhere from 1-1/2 ft. to zero; the 2 ft. on the west and the 1-1/2 ft. on the east would be the maximum that the applicant would raise it.

Mr. Prause asked if there would be any limitation in the engineering in the current plan.

Mr. Kochis reported there are no engineering limitations; it is to reduce the amount of earthwork. He explained that, additionally, the property is under a transfer act and all the soil that leaves the site must be tested according to CT DEEP. He noted that it is not necessarily that the soil is contaminated, but any soil that is removed would need to be tested and taken to an approved location.

Mr. Prause speculated on any long-term remediation that would be required.

Mr. Kochis explained that the only remediation, over the next month or two, will be between 500 and 1,000 cu. yds. of soil listed as meeting the criteria of being contaminated. It was his opinion that would be all within the building envelope. Additionally, he noted, for a five year period, any soil that is removed from the site must be tested and taken to an approved location.

Mr. Prause reiterated that the change does not have anything to do with a remediation site.

Mr. Kochis confirmed that the proposal does not result in a reduction in necessary removal of contaminated soil.

Mr. Prause asked about any changes to the erosion and sedimentation control plan.

Mr. Kochis replied that generally speaking, the intent has not changed. He displayed the latest erosion and sedimentation control plans, noting the construction traffic, catch basins, and silt fences with hay bales, which have just been relocated since the 2014 plans. Retaining the soil on site would be a benefit, he explained, as it will reduce the amount of truck traffic and it is preferable for erosion and sedimentation control purposes to retain soil.

Mr. Stebe said he assumed soil will need to be brought on site in order to raise the building.

Mr. Kochis stated that their earthwork estimates show there will not be a need to bring soil in, as they will be moving soil from other areas of the property.

Mr. Stebe asked if resetting the grade would change the flow of the planned parking impervious surfaces.

Mr. Kochis explained that they were very careful when the grade was changed. He displayed the site plan and pointed to the various drainage areas.

Mr. Stebe questioned whether the amount of impervious area has changed.

Mr. Kochis responded that the amount of impervious area has not changed at all. The only change, as a result of the regrading, was the sidewalk headed north of CVS, where the configuration had to change to keep it under 5% grade, he reported.

Mr. Stebe requested confirmation that, after changing the sloping in the northwest corner, the landscaping will be the same.

Mr. Kochis replied that the landscaping will be the same and displayed the rendering.

Mr. Stoppelman stated that it was his understanding when the plan was approved that Phase II would be a grassed area for the time being.

Mr. Kochis responded that area will be grassed. He explained that the intent is to begin construction on Phase I this summer and Phase II will be grassed. The contractors have been made aware that the Phase II area must be graded to allow proper drainage, he noted.

Ms. Bertotti reported that there are three minor and technical comments that have been communicated to the applicants. The comments can be easily addressed on the final mylars if the Commission approves the application, she explained. There are two separate applications, she described; one is the special exception modification and the second is the erosion and sediment control plan. Ms. Bertotti stated that there is no option for processing the changes to the certified erosion and sediment control plan outside of the full Commission. Therefore, when Staff was discussing the application, the building being raised and its appearance to the street, it was felt best that the applicant file both applications before the entire Commission.

Mr. Anderson inquired of the applicant if they have a view of the approved street view vs. the current proposal.

Mr. Kochis displayed both, noting that the prior street view plan did not consider grade at that time, and that the building would have been raised about a foot, after which he displayed the current plan.

Mr. Stebe noted changes to the grading plan and questioned whether the applicant had both renderings available.

Mr. Kochis displayed the 2014 application and explained each area and the associated drainage vs. the current application.

Mr. Prause inquired whether the applicant had elevation views of current buildings on Main Street compared to the CVS.

Mr. Kochis replied that he did not.

Mr. Prause asked Staff how the buildings would compare.

Mr. Anderson noted that Bennet would be the next building.

Ms. Bertotti added that there is also the church across the street.

Mr. Stebe sought clarification that the profile and height of the proposed building from sidewalk to cap would be completely unchanged.

Mr. Kochis responded that, from sidewalk to cap, the building will be 2 ft. higher. He explained that the architecture of the building has not been changed and the finished floor has been raised 2 ft.

Mr. Stebe questioned the sidewalk going straight into the building.

Mr. Kochis noted that is unchanged.

Mr. Stebe asked what the height would be if standing on the street sidewalk next to Main Street.

Mr. Kochis reported that, from the intersection of Charter Oak Street with Main Street, the roof of the building will be approximately 27 ft. above the sidewalk, and about 29 ft. from the sidewalk at Wells Street and Main Street.

Mr. Prause inquired about Ms. Handfield's comments.

Ms. Bertotti reported that Ms. Handfield had a comment noting that some language was eliminated and she would like to have that language back on the plan. She explained that Mr. Bernard Kalansuriya had a comment to inform the applicant that Wells Street has been paved, and they will be required to mill and surface a certain distance; this area would need to be identified on the plans. Ms. Bertotti noted that Mr. Kalansuriya's other comment was to add a note on the plan regarding the sewer laterals.

Mr. Prause commented that he understands that mistakes happen when creating a site plan. However, he stated, he is bothered by the fact that the plan had gone to public hearing with an incorrect elevation. It is difficult to visualize something that will change the footprint of the lot so much, he remarked, and during the public hearing, there was not an accurate rendering. To return at this time stating that there must also be different grading and the building is now 5 ft. above what was initially presented at the public hearing puts the Commission in a difficult spot when determining whether this is an excessive change, Mr. Prause explained. He recalled that,

during the public hearing, there were concerns about the scale of the building and how different the design would be from the prior business.

Mr. Kochis added that the existing building is directly on the corner of Charter Oak and Main Street, and while he was not involved four years ago, he assumes it was very important to develop the building away from the corner.

Mr. Prause questioned the retaining wall at the intersection of Charter Oak and Main Street that was part of the original plan.

Mr. Kochis stated that the only retaining wall proposed on the site is along the eastern property line, and has been there since the 2014 application.

Ms. Scorso agreed with Mr. Prause's comment, and added that she does not feel she has enough information. She would like to see how the elevation works with the rest of the cityscape on Main Street.

Mr. Kidd sought to clarify a statement by the applicant that they were raising the grade by 2 ft. from what was originally planned.

Mr. Kochis agreed that it would be raising the building about 2 ft. from the approved application.

Mr. Kidd noted that the applicant stated 5 ft. and he assumes it is 5 ft. based on the elevations offered at the time.

Mr. Kochis reported that there were never elevations shown on the original plans.

Ms. Bertotti stated that the confusion is between the grading plans and the projected building elevations that were shown by the architect, which were drawn on a flat, level surface. The grading plan has not changed, and they are raising the site by 2 ft.; they are not raising the site by 5 ft., she explained. Ms. Bertotti remarked that, even with an additional 2 ft., this building will still be the shortest in the area; Bennet School is taller, the church is taller, and the house across the street is at least 35 ft. in height.

Mr. Kidd stated that was his expectation. He noted that it was approved at a 3 ft. elevation and now it is requested to be approved at a 5 ft. elevation, a net 2 ft. change. In his opinion, the stairs seem to add more character to the building.

Ms. Scorso described her request for more information regarding how the proposal will fit in with the rest of Main Street and the rest of the cityscape. She noted that it may be shorter than other buildings in the area, but when considering the new elevation, she questioned whether it would fit in with the cityscape.

Mr. Prause questioned whether there was a consensus among the Commission members about whether or not to seek more information.

Mr. Kidd responded that he has enough information.

Special Exception Modification (2018-013)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the Special Exception Modification to change the plans approved by the Commission on November 17, 2014 with regards to grading with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated March 27, 2018; and
2. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated March 28, 2018 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

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

Mr. Kidd seconded the motion; Mr. Prause, Mr. Kidd, Mr. Stebe and Mr. Stoppelman voted in favor. Ms. Scorso voted against the motion. The motion passed four to one.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-025)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to certify the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-025) with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated March 27, 2018; and
2. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated March 28, 2018 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

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

ASSOCIATION OF MUSLIM COMMUNITY (AMC) – Pre-application review to discuss a possible zone change at 35 Oak Street and 50 Cottage Street.

Mr. Anwar Diana introduced himself, speaking as a member of the congregation. Until 2011, there were no Muslim houses of worship in Manchester, he reported. Thanks to the cooperation from the Town of Manchester and the regulatory agencies, Mr. Diana explained, they received approval to establish the first house of worship for Muslims on Cottage Street. He reported that in the last few years, the congregation has lived there, worked there and cooperated with the neighborhood, with a harmonious relationship with the neighbors. Like most new immigrants' growing communities, their needs have changed. Mr. Diana noted that the current facility works for prayer services, but most religious locations have necessary ancillary uses such as religious education for children, fellowship programs, community outreach programs, and social programs, none of which the congregation can offer.

Mr. Diana displayed the location, pointing to a building facing Oak Street and Cottage Street, which came up for sale. The congregation has expressed interest in the location with a Letter of Intent. He explained that, when viewing the building, it seemed to be a very logical solution. When considering the opportunity, the congregation did not realize that the building they are interested in is in a different zone than the current mosque. Staff recommended the congregation go before the Commission on an informal basis, answer questions, and determine if the plan is feasible. Mr. Diana referred to the aerial view of the area and noted that there would not be any change to the fabric of the community, the appearance of the area, or the use. There will be no change to the outside, no addition, and no new parking; the character of the neighborhood will remain exactly the same, he explained.

Mr. Kidd sought to clarify that the intent is to buy the entire building.

Mr. Diana confirmed and noted that would include the parking lot.

Mr. Kidd commented that the parking lot belongs to the proposed building. He inquired where the current mosque's parking is located.

Mr. Diana referred to the aerial view and explained that parking is not visible due to the trees.

Mr. Kidd noted that the intent is to keep the existing building.

Mr. Diana responded that the plan is to keep the existing building. The use has not been determined, but their intent is to keep the current building and move their operation into the new location. Mr. Diana noted that most religious locations have space for pastors' residences. He explained that their current location does not have such space, though the building was formerly a house and perhaps that may be a use.

Mr. Kidd stated that he reviewed the zoning map and questioned whether a small parcel to the west on Oak Street is a different piece of property.

Mr. Anderson explained that parcel is part of the Town's parking lot.

Mr. Kidd said he assumed that would not be included in this proposal.

Mr. Anderson replied that would not be included as it is a separate parcel.

Mr. Kidd questioned whether the zone change would be consistent with the area. The Commission would need to consider adjusting the zoning in place, he surmised, perhaps a reversion back to RB from years ago, which is not inconsistent with the rest of the street. He noted that there would be a different zone across the street if the proposed change in the zoning was made. Mr. Kidd noted that there is a dance studio across Oak Street. He remarked that the zoning would jump from CBD back to RB back to CBD, which is disconcerting. He questioned whether the parking lot on the corner of Oak and Cottage Street needs to remain CBD or if that could revert back to RB.

Ms. Bertotti responded that the best way to consider the issue would be more comprehensively, whether the Central Business District should run along Main Street or if it should spread onto the side streets.

Mr. Kidd noted that it would not be advisable to do a zone change for all the individual properties.

Mr. Anderson added that the area also follows the Special Services District, noting there are reasons behind why the lines are what they are. Obviously, he explained, the Cottage Street parking lot is an important part of the downtown parking situation.

Mr. Kidd stated that he reviewed the zoning regulations and did not see anything that allows parking lots in either in RB or CBD; parking, yes, but not parking lots.

Mr. Anderson questioned whether Mr. Kidd was referring to specific parking lots associated with private use.

Mr. Kidd responded yes, associated with private use, but not as a standalone entity. He speculated that the Commission could not necessarily change the property to RB because that does not include the ability to have a standalone parking lot.

Mr. Anderson stated that would have to be ascertained.

Mr. Kidd stated that, if the Commission was to change the zoning it should be kept consistent up to a certain point, rather than having a spot. In his opinion, the location is so far from Main Street it would not be a concern.

Mr. Stoppelman questioned whether the parking lot would remain CBD rather than RB.

Mr. Anderson interjected that, in his opinion, Mr. Kidd was talking about the public parking lot on Cottage Street and if there is a zone change for the properties in question, essentially that is a spot zone in the Central Business District inside of the Residential District.

Mr. Stoppelman commented that the Central Business District on the same side of the street extends to a couple of buildings further down Oak Street, though there is RB between.

Ms. Bertotti questioned whether Mr. Stoppelman was referring to properties along Spruce Street. She noted that is not CBD; that is Neighborhood Business.

Mr. Stoppelman stated that he thought there was CBD further down Oak Street.

Ms. Bertotti replied that there is, but it is a parking lot. Beyond the locations being discussed, she stated, there is a parking lot and following that there is a Neighborhood Business zone along Spruce Street.

Mr. Stoppelman stated that, in his opinion, this would be a good use for the property and he hopes this can be worked out.

Mr. Stebe questioned Town Staff about whether there is a way to maintain the CBD and put a place of worship in there with a special exception or a ZBA action.

Ms. Bertotti responded the only way to do that would be through a variance.

Mr. Anderson commented that there could be a text amendment. There could be a text amendment re-adding religious uses back to the Central Business District, he explained. Those were removed a couple of decades ago, he noted, for very specific reasons, but he said he believes it would be a broad brush for a specific problem.

Mr. Stebe stated, if the applicant went through the ZBA and received a variance for that specific property, that would maintain the contiguous aspects of the zone. He reported that in 2010 or 2011, a variance was needed because of the size of Cottage Street; it was not deemed the correct size or type of roadway. Unless the Commission wants to go into a longer discussion on where the CBD is and where the Downtown District is, which would entail a number of stakeholders and a longer process, Mr. Stebe explained, the most expedient measure would be to work through the ZBA to get a variance on that specific property. He recalled that section of parking lot and that buffer between the bank building and the Town parking was improved as part of the parking lot improvement, and there is now a buffer, division, or fence extending from Oak Street

to the fence at the beginning of the mosque's current property, and thus that is not a throughway as depicted on the aerial view.

Mr. Diana responded that is correct.

Mr. Stebe noted that the two properties flow very nicely. Instead of going through a zoning change, a ZBA process would be easier, in his opinion. He expressed that this would be a nice expansion of what is being done in the community and their ability to thrive.

Ms. Bertotti remarked that Staff discussed the variance avenue with the applicants. Variances require a hardship, she reminded the Commission, though she cannot think of one in this instance.

Mr. Diana stated that they have racked their brains to determine a hardship, noting that they are not allowed to say it would be a financial hardship. Looking at the overall context of the community, he expressed, and how the community has grown, noting the new section of immigrants who are a part of the fabric of Manchester, Mr. Diana reported that they fully respect and understand that there are zoning regulations. For this particular location, he stated, it is a nice flow and this would be the least impact in terms of the use, traffic, change of character or how the buildings look. Mr. Diana noted that the proposal would give the mosque, as a thriving community, an opportunity to have a place for the children to attend religious education and community outreach programs.

Mr. Diana reported that they are seeking the Commission's guidance as to whichever solution or path will be in the applicant's favor. If the ZBA is the pathway, that can be done, but he noted that the Commission is much more experienced in the language and the nuances of the zoning regulations.

Mr. Kidd said he assumed the applicant would be hard pressed to receive an exception through the ZBA due to the lack of hardship. He stated that his only problem is the continuity with the zone, though that parking lot is non-conforming in a non-conforming situation to begin with. Mr. Kidd explained that the Town cannot do anything with the location; it cannot be turned into an RB in his opinion. He noted that it is only a CBD by default. The location is reasonable, he explained, the flow is reasonable, and if the current location is made into guest housing or leadership housing, and has events, ceremonies and education in the bigger building, that would be a good repurposing of the building. He reported that he would not have a problem with a zone change application.

Mr. Prause questioned Staff whether they are looking for direction from the Commission about whether the applicant should submit a zone change only for the property they are interested in or to develop a plan for the Commission to make a zone change.

Mr. Anderson reiterated that a zone change would be a much larger process. He stated that the Staff is not seeking guidance, the applicant is, and the Planning Department has determined that this is the most prudent and straightforward way to present this. The topic is providing the applicant with as much information as possible on the idea for a zone change just on the property.

Mr. Prause stated that he had no issue with changing the zoning to Residence B.

Mr. Diana questioned whether the applicant should work with Town Staff to proceed. He explained that they are open to any suggestions.

Ms. Bertotti explained that the zoning map amendment is a formal procedure and suggested the applicant speak with Staff. She reported three options: 1) A zoning map amendment, which is the most localized way to address this in front of the Commission, 2) Apply for a variance, or 3) A text amendment, which would be extensive and would apply to the entire district. Ms. Bertotti explained that the map amendment would be localized to the applicant's property.

Mr. Diana commented that they would prefer to take the simplest route.

Mr. Anderson suggested that Mr. Diana call Ms. Bertotti to move forward.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT – Modification to the previously approved Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan approved on May 1, 2017 to address minor changes in the proposed footprint of the southern Lincoln Center parking lot at 494 Main Street, 41 Center Street, 99 Edgerton Street, and 35 Center Street. – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-022)

Ms. Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner, introduced herself. Ms. Bertotti explained that the Town Engineering Department has recently received an approval of the erosion and sediment control plan to rebuild the Lincoln Center parking lot. She displayed the plan and described the changes, increasing an area to 28 ft. from 24 ft. Ms. Bertotti explained that there are circulation problems with box trucks maneuvering through the parking lot. In order to accommodate the change, a spruce tree would be removed, she said, and she further depicted the changes to the grass strip areas.

Mr. Prause questioned when the activity will commence.

Ms. Bertotti replied that the project is anticipated to start in the summer and to be completed by the fall. She explained that Staff realized they do not have the authority to review this type of plan administratively, and one of the applications forthcoming will be a text amendment for a resolution.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to certify the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-022). Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Ms. Bertotti brought to the Commission's attention Staff's discussion about a comprehensive look at the Town's parking requirements and parking lots. A meeting was held by Engineering, Zoning, the Environmental Planner, and herself to discuss various issues regarding parking, including the surface of parking lots and the fact that all parking lots are required to be bituminous, which is becoming problematic. She also reported the discussion about landscaping and the Town's minimum requirements for parking. The next meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission will have a light agenda, and Staff proposed a workshop regarding the issues.

Mr. Anderson noted that, as a built-out community with redevelopment becoming the economic development in town, much of that will involve parking lots. He noted that there is a great deal of surface parking in underutilized areas and speculated on how there could be better use of those spaces. Currently, the regulations make that issue difficult, in his opinion, and overly difficult in some locations, especially commercial locations where a lot of parking is required but not used often. He also reported that many people are looking to be creative, in terms of shared parking or to have one parcel zoned for a parking lot related to another parcel, and they cannot do it because the Town requires all the parking to be on-site. Mr. Anderson stated that Staff believes that a comprehensive review of this issue is overdue.

Mr. Kidd noted that he has been concerned for years about over-paving and would be interested in reviewing maximum parking requirements and/or different materials with a pervious surface. He also stated that he would be open to shared parking, though it may be troublesome.

Mr. Stoppelman pointed out that the future CVS will have twice the minimum parking, and the Commission had no control over that.

Mr. Anderson reported that there are communities that have maximum parking numbers. Hartford, he said, eliminated parking requirements altogether, and there are efforts in other towns to look differently at parking.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

March 19, 2018 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

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

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:

Ms. Bertotti reported that the Commission will be accepting two new applications:

1. Connecticut CVS Pharmacy, LLC – Special Exception Modification (2018-013); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-025)
The Commission acted upon the item at the current meeting.
2. Trustees of North Methodist Church – Resubdivision (2018-027); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-028) – For re-subdivision and associated improvement of two existing parcels at 40 and 41 Farmington Street into five lots and associated site work at 300 Parker Street.

Ms. Bertotti explained, at the request of Ms. Ike, that the future text amendment proposal shown on the tentative Future Agenda for May 7th is for sign posting, not to extend an area of notification to 500 feet. It was Staff's understanding, based on the workshop, that that was the direction the Commission sought.

Mr. Anderson interjected that if, in the future, the Commission wishes to extend the area, that can be done without an amendment. The posting of signs is required to be in the regulations, he explained; the sending of abutter notices is not, but is a practice that is currently done. He

reported that Staff seeks direction from the Commission on the signs before making a decision on the abutter notices.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to adjourn the business meeting. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 9:10 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

April 16, 2018
Date

Eric Prause, Chairman