

**MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING  
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 5, 2018**

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman  
Andy Kidd, Vice Chairman  
Michael Stebe, Secretary  
Jessica Scorso (Recused for 2017-111)  
Timothy Bergin

Alternate Member Sitting: Teresa Ike (For 2017-111 only)

Alternates: Patrick Kennedy

Absent: Jay Stoppelman

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

The Chairman opened the Business Meeting at 8:24 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

TRUSTEES OF NORTH METHODIST CHURCH – For re-subdivision and associated improvements of two existing parcels at 40 and 41 Farmington Street into five lots, including a rear lot at 41 Farmington Street under Art. III, Sec. 6, and associated site work at 300 Parker Street. – Special Exception (2017-111); Re-Subdivision (2017-099); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-100)

Ms. Bertotti reminded the Commission of the public hearing during which the applications were discussed. At that time, the Commission expressed interest in screening between proposed Lot No. 5 and the westerly property boundary. She explained that the Commission subsequently closed the public hearing and, in deliberation, tabled the decision subject to a plan depicting the screening discussed during the public hearing. Ms. Bertotti reported that the revised plan was presented to Staff, who reviewed and sent it to the Commission. The revised plan includes a row of dense evergreen screening shrubs running along the entire length of the property line between proposed Lot No. 5, which is the rear lot in question, and the western property boundary, she said. She explained that the proposed bushes are shamrock inkberry, which would be spaced at 5.5 feet on center, and installed out of five gallon containers at 24-30 inches in height. The bushes will reach 5 feet tall x 5 feet wide at maturity, she stated.

Mr. Prause questioned if the shamrock inkberry is similar to an arborvitae.

Ms. Bertotti explained that it is not an arborvitae; and she was not familiar with it but knew that it is a green bush.

Mr. Prause clarified that it is an evergreen, to which Ms. Bertotti agreed.

Mr. Kidd stated that, unless there are different variations of the shamrock inkberry, his information states that, at maturity, the bushes are 3-4 ft. in diameter rather than an arborvitae-look, and are slow growing. He said he was concerned that the bushes would be 5.5 ft. on center starting at 24-30" in height. In his opinion, he said, it would be a long time before the bushes would create an adequate buffer. At the moment, he stated, it appears these would not be the correct buffer for the situation.

Mr. Stebe noted that the plan states that the bushes will grow to 5' x 5', though the timeline for maturity is not known. However, he stated, installing a bush that is 5' in diameter would push the driveway over, which may present grading issues.

Ms. Bertotti explained that, the way the application was presented, everything was included in the public hearing testimony. Once the hearing was closed, no new information could be shared, and she could not recommend that anyone further testify.

Mr. Anderson indicated that the Commission could make conditions in a decision, related to the plan.

Mr. Prause agreed that there could also be a condition for a fence, if that would be more straightforward and appropriate for screening, or the Commission could specify more familiar vegetative screening.

Mr. Kidd noted that the situation is what the Commission was trying to avoid; the hope was that the plan would return in a straightforward manner. He noted that he was expecting a fence solution rather than a natural solution, in that there would be a long period of time before maturity.

Mr. Bergin said he appreciated the concerns over the insufficient screening proposal, though he observed that there is no screening for the existing house, which would be immediately in front of the proposed rear lot.

Mr. Kidd referenced his prior comments at the Public Hearing. He reiterated that, when looking at the criteria, he could not find any reason not to approve the proposal with the condition that the current issue is resolved. He stated that, if the buffering is made a condition, he would be in favor of approving the rear lot.

Mr. Stebe agreed with Mr. Bergin's point that there is nothing between the existing house and the rear lot, both of which are owned and held by the applicant. However, 29 Farmington Street is not part of the application, he noted. He questioned what wording would be appropriate to add a requirement that planting or fencing prohibit headlights from impacting surrounding homes.

Ms. Bertotti suggested that the Commission should be very specific. If the Commission places a condition requiring a fence, that condition should be specific about the length, height, material and color, she explained. The more specific the Commission is, the more direction the applicant will have, she said. To that point, she stated, if the applicant wishes to change an element at a later date, they can apply and return to the Commission to change the condition of the approval.

Mr. Prause noted that he is personally more familiar with arborvitaes, and questioned if the Commission could specify arborvitaes and the spacing.

Ms. Bertotti mentioned that according to the public hearing testimony the area has a lot of deer.

Mr. Anderson suggested spruce or something similar.

Mr. Stebe asserted that he is not an arborist and would not be in a position to recommend a certain plant. As brought up in the Public Hearing, he reminded the Commission, there are many animals in the area and perhaps a fence would be advantageous as the deer cannot eat a fence.

Mr. Kidd stated that he would agree with a natural buffer if it were four feet at planting. It appears that the headlights would come in at an angle, he described, and even before the plants reached full maturity, there would be adequate coverage. He explained that his concern with a fence would be determining the proper conditions; i.e., PVC with that set of issues or natural with the associated maintenance. Mr. Kidd said his opinion was that the natural buffer would need to be at least four feet at inception, and arborvitaes would present a problem with the deer. He suggested that setting an initial size is crucial; a fence could be required to be the same length as on the plan with a minimum height of four feet of stockade fence. It would be difficult to dictate color and material, in his opinion. Mr. Kidd concluded that a natural buffer may be the wisest choice, something deer-friendly, such as an evergreen.

Ms. Bertotti stated that the applicant could utilize the proposed plan, though the buffer must be higher than currently proposed.

Mr. Prause noted his concern is that it would take a long time for a natural buffer to mature. The spacing currently proposed and the width of the plant, less than the width of the space, would create large gaps, in his opinion. He suggested specifying a planting that would be four feet tall or more, providing immediate buffering based on the spacing, and would be evergreen and robust to the environment. Mr. Prause stated that the neighborhood is unique and expressed that some of the concerns were valid, though some were allayed by the applicant. One concern was about the square footage, which may impact the property values, he recalled, but the two abutting properties, 29 and 30 Farmington Street, are similar in size or less, so he was not concerned that there would be a large impact on the houses immediately in the area. Mr. Prause said he was surprised that there are no traffic signs in the subdivision, though the traffic would not increase substantially with the number of homes proposed. He also noted that the lots proposed would be pitched downhill, which would help prevent view detracting. There was an interesting discussion surrounding the environmental value of the land, he recalled, specifically the wildlife, and as the area is developed, much of the wildlife will be lost.

Mr. Prause referred to the rear lot proposal, and noted that there are no other rear lots in the neighborhood. The criteria for rear lots state that it must be suitable for the intended use, must not impact the character of the district, must conserve property values, and cannot be in proximity to intersecting streets which could imperil safety, he explained. He said his concern was over the character of the district, creating a rear lot which would be unique to the subdivision. Mr. Prause indicated that the plan appears to be in compliance with the character of the neighborhood, though he was concerned about the impact to the natural features of the area and the atypical rear lot.

Mr. Stebe expressed his concern regarding the rear lot, as the current homes face the street. He referred to the elementary school traffic, which is chaotic, though he assumed the issue would be alleviated when the school is renovated in the future. He explained his concerns about the development pinching the natural habitat. Two areas not of concern, in his opinion, are the two areas within a wetlands definition but not standing water wetlands. Mr. Stebe reported that he has no concerns over the placement of Lot 1 and Lot 2; the rear lot and Lot 3 would push into the undisturbed areas.

Mr. Kidd commented that rear lots are not common in Manchester, noting that there are a number of them in town. He explained that he is not in favor of rear lots, though in reviewing the regulations and special exception criteria, it is a permitted use. While the Commission does not delve into financial aspects, he said he assumed that not allowing the rear lot as well as the cost of the infrastructure and improvements would be a hardship. Mr. Kidd agreed with Mr. Stebe's assessment that Lot 1 and Lot 2 are not a problem.

Mr. Prause requested that Ms. Bertotti restate the modification she recommended for the special exception.

Ms. Bertotti stated that Staff completed a review of the applications, the special exception as well as the re-subdivision application. She reported that there are outstanding comments from the Assistant Town Engineer and from the engineer who handles Water & Sewer reviews. The Assistant Town Engineer's civil engineering review recommended approval subject to modifications listed in the memo. Ms. Bertotti noted that there were several comments, generic and technical in nature, dealing with storm water management notes, storm water management plans, and items that need to be corrected on the maps, as well as comments regarding the erosion and sediment control and the survey map. The Water and Sanitary Sewer review resulted in one comment, she explained, and the Engineer recommended approval with modifications that can be addressed on the final plans.

Mr. Prause referred to a condition discussed regarding a robust evergreen, four-foot tall minimum buffer. He explained that could be included as a condition in the motion.

Ms. Bertotti recommended, if the special exception is denied, that should be done without prejudice, offering the applicant the opportunity to reappear before the Commission.

Mr. Prause agreed with Ms. Bertotti, noting that the rear lot is the issue. He noted that the current paved area covers the footprint of the proposed cul-de-sac.

Mr. Stebe offered the opinion that the cul-de-sac is preferable to the current turnaround when considering the water runoff. He stated that he was in favor of Lot 1 and Lot 2; he would agree with Lot 3 because, hypothetically, if the rear lot did not exist, Lot 3 could move in the westerly direction.

Special Exception (2017-111)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kidd moved to approve the special exception under Art. III, Sec. 6 to allow the creation of a rear lot at 41 Farmington Street, with the condition that the applicant provide appropriate evergreen shrubs, a minimum of four feet in height at planting, consistent with the length and location shown on the current plan to provide immediate buffering to the abutting property at 29 Farmington Street. Ms. Ike seconded the motion. Ms. Ike and Mr. Kidd voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Stebe, Mr. Bergin and Mr. Prause voted against the motion. The motion did not pass and the application was denied.

Re-Subdivision (2017-099)

The applicant withdrew the application.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2017-100)

The applicant withdrew the application.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

NORMAN AND LINDA LATULIPPE – For a special exception under Art III, Sec. 6 and a preliminary plan of development to create one rear lot at 780 Vernon Street. – Special Exception and Preliminary Plan of Development (2017-112)

Mr. Bergin considered that the existing lot functions as a rear lot, and the applicant would utilize the existing driveway to build properties on ample lots. His opinion was that the proposed homes' orientation would be consistent with the area.

Mr. Stebe noted that the applicant was thorough when explaining and detailing that, if the home was larger than the neighboring homes on Vernon Street, the lot would be quite far from the road and behind a substantial natural buffer, and there would not be a noticeable difference. He reiterated that the driveway would need to be upgraded as well as addressing the existing tree on the road front. Mr. Stebe commented that the proposal would work well with the neighborhood.

Mr. Prause commented that the rear lot subdivision is suitable for the location. It fits in well with the character of the district; it would be another couple of single-family lots in the RR zone, he said. It meets the lot requirements, the driveway requirements and the minimum lot size requirements, he stated. Mr. Prause stated that the proposal would not affect property values and the applicant realizes the sight line impacts and will make concessions about that with the tree to

make sure there are no safety impacts. He referred to the comments from the neighbors and noted that these items should be addressed in the detailed plan.

Mr. Kidd concurred, stating that the property is unique and the proposal seems reasonable for development on the site.

Ms. Bertotti reported one minor and technical comment from the Assistant Town Engineer to correct a footing drain elevation so it reflects a proper grading on the plan. The comment, however, is related to the re-subdivision plan, and the plans were required to depict grading information so there is buildability for a house on the lot. There is a note on the plan implying that the footing drain is at an elevation that is different than the grading plan depicts, she explained. The applicant is aware of that and will correct it, she said.

Special Exception and Preliminary Plan of Development (2017-112)

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to approve the special exception with the preliminary plan of development only to allow the creation of a rear lot at 780 Vernon Street, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer dated February 5, 2018 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

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

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

WAL-MART REAL ESTATE BUSINESS TRUST – To designate 7 parking spaces under a proposed canopy for customer parking while picking up online orders at 420 Buckland Hills Drive. – Minor Change to Approved Special Exception Plan (2018-006)

Mr. Perry Petrillo, Architect with Petrillo Architects, introduced himself. Mr. Petrillo reported that the proposal would add online grocery pickup to the Wal-Mart facility to address customer convenience. He explained that Wal-Mart has added online grocery pickup to a substantial amount of stores every year, with the goal that every store will have online grocery pickup in some format. Currently, he reported, there is a general merchandise pickup. He explained that online grocery pickup enables customers to use the Wal-Mart app to order groceries. The store would require 4-6 hours to gather the merchandise by personal shoppers, with a provision for refrigerated and frozen goods, and customers would select a time to pick up the items, he noted.

Mr. Petrillo reported that the proposal is for seven spaces dedicated to online grocery pickup; six of the spaces would be covered. The company estimates 60 to 90 pickups per day, he stated, roughly 10-15 pickups an hour per space. A customer would arrive at the store and use the app to inform the personal shopper that they have arrived, after which the app will assign a space number, and an associate will bring the groceries to the car, he explained.

Mr. Petrillo displayed the plan and explained the changes to the doors as well as the parking spaces. He reported the pickup spaces will be wider than an average parking space to allow ample room for the placement of groceries in the rear seat. Mr. Petrillo demonstrated the fabric

canopy, which would be made of a translucent off-white material, with four support columns. He explained that the structure clears the existing utilities as well as a storm line. Under the canopy, at the head of each space, would be a sign indicating the pickup stall, he described. Another proposal is for a sign on the left corner of the building, according to Mr. Petrillo.

Mr. Alan Carpenter, Professional Engineer, introduced himself. Mr. Carpenter reported that his company was in possession of the as-built plan, by which they located the storm water pipe originating at the building and through the canopy area. With that information, they were able to locate the pipe and determine that the pipe was separated equally between the two canopy supports, he explained. Mr. Carpenter noted that the Town GIS has a different configuration, and the original as-built plan led to discussion with Mr. Mark Czerepuszko, Chief Construction Inspector. Therefore, the company designed the plan based on the as-built, according to Mr. Carpenter.

Mr. Carpenter responded to comments regarding lighting and depicted the proposed light poles, noting that all fixtures would be LED. The safety lighting for Wal-Mart, he explained, is a minimum of two foot-candles throughout the entire parking lot, and this area will be consistent. There will be lighting under the canopy as well as new lighting on the building, which will increase the security lighting in that area, he stated. Mr. Carpenter reported that there is a security camera on the portion of the building projecting over the proposed canopy area. He noted that there are no other utilities that will be impacted by the canopy.

Mr. Prause questioned why parking spaces adjacent to the building are not being converted. Many vehicles pass through that area, which does not have great sight lines, he noted.

Mr. Petrillo reported that the areas adjacent to the building have an underground grease interceptor vault along with utilities, preventing the construction of footings.

Mr. Carpenter displayed the plan depicting a main access road leading to Buckland Hills Drive and said the proposed area would be a separate off-shoot of that road as well as a pedestrian connection. He reported that, when shopping at the store, he has never witnessed vehicles driving at a high rate of speed in that area.

Mr. Stebe agreed, stating that the area is similar to an alcove without much traffic.

Mr. Carpenter noted that the area has a large volume, as it is not far from the front door. He observed that the speed in the area is not similar to the other roadways in the area.

Mr. Petrillo reiterated that customers in the pick-up area would not be crossing to the building. The employee will go to the customers' cars and deliver the groceries using a handcart, he explained.

Mr. Prause remarked that there will be a sign for the pick-up, though he questioned whether ordinary customers to the store will also utilize those spaces.

Mr. Petrillo stated that the area will be well-signed, and though at the inception there may be customers mistakenly parking in the area, the associates will be monitoring the users.

Mr. Stebe noted that, two years ago, Wal-Mart addressed the Commission about sidewalk seasonal displays. He said he assumed that the sidewalks in the new pick-up area are not used for any seasonal sales and requested confirmation.

Mr. Carpenter reported that, to his knowledge, there will be no seasonal display.

Mr. Stebe requested the ratio of cars entering from the mall area vs. cars entering from Buckland Hills.

Mr. Carpenter acknowledged that he does not have that information and would refer to the traffic study done when the store was expanded. In his opinion, it would be a 50/50 split, he said, noting that the driveway to Buckland is limited to right-in, right-out, left-in. There are no lefts out onto Buckland because of the traffic volumes, he explained.

Mr. Stebe questioned whether, when the online parking area was designed, there was a consideration for changing the driveway to one-way.

Mr. Carpenter explained that there had been no thought given to that. There are 20-30 parking spaces in that area for general merchandise customers to park, he noted, which will function as any other parking spaces in the parking lot, he reported.

Mr. Stebe reiterated that his concern was about the estimated numbers of people to travel through the parking bays for online parking.

Mr. Carpenter responded the estimate is 60 to 90 per day per space.

Mr. Stebe calculated approximately 600-700 runs in and out. There will be a store employee going in and out, which is much more foot traffic going across that line, he said, noting that the stalls are built for efficiency for customers to get their orders and get out quickly. He noted that vehicles entering from Buckland Hills would not necessarily expect an employee to walk across. He reiterated his opinion that a one-way traffic flow would eliminate some level of the safety run; vehicles entering from Buckland would be required to move to the front of the building. Mr. Stebe stated that he is concerned about the employees' safety, as the customers would not be exiting their vehicles. He reported that employees walking back and forth approximately 600-700 times per day is not a normal pedestrian traffic pattern.

Mr. Petrillo considered negative impact from a one-way roadway.

Mr. Carpenter referred to the proposed signage for pedestrian crossing to heighten the awareness of vehicles entering. He explained that signage could be enhanced, if necessary.

Mr. Petrillo stated that signage could force customers to loop around.

Mr. Stebe stated his concern about controlling the traffic to make a safe line for employees to access the pick-up area.

Mr. Petrillo expressed his concerns about customers entering as they are accustomed to. He suggested signage to encourage customers to loop around, thus allowing customers to back out of the parking stalls more easily.

Mr. Stebe requested clarification that the applicant is proposing to enhance the signage to make customers aware that there is more pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Perry suggested enhancing the signage to make drivers aware that they are approaching a crosswalk, and signage to direct customers for online pick-up.

Mr. Stebe confirmed that meshes with the signage on the building.

Ms. Bertotti reported that there was one comment from the Engineering Department that Mr. Carpenter addressed. There is a discrepancy between the Town's GIS mapping and the applicant's mapping regarding the location of some utilities on the site, she noted, and resolution will be required. Ms. Bertotti explained that the applicant provided an as-built utility plan, which provides utility mapping as they are in the field, and the Town's mapping is most likely inaccurate. She stated that, with that correction and with the required documentation, the Assistant Town Engineer has recommended approval.

Minor Change to Approved Special Exception Plan (2018-006)

**MOTION:**

Mr. Stebe moved to approve the minor change to the approved special exception plan, with the modifications as specified in Staff memoranda from:

1. Michelle Handfield, Assistant Town Engineer, dated February 5, 2018 to Renata Bertotti, Senior Planner.

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

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

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – To revise Art. I, Sec. 2 (Definitions), Art. II, Sec. 15 (Central Business District), and Art. IV, Sec. 23 (Sidewalk Cafes) to add a definition for Seasonal Vestibule and provisions for Seasonal Vestibules within the Central Business District. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-004)

Ms. Scorso stated that she was in favor of approval of the proposal. She noted that local businesses brought up the proposal and the Town helped to bring the proposal forth. After gaining the information that the material used for the structures would be reviewed and must meet architectural guidelines, she is in favor, she said.

Mr. Kidd noted that he was in favor of the proposal as well. In his opinion, the seasonal vestibules are a much needed enhancement to the downtown businesses in the wintertime. He

said he felt that there was no need to deny the proposal, given that there is no issue with giving the owners access to modifications needed for the sidewalk.

Mr. Prause reiterated that Mr. Kennedy's recommendation was to add the phrase "or seasonal vestibule" in Art. IV Sec. 23.05.02 and 23.05.03.

Mr. Anderson said he agreed with Mr. Kennedy's suggestion of just removing "sidewalk cafes" from Sec. 23.05.03.

Mr. Anderson pointed to a new definition presented and said that could be read into the record or the Commission could just mention "as presented." He also noted a question from Mr. Stebe about signage. Mr. Anderson suggested changing the wording of Art. IV Sec. 23.02.07 to state, "No signs shall be allowed at any sidewalk café or seasonal vestibule except for the name of the establishment on an awning or umbrella, or vestibule." The owner would be allowed to put the name of the establishment on the vestibule and the Commission would still have design control, he said.

Mr. Stebe remarked that he liked the idea, though Sec. 23.02 is under the heading of the design standards for sidewalk cafés and not for seasonal vestibules. Presumably, he stated, that would need to be moved elsewhere.

Ms. Bertotti recommended that change be made at a later date, as that particular change might require a new advertisement, especially if it were under the sign regulations.

Mr. Stebe said he assumed that securing and anchoring the vestibules will be addressed by all the permitting and approvals required.

Mr. Kidd noted that, on one of the pictures Mr. Anderson displayed, the menu was displayed, and he was concerned about complicating the regulation.

Mr. Stebe requested that Mr. Anderson read the updated definition for the vestibule.

Mr. Anderson read as follows: "Seasonal Vestibule – A temporary exterior passage, hall or room adjacent to a building entrance."

Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-004)

**MOTION:**

Mr. Stebe moved to approve the zoning regulation amendment (2018-004) for revisions to Art. I, Sec. 2 (Definitions), Art. II, Sec. 15 (Central Business District), and Art. IV, Sec. 23 (Sidewalk Cafes) to add a definition for Seasonal Vestibule and provisions for seasonal vestibules within the Central Business District, with the following modifications:

1. To modify the proposed definition in Art. I, Sec. 2 to read: "Seasonal Vestibule: A temporary exterior passage, hall or room adjacent to a building entrance."
2. To modify the proposed Art. IV, Sec. 23.05.02 to add the phrase "or seasonal vestibule" to the third sentence after the phrase "sidewalk

- café” and to remove the phrases “of the” and “governing sidewalk cafes” from the third sentence.
3. To modify the proposed Art. IV, Sec. 23.05.03 to remove the words “sidewalk cafes” from the second sentence.

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

The reason for the approval is that the proposed amendment is consistent with the POCD.

The zoning regulation amendment will be effective on February 20, 2018.

### **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:**

Mr. Anderson reminded the Commission that he had given the members the Manchester 2020 Implementation Matrix in the meeting packet. He explained that Staff has worked on the matrix for the last few months in an attempt to outline all the work that Planning as well as other departments and groups in town have done to implement the impressive plan. Mr. Anderson reported that he has received questions about what has happened with the plan and why it is not being implemented. He noted that nothing could be further from the truth. Almost everything done in town is related to the plan in some way, he remarked. Mr. Anderson informed the Commission that the implementation will be tracked every year; it is tracked every quarter as part of the Planning Department’s Performance Measures. At the end of every year, he explained, there will be a percentage of the actions that have been addressed. He sought suggestions about implementing the plan going forward in terms of prioritization.

Mr. Kidd thanked Mr. Anderson for the report detailing the efforts as well as the planned efforts. He questioned whether the plan is reviewed with the Board of Directors.

Mr. Anderson stated that he had given that some thought, and sought the members’ input, noting that it could be sent to the Board and added to the website.

Mr. Kidd said he assumed the Plan of Conservation and Development needs the Board’s support.

Mr. Anderson reported that one reason Staff feels the plan is successful and that people remember it, is because a resident mentioned it at a meeting recently.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

January 3, 2018 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

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

### **RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:**

1. TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2018-004) – To revise Art. I, Sec. 2 (Definitions), Art. II, Sec. 15

(Central Business District), and Art. IV, Sec. 23 (Sidewalk Cafes) to add a definition for Seasonal Vestibule and provisions for seasonal vestibules within the Central Business District.

2. **WAL-MART REAL ESTATE BUSINESS TRUST** – Minor Change to Approved Special Exception Plan (2018-006) – To designate 7 parking spaces under a proposed canopy for customer parking while picking while picking up online orders at 420 Buckland Hills Drive.
3. **TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION** – To revise Art. II, Sec. 7 (Planned Residential Development Zone) to add procedures for major changes to approved plans in PRD zone and for the revocation of a PRD zone when its associated Preliminary Plan expires and construction has not begun.

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

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

February 21, 2018

\_\_\_\_\_ Date

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

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