

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 15, 2018**

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman
Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Jessica Scorso (Absent for 2018-112,
extension requests for 2018-
085,086,087,088,089, and approval
of minutes)

Alternates: Julian Stoppelman, Sitting
Teresa Ike (Sitting for 2018-112, extension
requests for 2018-
085,086,087,088,089, and approval
of minutes only)

Absent: Timothy Bergin
Patrick Kennedy

Also Present: Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner
Gary Anderson, Director of Planning &
Economic Development
Katie Williford, Administrative Secretary

Time Convened: 7:21 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS:

TOLLAND TURNPIKE REALTY LLC – To demolish an outbuilding, construct a building addition, overlay the existing pavement, and pave the gravel parking area at 30, 54, and 80 Tolland Turnpike. –Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2018-098); Inland Wetlands Permit (2018-098); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-099) Special Exception Modification (2018-100)

Mr. Mark Grocki, Project Manager with VHB, 100 Great Meadow Road, Wethersfield, CT, presented on behalf of their client, Manchester City Nissan. Also present were Jay Marino of American Contractors and Katie Taylor, Engineer with VHB.

Manchester City Nissan is located at 30 Tolland Turnpike and there are 3 parcels involved in the application, Mr. Grocki said. He displayed an aerial photo showing the existing conditions of the site. 30 Tolland Turnpike is the large building located centrally; 54 Tolland Turnpike is just south of the large building; and 80 Tolland Turnpike is to the far south of the property, he said.

Mr. Grocki said the applicant is proposing to modify the existing special exception, which relates to development on a site over 4 acres in size and with more than 60 parking spaces. A new building addition is proposed, a wetlands permit is required for activity within the 100' regulated

area of the wetlands located to the east of the site, and erosion and sedimentation control certification is required for disturbance of greater than half an acre, he said.

The primary dealership and repair shop is located central to the site, Mr. Grocki said. The building at 54 Tolland Turnpike has recently been demolished and the building to the far south will be used for auto body detailing, he said. Mr. Grocki noted that the owner of the property recently changed; Decormier Nissan owned it previously but is not involved in the current project. The goals of the project are to dress up the site, improve the parking surface area, add inventory storage space, and construct a building addition, he said.

Mr. Grocki indicated the existing edge of the wetlands along the eastern and southern perimeter of the site, indicated by a red line on the plan. The wetlands were delineated by Professional Wetlands Scientist Matt Davison of Davison Environmental. Along the eastern perimeter and to the south is a compacted gravel and dirt parking lot area.

Mr. Grocki displayed a plan showing the proposed conditions for the site. The building in the center is now demolished. A new 1,800 sf service bay addition is proposed to the south of the large building. The entire parking field will be overlaid with new bituminous pavement and some of that new overlay payment will encroach into the 100' wetland regulated area, he said. The gravel parking perimeter along the east and south is proposed to be resurfaced with bituminous pavement for parking of storage inventory vehicles, which will be the most significant impact to the 100' upland review area.

On site visits, it was discovered that the previous owner had pushed gravel into the wetlands system to the east, Mr. Grocki said. In addition to resurfacing the area so gravel will no longer be pushed into the wetlands, the applicant also proposes to remove gravel and debris from the wetlands. Additionally, the new perimeter of impervious pavement will be curbed off. Under existing conditions, stormwater runoff was untreated and ran from the parking area directly into the wetlands, he explained. With the proposed pavement and curbs, the runoff will instead be directed to six proposed vegetated water quality basins that will provide detention and water quality treatment for the new impervious surface on the site. The removal of the gravel from the wetlands will be by hand shovel or small excavator, not large machines, Mr. Grocki said.

Mr. Grocki said all staff comments had been worked through, but there were two outstanding comments for which the applicant wishes to keep the current proposal. One comment from Staff was to relocate the oil water separator, from the middle of the new addition to the outside. He explained that the applicant requests to keep the oil water separator in its current location for ease of construction, because accessing it will be easy using a vac truck with an extended hose, and because if it is in a visible space it will help workers remember to have it serviced.

The second staff comment for which the applicant is requesting to keep their current proposal related to the location of the landscaped islands, Mr. Grocki said. Four new landscaped islands are proposed near the center of the site, and Staff suggested relocating them to the far end rows of the inventory storage areas. If the landscaped areas were at the front, closest to the right of way, they would block off new vehicles that will be displayed in the front spaces.

Mr. Grocki said proper erosion and sedimentation controls are proposed around the perimeter of the site and are properly engineered per the 2002 Connecticut Erosion and Sedimentation Guidelines.

Mr. Grocki explained that two different elevations for the building were submitted, one with a red parapet and another with a standard whitish gray parapet, because Manchester City Nissan has not decided which color they would like. The applicant requests that both options be approved so they can then decide which they want to use.

Mr. Kidd asked Mr. Grocki to indicate the location of the 100' upland review area on the plan. Mr. Grocki stated it would be somewhere on the edge of the building.

Mr. Kidd asked if the repaving over compacted gravel would be within the existing footprint. Mr. Grocki replied that is correct; they will not encroach beyond the limits of the inventory parking area, other than to remove gravel that has been pushed too far. The curbing will help establish the new limit. The curbing will follow the outline of the parking spots and beyond that is a vegetative buffer to the wetlands.

Mr. Stoppelman asked where customers waiting for service will park. Mr. Grocki said display and inventory will be to the south, there are a couple parking spaces for post-service, customer parking will be directly in front and on the side, and employees and waiting for service parking would be on the north side. The green area on the map in front of the building next to the street is an existing green area that will be maintained.

Mr. Stebe asked how far beyond the proposed curb location the gravel is going into those wetlands, on average. He noted that there is an intermittent stream behind the property and asked how far they will go into that, what level of debris they will pull out, and what they will put in its place. Mr. Grocki replied that, from the curb line to the wetlands buffer on average is about 10 ft. The gravel extends at most 5 to 10 ft. into the wetlands, he said. If it is too wet, they will not haul it all out, but they would like to clean up the gravel from that buffer between the curb and the wetland limit and whatever they can reach without going too far into the wetlands. Mr. Stebe asked if his understanding was correct, that there is about 10 ft. between where the new curb will be established and the full demarcation line, which is going to get cleaned up, and then the gravel goes beyond that another few feet. Mr. Grocki confirmed that was correct; they have seen gravel encroach into the wetlands. Mr. Stebe asked what the gravel will be replaced with in order to rebuild that area and shore it up again. Mr. Grocki said the area from the wetlands line to the curb line will be restabilized with new topsoil, grass seed, and an erosion control blanket to ensure a stabilized vegetative buffer.

In response to a question from Mr. Stebe about erosion control measures, Mr. Grocki said the majority of the overlay does not need to be milled out; new asphalt can be put right over top of it. In the compacted gravel area, some will have to be removed, but as material starts to get removed the area can be backfilled with appropriate gravel, minimizing the potential for any exposed earth. A double row of silt fence and straw bale combination is proposed along the perimeter, he said, and for any exposed earth, like the landscaped perimeter, once the topsoil is down it will immediately be seeded with an erosion and sedimentation blanket on top to ensure stabilization.

Mr. Prause asked if there is a naturally occurring channel in the area. Mr. Grocki replied he is not a wetland scientist, but there is a decent amount of flowing water and it has been fairly wet every time he has visited the site.

Mr. Prause asked if the gravel removal is likely to impact the flow or capacity of that channel. Mr. Grocki said, if anything, capacity would be gained back, and there would be minimal if any

impact to the flow of water.

Mr. Prause asked for more information about the proposed curbing. Mr. Grocki replied that it is a typical 6" curb. The pocket vegetative water quality areas are in the natural low points in the parking lots, he said. Stormwater will follow the curb toward the vegetated areas, going through some stormwater treatment before going into the wetlands.

Mr. Prause asked about indications on the plan of vegetation on part of the unpaved area in the south corner. Mr. Grocki replied that is the existing tree line and confirmed there are no additional plantings proposed in that area.

Mr. Prause requested a better picture of the proposed building elevations. Mr. Grocki did not have a better color rendering but he described the color options. Referring to elevation sheet A-4A, he said the darker bands will be the classic color red that every Nissan dealership has. In the other option, A-4B, the entire expansion area would be whitish gray instead of having a red parapet. Mr. Marino of American Contractors said they want to get approval before approaching corporate to get their decision. Both existing buildings have the red parapet wall, Mr. Marino said.

In response to a question from Mr. Stoppelman, Mr. Grocki stated the curb will be made of bituminous asphalt.

Mr. Kidd asked for more information about the recommendations Town Staff had made with regards to the landscaped areas and the oil water separator. Mr. Bordeaux explained that the original plans did not include islands, and the recommendation to include islands would be to break up the monotony of an extensive paved area. The applicant then provided islands. On further review, Mr. Bordeaux said, he would prefer to see trees in the islands to provide shade. Further, he thought it might be more appropriate to locate the islands at the end of the rows of parking. The applicant's agent has said trees would produce leaf litter and, if islands were located at either end of the rows, vegetation might obstruct the view of display vehicles from the street, Mr. Bordeaux said.

Mr. Kidd asked what types of plantings were proposed for the island. Mr. Grocki said the applicant would prefer low shrubs, low planting arborvitaes or perennial plants.

Mr. Kidd asked if Mr. Bordeaux's reason for suggesting moving the islands was that it would look more appealing with trees in the front and back, sort of bounding the ends of the parking lot. Mr. Bordeaux agreed and said that configuration is more typical. The provision of landscaping is important either way, he said, and the islands do serve the purpose he identified. He noted that snowplowing would be another consideration. If trees were provided, typically new tree plantings begin at a 6 ft. height and have bare stems, so they would not cause much of a visual obstruction in Mr. Bordeaux's opinion. He would like there to be shade within the parking area, he said.

Mr. Kidd asked about the reasons for wanting to move the oil water separator. Mr. Bordeaux replied that this comment came from the Water and Sewer Department, who suggested moving the oil water separator "to prevent future maintenance and access issues." He said Mr. Grocki had addressed the question of access. In terms of maintenance, Mr. Bordeaux said, there is regular vacuuming per whatever schedule is identified. If there is a failure or damage, if it is outside it doesn't impact the operation, but if it were inside it could be repaired under cover. Mr.

Kidd asked if this comment was more of a suggestion and Mr. Bordeaux confirmed. Mr. Kidd asked if the oil water separator was already existing in that location and Mr. Grocki stated that it was.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if there was any concern about having chemicals from oil changes and maintenance performed inside this building above the water separator. Mr. Bordeaux said a lot of those chemicals will ultimately pass through the oil water separator anyway; that device would capture spills or oil that is bound to water. It separates from the water and is typically captured in a separate chamber within that unit and can be vacuumed out or regularly maintained. Mr. Grocki said the new addition is only going to be a drop-off area; all repairs will be in the existing building where there are appropriate means of containment.

In response to a question from Mr. Prause, Mr. Grocki said the building on the right-hand side of drawing is for auto detailing services. The heavy repair services would be in the other building.

Mr. Bordeaux said there were outstanding staff comments from him and from Mr. Kalansuriya. He said Mr. Grocki addressed two of Mr. Kalansuriya's comments, and the remaining comments were minor technical comments relating to notes on the plans.

In response to questions from Mr. Stebe about the impact to the wetlands, Mr. Bordeaux said the southerly area is part of a larger residential watershed. The majority of the stormwater from the self-storage units is headed to the west a bit, so the area of the wetland there is substantially saturated through the year. The times Mr. Bordeaux has visited the site, the brook was full. The perimeter of site is compacted gravel and there is no specific delineation to the end of that gravel. It was probably placed and compacted and over time has been pushed by plowing, he said. There is some vehicle storage back there. It is probably not a part of site where DeCormier Nissan wanted to bring customers. The proposal would be an improvement, Mr. Bordeaux said. There would now be a delineation of the paved area so it cannot continue to expand over time. The water quality basins should provide water quality renovation. There will be less infiltration and just the fact that stormwater will now be captured rather than just shed with whatever it is carrying into the brook is an improvement, Mr. Bordeaux said.

Mr. Prause asked if there was any further discussion on the landscaped islands or oil separator. Mr. Kidd said his recommendation was that the Commission would prefer trees and that the islands would be moved to the ends. Mr. Grocki suggested a compromise, planting the islands with tall trees but locating some of the islands further in to keep the display area in view from the street. Mr. Marino added that those 10 or 20 stalls are some of the most valuable display stalls. Mr. Kidd suggested locating the islands with the light poles, exactly where the light poles are on both ends, which would also make one less thing to work around for plowing. Mr. Grocki suggested also moving the light poles slightly, to allow three spaces for display in front of the landscaped island. Mr. Kidd said that sounded reasonable and clarified that the islands will be moved towards either end. Mr. Grocki reiterated that they would like three spaces in front of the islands on the west side, and the other islands would be an equal distance from the other end of the lot.

Mr. Kidd said he did not see a reason to make the applicant move the oil water separator as long as there is access and they have a maintenance schedule to follow.

In response to a question from Mr. Stoppelman, Mr. Grocki said the lighting will be full dark sky compliant with no up lighting and no bleed over to property lines. It is for safety and to illuminate the parking lot for the display of vehicles.

Ms. Scorso thanked the applicant for the compromise on the islands. She expressed gratitude for the improvements and cleanup the applicant is performing on the property, as well as the improved stormwater basins to help treat the water and care for the wetlands better.

Mr. Stebe asked to see an example of the proposed red color. Mr. Grocki showed some photos of other Nissan buildings. Mr. Stebe said both designs show the whole top crown of the existing building as red. Ms. Taylor replied that the existing building is already red on top. Mr. Grocki showed a current view of the detail center, which already has the red color on top, and said that the large building mimics that. The option for the new express service drive-in component has one option with red and another without red, and the applicant requests approval of both, he said. In response to questions from Mr. Stebe, Mr. Grocki confirmed that the addition will have a more compact, horizontal metal overlay and the doors will be generic white overhead doors.

Mr. Kidd echoed Ms. Scorso's comments and said the remediation in the wetlands did not sound too onerous. He did not have a problem with either proposed façade.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2018-098)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the inland wetlands permit application 2018-098 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

Inland Wetlands Permit (2018-098)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the inland wetlands permit to demolish an outbuilding, construct a building addition, overlay the existing pavement, and pave the gravel parking area at 30, 54, and 80 Tolland Turnpike. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Mr. Prause said the work will improve the volume and function of the wetlands and the applicant has taken care in the design to make sure that gravel will not impact the wetlands in the future.

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 wetland 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.

In response to questions from Mr. Stebe, Mr. Bordeaux confirmed that the wording in the draft motions he provided would incorporate the Commission's discussions with the applicant, so there do not need to be additional modifications listed in the motion.

Mr. Prause asked what the plantings are in the islands. Mr. Bordeaux said there is a list of

recommended parking lot or urban landscape tree species that would be appropriate. It would not be an evergreen; it would be a deciduous species with something of a canopy, he said.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-099)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to certify the erosion and sedimentation control plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner, dated October 5, 2018; and
2. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated October 11, 2018.

Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Mr. Prause said the plan includes silt fencing and hay bales as required by the guidelines. He made note of the curbing and water quality basins, which would help with infiltration and water cleanliness and keep the wetlands functioning well.

All members voted in favor.

Special Exception Modification (2018-100)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the special exception modification to demolish an outbuilding, construct a building addition, overlay the existing pavement, and pave the gravel parking area at 30, 54, and 80 Tolland Turnpike with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner, dated October 5, 2018; and
2. Bernard Kalansuriya, Design Engineer, dated October 11, 2018.

Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Mr. Prause said it is exciting to see more investment in properties in town and it is good to see the improvements in the parking lot.

All members voted in favor.

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

THANH DAI – For installation of a patio in the front area of the house and a railing for the existing porch at 78 Forest Street. – Historic Zone Site Plan (2018-101)

Ms. Thanh Dai, owner of 78 Forest Street, presented her application for installation of a handrail on the existing porch and a patio in front of the home. She said she had met with the Cheney Commission twice in recent weeks, and she brought material samples to present.

Ms. Dai explained that the porch is on the front of the building and the retaining wall is on the bottom of the porch. She is proposing stone for the retaining wall and picked something that looks similar to that stone. She displayed some photos of the existing stonework.

Regarding the proposed handrail, Ms. Dai said the material would be wood, painted white, and it would go around the existing porch. She explained they are proposing the handrail because they have young children and the porch is 2-3 ft. above the ground, which is a safety issue.

Ms. Dai said she was seeking the Commission's approval of the patio installation. She explained that the Cheney Commission recommended she search for a different patio material from what was originally proposed, and she did. She presented a sample of the new proposed material, which is called Blue Stone Blend. It is a compromise, she said; it is not exactly bluestone with the natural cleft, but with young children it is not practical to have those deep indents. This material would have the look and feel of bluestone without the price tag and safety concerns, she said.

Ms. Scorso asked about the other material samples Ms. Dai had brought. Ms. Dai explained that the red concrete brick is the original proposed material that the Cheney Commission saw. They asked Ms. Dai to look for something with more texture, for a bluestone look and feel.

Ms. Dai asked the Commission for a conditional approval of her application, given that the material is found acceptable by the Cheney Commission when they review it on October 18.

Mr. Kidd asked if Ms. Dai is proposing to replace or add to the retaining wall she showed in her presentation. Ms. Dai said she is not replacing that; she only showed it to illustrate that they are proposing a stone that looks similar to that for their retaining wall around their patio perimeters; it somewhat matches the original brownstone. In response to a question from Mr. Kidd, Ms. Dai confirmed that the Cheney Commission did not have a problem with the brownstone; they just had a problem with the brick for the patio.

Mr. Anderson said the Cheney Commission did a site visit and looked at the patio location and retaining wall. They recommended approval of the railing, the location of the patio, and the material for the retaining wall, he said. The one outstanding piece is the material for the patio itself, which is now proposed to be the new material Ms. Dai presented. If they chose to, the Commission could approve the plan with the condition that that material be approved by the Cheney Commission, Mr. Anderson said.

Mr. Prause noted that Mr. Anderson's memo to the Commission discussed additional work relating to another retaining wall and some electrical structures that need screening. Mr. Anderson replied that work is not part of this application; it will be part of a separate application.

Ms. Dai presented some slides showing progress on the property since last year.

Historic Zone Site Plan (2018-101)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the historic zone site plan for installation of a patio in the front area of the house and a railing for the existing porch at 78 Forest Street, with the condition that the applicant will review the proposed patio material with the Cheney Commission for its endorsement. The applicant shall return to the Planning and Zoning Commission if the patio material is not endorsed by the Cheney Commission. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Mr. Stebe said he liked the composite material, which he had not seen before.

All members voted in favor.

VANLOSE ENTERPRISES, LLC – Pre-application review for 86 Oakland Street, 11 Edward Street, and 25 Edward Street.

Attorney John LaBelle spoke on behalf of Vanlose Enterprises. Mr. Steve Carter, principal of Vanlose Enterprises, and Eric Peterson, from Gardner & Peterson in Tolland, were also present. Attorney LaBelle asked for the Commission's input on a possible extension of the General Business (GB) zone, located on the south side of Edwards Street, north to the three small lots at 86 Oakland Street, 11 Edward Street, and 25 Edward Street. There were residences on the two lots to the east and there is still an unoccupied house on the westerly lot that would be torn down to accommodate the proposed plan, he said. The question before the Commission tonight, he said, is whether it is appropriate to extend the GB zone north across Edwards Street, where it would abut a Planned Residential Development (PRD). There is also a small apartment building to the west and a residence immediately to the north on Edwards Street.

Mr. Carter, of Vanlose Enterprises and also of Mazda in Manchester, said the Mazda brand has been growing and they need to expand. They would like to put employee parking on the other side of the street from where the dealership is. They also wish to provide for temporary storage of inventory, which is a seasonal need, especially from January through March.

Mr. Prause asked if it is all parking. Mr. Carter said about two-thirds is parking. Employee parking is in the front and the goal is for the whole piece to be very parklike. It is mostly grass currently, but there are a house and shed that are scheduled for demolition.

Mr. Peterson said the plan is to build parking for employees and overflow vehicle storage. The two parking areas to the east on the plan would be for employees, while the unstriped area to the west would be for overflow vehicle storage, he said. The goal was to keep parking toward the interior of the parcel, with greenery toward the exterior. Mr. Peterson reiterated that the topic for discussion is the possible extension of a zone, but he gave a quick overview of the plan, with parking in the middle, evergreen screening to the back toward the PRD and residential structures, some shade trees on the west side adjacent to Edwards Street, ornamental plantings along Edwards Street, and medium sized plantings between parking lots to break them up.

In response to questions from Mr. Prause, Mr. Peterson confirmed the parcels are currently zoned Residence A (RA), there is no existing sidewalk, and the applicant is not proposing to add sidewalk. Mr. Prause noted there is no crosswalk and it is a narrow road. Mr. Peterson replied the street is relatively narrow and, while a traffic study has not been done, he believes the traffic is relatively light on that section of street.

Mr. Stebe asked about the location of the employee parking at the dealership now. Mr. Carter said employee parking is on the northeast side of the building and runs down Edward Street, probably about 25 spaces going down and maybe 12 around in the corner. Mr. Stebe asked if the goal is to relieve parking pressure and inventory space pressure on that main lot, and Mr. Carter said that is correct. He explained he had acquired these properties with the idea that the dealership would need to increase parking at some point. Sales rates decrease in some months with the same amount of product coming in and snow cutting down some spots, he said.

Attorney LaBelle said Oakland Street is designated as a Community Corridor in the Plan of Conservation and Development, and one of the points in the plan for Community Corridors is that the Planning and Zoning Commission would try to put underutilized properties into some sort of development. He said the lots are not really appropriate for housing, as the lots are small

and the road is busy. The proposed green space in this area would be an appropriate use and an attractive amenity, Attorney LaBelle said. He reiterated that the real question before the Commission is whether it is appropriate to extend the GB zone across Edwards Street for essentially a parking use.

Mr. Kidd said he liked having Edwards Street as a buffer and did not like the idea of nibbling away at the RA and PRD zones. In his opinion, the proposal seems like spot zoning inside of the RA zoned area. Mr. Kidd anticipated pushback from public and residents on the proposal. In addition, he expressed concern that there is no guarantee the property will always be a parking lot if the zoning is changed. Mr. Kidd said he appreciated the attempt to make the area parklike with a lot of green space and buffering from neighbors, and said he understands that a business needs to grow. However, he said, he felt conflicted and did not expect such a proposal to be a simple conversation.

Regarding Mr. Kidd's concern about whether the property would remain parking, Attorney LaBelle said because it is an automobile use, the Commission has some controls to exercise.

Another option, Attorney LaBelle said, is to try to make the area an Off Street Parking zone, which would require amendments to the zoning regulations. Mr. Kidd said that might be helpful. Mr. Anderson said staff discussed that option with the applicant and felt the proposal does not quite fit the intent of the Off Street Parking regulations, and so extending the GB zone was the more appropriate approach.

Mr. Kidd said, if it were changed to GB zone, a business could be put in there. Mr. Anderson said it might not be possible to do anything on a site that size in that district, and it would be a special exception because it is an automobile use. Mr. Kidd replied it might not be an automobile use if they sell the property.

In response to a question from Mr. Prause, Mr. Carter said no one uses the space now.

Mr. Prause said the location is tricky because it is a buffer kind of area. He said he could see the proposal not being a nuisance, and added that, at a hearing, it would be important to point out screening and plantings. Mr. Carter said they tried to hide the parking lot within some layers of landscaping. He said employees would use the space if he put picnic tables out.

In response to a question from Mr. Kidd, Mr. Anderson said he would need to review the regulations to determine lighting requirements for the parking lot. Mr. Carter said a minimum amount of lighting in the employee area would be necessary for safety. Mr. Kidd said the applicant would have to look closely at how they could mitigate any light seepage.

Mr. Peterson said the condos to the north have a chain link fence that encompasses their property, so they are not coming on this property to use it. Regarding building, the most difficult constraints would be size and depth of these properties; when building adjacent to residential zones, residential setbacks have to be used, which really restricts the area on these properties, he said.

Mr. Stoppelman asked for Mr. Anderson and Mr. Bordeaux's input. Mr. Anderson said it would ultimately be up to the Commission, guided by the Plan of Conservation and Development and the character of the area. The use makes sense practically, he said, but it would require a zone

change and the Commission should consider what possibilities that would open and what effect it would have on neighbors.

Attorney LaBelle said the Zoning Enforcement Officer interprets the word "adjacent" in the Off Street Parking regulations as meaning "abuts," so there is a question about whether property with a street in between is still adjacent. Per the regulations, the zoning extends to the middle of the street, he said. In addition, the Off Street Parking regulations are not clear regarding storage of vehicles, so there would have to be some modifications to the regulations. Attorney LaBelle stated that the applicant's intent is to have what they presented on the site, not to get a zone change and then come up with a different plan.

Mr. Prause noted that an Off Street Parking zone at this location would be dependent on this one business, unlike downtown, where several businesses support one parking lot, which makes sense. He said he would rather the properties were zoned GB so there is some flexibility in the future.

Mr. Stoppelman said, because of the limited frontage on Oakland Street, which would be important to a GB zone use, he does not see a problem making this a business zone.

Mr. Stebe said this location was highlighted during a focus group several years ago as another major corridor and focal point to highlight the town. The Commission needs to look at the entire area as a whole, he said. In the GB zone, there are many uses that do not require a hearing, Mr. Stebe said, and there are other locations near the dealership that could be used for this proposal. He said he was not sure taking three residential zoned parcels and turning them into GB or Off Street Parking would do that area as a whole much good, and there should be a broader discussion of what the Commission wants to see there.

Attorney LaBelle said the Off Street Parking zone is supposed to be a transition zone and if the Commission would prefer an Off Street Parking zone to minimize potential for development on the site, the applicant will try to address it that way. The alternative is probably to have that land remain vacant, he said.

In response to a question from Mr. Prause Attorney LaBelle said there was a dilapidated house on the vacant corner lot when Mr. Carter bought the property and demolished the house. A second house in the middle was also dilapidated and was demolished.

In response to questions from Mr. Kidd, Mr. Anderson said the intent of the Off Street Parking zone is to provide parking adjacent to a business zone, maybe for a group of businesses. To define it specifically for one business, especially when the use there would be parking for the business, does not seem to match the intent. The regulation could be changed to change that, but it does not contemplate things like vehicle storage. Mr. Kidd replied that multiple issues should arise in town before the zoning regulations are amended. Mr. Anderson said this exact issue has not come up elsewhere, but there have been issues with the "adjacent" piece before.

Mr. Kidd said he personally did not see Off Street Parking as an option and felt it would be GB or nothing. He added that he was not in favor of or opposed to the proposal; there would still be testimony, a public hearing, and the applicant's ultimate proposal. He was not in favor of trying to change the Off Street Parking regulations, he said.

Ms. Scorso said she would like to hear from residents. It could be that they would be in favor of this parklike concept for this corner, she said.

Mr. Prause said the applicants would need to get clarification of whether the properties are considered "adjacent" to the dealership. Off Street Parking is supposed to be used as a buffer and can be used for parking for employees or guests of adjacent businesses, so it makes sense that way, he said. He did not have an issue with the properties being zoned GB either, Mr. Prause said.

TRINITY COVENANT CHURCH – Pre-application review to discuss a special exception for 296 Hackmatack Street.

Tim White, one of the lay leaders of the church and one of the ministry partners of Hope 4:10, presented the pre-application. The home at 296 Hackmatack Street was recently used for one of the interim pastors and the church is now hoping to use it for more meeting space. The church has a small nonperishable pantry that they would move there. He explained that the ministry tries to connect people in need with people who have, and gave examples of furniture, clothing, rent money, or car repairs. He noted no repairs would be performed at the site. There is currently some storage on the property, a single car garage and a couple of sheds in the back, he said. They would like to have a sign, he said.

Mr. White said one question was whether it would make more sense to combine that parcel with the church property, which they would be willing to do, or to leave it as-is but use it for ministry purposes such as putting baskets together. He said the church is looking for ways to connect to the community, and for some people coming to a church building is intimidating. There is no plan to renovate the property at all, he said.

In response to a question from Mr. Prause, Mr. Bordeaux said the use of the home for religious associated purposes would count as an extension of a place of worship and thus would require a special exception and a public hearing. Mr. Prause read the definition of Places of Worship in the zoning regulations, "A building or buildings where people regularly assemble for religious worship, services, meetings or other activities." Mr. White said that would not be a good definition of the proposed use; it is a small house and worship will not be held there. Mr. Anderson said the use has to be an allowable use for that zone, and asked what it would be if it is not a place of worship.

Mr. Stebe noted a recent amendment to the regulations relating to attorneys and counselors who do not have a large traffic flow but operate out of their homes.

Mr. Stoppelman referred to a house on the South United Methodist Church's property that they use for youth meetings, etc.; he did not think the Commission approved anything in that case. Mr. Anderson replied it was his understanding that that was a parsonage. Mr. Prause asked for clarification of whether a parsonage would count as a place of worship. Mr. Anderson said he thought that, from a zoning perspective, a parsonage is a single family home, but if there are other things happening there, that might change the use of the property. Mr. White said most parsonages he is aware of are also used as meeting space. Mr. Anderson replied that they are not all like that. He asked if someone will live in the house and Mr. White replied no one will live there. Mr. Anderson said that is a difference from a parsonage. Mr. Stebe added that also eliminates the possibility of a home-conducted occupation. Mr. Anderson said the case could be made that the church's activities are expanding to this property; that would be the one path to follow to make it an allowable use there.

Mr. Kidd said a special exception is for places of worship and asked if it can qualify as a place of worship if no service is held there. He suggested the Zoning Enforcement Officer's input may be needed. Mr. Anderson said Mr. Davis, the Zoning Enforcement Officer, was amenable to defining this use as a place of worship.

In response to questions from Mr. Kidd about parking, Mr. White said there would not be parking issues because the church has a large parking lot. Mr. Kidd asked whether the applicant could say parking is proposed on the adjacent property. Mr. Bordeaux said yes, if they can show they have parking available, in the form of an easement. Mr. Anderson said merging the lots is another option.

Mr. Kidd said the area is all residences except for the driveway, and merging the lots would take that property out and change the shape of the property. He would prefer the special exception route, he said. Mr. Anderson said this property has not been used for this purpose before, so even if the parcels were merged it would require at least a special exception modification.

In response to a question from Mr. Kidd, in terms of whether those buildings are allowed to be together, staff would work with the applicant and the Zoning Enforcement Officer and Building Department could help with that part.

The question for the Commission is whether they are open to the church expanding its religious activity to this building, Mr. Anderson said. Mr. Kidd replied he is open to it. The Commission has done it before in other parts of town and this is less intrusive as there are no weekly services, he said. He said he would prefer the lots to remain separate.

Mr. Stebe said he did not see it as a major issue. He suggested that they leverage using the sign for the church that is on the church property, as it has room to expand within the specifications of the regulations.

In response to questions from Mr. White about requirements for a formal application, Mr. Bordeaux said a detailed plan will be required and he will need input from the Zoning Enforcement Officer about the parking requirements. A statement on the impact to traffic on Hackmatack Street would also be needed, Mr. Bordeaux said.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – To revise Art. IV, Sec. 13.07.01 to change sign size limitations in the Central Business District zone. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-112)

Mr. Kidd said he was in favor of the amendment, which he felt is appropriate and will aid the businesses downtown. He noted that the upcoming updates to the Main Street Architectural Guidelines should also be helpful.

Mr. Stebe echoed Mr. Kidd's comments, saying the amendment addresses the immediate problem in the downtown business district. The Commission will need to look at this issue when other areas of town are redeveloped to have frontage closer to the street like Main Street, he added.

Mr. Prause agreed, saying the 3sf per linear foot of frontage seems to be a good rule of thumb. He admitted that the amendment is a patch, but said it is what the Commission needs to do now.

Mr. Prause said Ms. Ike was seated because Ms. Scorso had to leave.

Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-112)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to approve the zoning regulation text amendment to revise Art. IV, Sec. 13.07.01 to change the sign size limitations in the Central Business District zone. Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and objectives of Growth Management Principle 3 in the Plan of Conservation and Development, which cites redeveloping and revitalizing existing commercial centers and areas of mixed land use.

The zoning regulation amendment will be effective on November 1, 2018.

HILLIARD MILLS, LLC – For parking area expansion and renovation of Building 4 into a banquet hall at 640 and 642 Hilliard Street and 370 Adams Street. – Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2018-085) – Request for 65-day Extension; Special Exception (2018-086) – Request for 65-day Extension; Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-087) – Request for 65-day Extension; Special Exception Modification (2018-088) – Request for 65-day Extension; Flood Plain Permit (2018-089) – Request for 65-day Extension

Mr. Bordeaux said the applicant is interested in rehabilitating one of the buildings to be a banquet facility, which will impact the parking calculations. The applicant is interested in pursuing the special exception modification for the existing site without the special exception for the banquet hall, and his current idea is to seek a variance for parking to accommodate the banquet facility.

Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2018-085) – Request for 65-day Extension

Special Exception (2018-086) – Request for 65-day Extension

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-087) – Request for 65-day Extension

Special Exception Modification (2018-088) – Request for 65-day Extension

Flood Plain Permit (2018-089) – Request for 65-day Extension

MOTION: Mr. Stoppelman moved to approve the 65-day extension for all five applications. Mr. Stebe seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Mr. Anderson said, regarding Mr. Stebe's comment about the north end, staff does plan on having that type of exercise this winter because of the change in Robertson School.

Mr. Bordeaux said he had emailed the Commission a draft regulation for how to address agritourism and had received some feedback from Mr. Kidd and from some residents who would be impacted by the draft regulation. He asked how the Commission would like to move forward.

Mr. Stebe said he felt another workshop would be helpful, with someone who practices in the field to give their input on some actual draft language. Mr. Kidd agreed it would be good to have another workshop with stakeholders. Mr. Stoppelman agreed, adding that the draft Mr. Bordeaux prepared should be the focus of the workshop.

Mr. Prause said he was hesitant to have a workshop on something that is pretty much roughed out as a regulation. He said he would like it to be a public hearing, as he was not sure where the line needs to be drawn once a draft has been prepared. Mr. Anderson replied he did not think there was danger of not being transparent enough, because there will still be a public hearing later. However, Mr. Anderson suggested another workshop may be redundant.

Mr. Bordeaux said he had received some additional feedback and the draft is as close to ready as it will be without changing the approach drastically. Mr. Kidd said perhaps Mr. Bordeaux should send the draft to a few more stakeholders and, once he is satisfied, he should put the amendment on an agenda.

Mr. Anderson added that the Planning Department has a new Environmental Planner/Wetlands Agent who happens to be a farmer as well.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 1, 2018 – Business Meeting

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

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-112) – To revise Art. IV, Sec. 13.07.01 to change sign size limitations in the Central Business District zone.

Mr. Bordeaux said there is just one new application to report, which was the sign zoning regulation amendment.

Regarding the tentative future agenda for November 5, Mr. Bordeaux said Hilliard Mills may be heard, Big Y Foods is proposing to rehabilitate a gas station at Parker Street and Tolland Turnpike, and the Association of Muslim Community is coming to request a special exception. For November 19, Mr. Bordeaux said he is waiting to see revised plans for the Sanrico Associates project for small business rental units at 58 Sanrico Drive, as there were some substantial staff comments.

Mr. Stebe moved to adjourn at 10:19 p.m. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor. The Chairman closed the business meeting at 10:19 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

November 5, 2018
Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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