

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MAY 20, 2019**

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Jessica Scorso
Timothy Bergin

Alternate Members Sitting: Teresa Ike

Alternates: Julian Stoppelman

Absent: Patrick Kennedy, Vice Chairman

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning
Matthew Bordeaux, Assistant Planner
Nancy Martel, Recording Secretary

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing at 7:05 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

KIMLAR, LLC – For a zone change from Neighborhood Business to Planned Residential Development zone for a portion of 699 Middle Turnpike East and from Residence A to Planned Residential Development zone at 719 Middle Turnpike East; a 2-lot resubdivision of 699 Middle Turnpike East; and construction of 32 residential apartment units in 6 buildings at 699 and 719 Middle Turnpike East. – PRD Zone Change and Combined Preliminary and Detailed Plan of Development (2019-011); Resubdivision (2019-012)

Attorney Mark Shipman, with the law firm of Shipman, Shaiken and Schwefel, introduced himself. Attorney Shipman stated the plan is not affordable housing; it will be market rate housing. He informed the Commission that the applicant believes the plan will provide a substantial upgrade to the property and will create a partial buffer from the existing Department of Social Services (DSS) building. Additionally, there will be modifications to the rear of the DSS building to enhance the view for nearby residents. The current zoning for the property permits 25,000 square feet of retail space with apartments above, Attorney Shipman explained, and the applicant believes the proposal is considerably more beneficial to the neighborhood.

Mr. Biff Schechinger, Licensed Landscape Architect, introduced himself. Mr. Schechinger described the proposal as well as the area roads. He explained the details of the undeveloped parcel, as well as the reconfiguration of parking. Mr. Schechinger reported that the density falls within the requirements of the regulations, as does the gross floor area percentage. He explained the perimeter and interior landscaping in detail, noting that the proposal will exceed the minimum requirements. Mr. Schechinger stated that there will be more than 16,000 sq. ft. less of impervious area than what currently exists. He reiterated that the landscaping will be an attractive view rather than the state parking and state building.

Mr. Stoppelman requested clarification of the residential vs. business zone, which Mr. Schechinger detailed.

Mr. Prause inquired whether there will be a presentation about the special exception modification and the erosion and sedimentation control plan during the public hearing portion of the meeting, or under new business.

Mr. Schechinger noted that a plan has been developed and reviewed by George Logan, Environmental Scientist, who sent a letter stating the plan complies with all the requirements of the Connecticut DEEP 2004 Manual for S&E control.

Mr. Prause explained that the Commission would need to see drawings and hear an explanation of the plan. He reiterated that the applicant intends to present only the zone change, preliminary and detailed plan of development and the resubdivision application, with which Mr. Schechinger agreed, noting that the erosion and sedimentation control plan can be discussed at the Business Meeting.

Mr. Bergin questioned the renderings, asking whether the colors as presented represent the siding on the buildings.

Mr. Hans Winkel, Don Hammerberg Architects, stated that the renderings are conceptual, though the colors will be very muted and will vary slightly dependent upon the siding manufacturer. He explained that there are two 2-bedroom units on the first floor and two 2-bedroom units on the second floor, noting that the color will not define each unit separately.

Mr. Prause asked for clarification of the colors on the rendering, as well as whether there will be shutters and trim around the windows, which Mr. Winkel detailed.

Mr. Stoppelman asked about the number of units in each building, and Mr. Winkel explained in detail.

Mr. Stebe inquired about the elevations and the full size of each building.

Mr. Winkel explained the peak height of the buildings is approximately 25' 3", though 40 ft. for three stories is allowed. He stated that the four-unit buildings are 2,500 sq. ft. per floor and the eight-unit buildings are essentially double that figure.

Mr. Stebe asked how the height would relate to the traditional capes and ranches that are predominant in the neighborhood. He surmised that the applicant will work through parking and traffic flow plans.

Mr. Winkel reported that the sign for the development will be on Middle Turnpike East and went on to explain in detail the traffic flow and parking plans as well as the dumpster, sidewalk and postal units.

Mr. Stebe inquired how the area behind the homes on Middle Turnpike East as well as behind the State building would look, which Mr. Winkel explained. Mr. Stebe acknowledged the condition of the paved area and speculated on whether the plan is for runoff to drain into the retention basin.

Mr. Winkel explained the series of small water quality basins that will capture the runoff prior to it being concentrated into the final basin.

Mr. Wilson Alford, Jr., Landscape Engineer and Land Surveyor, introduced himself. He reported the property pitch and the proposal to install rain gardens to intercept the water, and detailed the flow of the runoff and detention basin. The property will be graded to the detention basin, he stated, and explained the details of the flow.

Ms. Scorso reported that, in the Commission's renderings, the buildings' peaks are at 32 ft.

Mr. Schechinger acknowledged he was incorrect and that Ms. Scorso's reporting was correct.

Mr. Bergin questioned the location of lighting on the plan.

Mr. Schechinger reported that there will be 14 ft. high maximum carriage lamps throughout the PRD site, which were pointed out. A full photometric plan was completed to ensure no light trespass, he stated.

Mr. Prause requested information about the traffic flow throughout the site.

Mr. Schechinger explained there will be two entrances, with the main entrance off Middle Turnpike East. He demonstrated the proposed flow through the property.

Mr. Prause inquired about on-site management of the property, and Mr. Schechinger replied there would be none. He questioned how residents would contact management if the property had a problem.

Mr. Larry Shipman, member of Kimlar, LLC, explained that there will be a management company responsible for facility repair, snowplowing and landscape maintenance. He reiterated that there will not be an on-site super or a leasing office.

Mr. Prause questioned how a resident in the adjoining neighborhood could report problems such as litter or garbage piling up.

Attorney Shipman explained the neighbor would call the property management company, noting that the tenants would all have management information.

Mr. Prause inquired about the waste storage plan.

Mr. Schechinger explained the plan regarding the dumpsters, stating there will be frequent pickups to ensure they do not become an eyesore.

Mr. Prause speculated on how the residents would access the dumpsters. He noted this issue is a problem in residential units as it is hard for management to maintain, pointing out he is skeptical about the size of the dumpsters.

Mr. Schechinger explained that the details have not yet been developed. He noted that there has been discussion about whether to have multiple sites for the dumpsters, though the scale of the development is small. The consensus was that any problems could be alleviated by scheduling frequent pickups.

Mr. Prause asked if Mr. Schechinger could provide more detail on the landscape plan.

Mr. Schechinger reported that the idea behind the layout of evergreen trees, shrubs and shade trees was to create a year-round opaque multi-level landscape buffer. In addition, he detailed the plan for the trees and ground cover in the central areas.

Noting that there is an open space requirement for passive recreation, Mr. Prause remarked that there are areas behind the two larger buildings.

Mr. Schechinger elaborated on the open space plans, noting that they have more than is required.

Mr. Prause asked for clarification regarding the rain gardens and whether they would interfere with the passive recreation.

Mr. Schechinger explained that they will not interfere with passive recreation and detailed each location and the specific plans for the rainwater.

Mr. Prause observed that there are no walking paths proposed.

Mr. Schechinger commented that there is a large path system around and through the site.

Mr. Prause questioned whether pets will be allowed, and if there will be a special area for walking dogs.

Mr. Schechinger stated they will be allowed, though a specific area has not been identified at this time.

Mr. Prause asked for clarification of the elevation drop on the site.

Mr. Schechinger explained that it is a modestly modulated plateau and gave further explanation regarding the elevations and grading.

Mr. Prause referred to specific buildings and inquired whether there are carports.

Mr. Schechinger informed him that there are eight carports in total for the four buildings.

Mr. Prause referred to the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development, the Manchester 2020 plan, and questioned how the proposal complies with the stated goals.

Mr. Schechinger remarked that the Town encourages several types of housing, and in his opinion, the proposal is a great transition from an existing Neighborhood Business zone and complies with providing diverse housing in the area.

Mr. Prause commented that the area is a mix of suburban and traditional suburban character. Suburban character refers to primarily residential zones and single-family houses. When looking at the definition of traditional suburban character, he stated, it does refer to mixed use buildings, residential single-family and duplex housing with some multi-family buildings. He stated that he is not certain that the plan is the best example of what the Town is trying to accomplish with the Manchester 2020 Plan in the area.

Mr. Schechinger acknowledged the parcel is odd as it is set back from Middle Turnpike East and the developer is proposing a well-scaled, transitional use, which goes to the heart of enhancing streetscape quality.

Mr. Stebe, in referring to the access road, reiterated that the carriage lights are to be on the sidewalk side. However, the plan drawings depict them on the property line. He also questioned their height.

Mr. Schechinger explained the lights will be placed at the locations to avoid light trespass. He said the lights will be 14 ft. in height and gave a detailed explanation for their location and projection.

In reference to the passive recreation area, Mr. Stebe questioned whether they are including the small Residence A space on Middle Turnpike East as part of the square footage calculation, and Mr. Schechinger said they are not.

Mr. Anderson clarified the identification on the character map in the Manchester 2020 plan. The location is in a community corridor character area, but he noted that it is between the suburban and traditional suburban classifications.

Mr. Prause opened the meeting to the public.

Ms. Frances Sanchez, 39 Alice Drive, introduced herself. She sought clarification about the placement of the four individual apartment buildings in reference to Middle Turnpike East. Ms. Sanchez expressed her displeasure over two-story buildings rather than individual homes that may increase the neighboring home values.

Ms. Nichole Herman, 59 Arcellia Drive, stated that she is concerned about the impact on the neighboring schools.

Mr. Philip Carabillo, 48 Arcellia Drive, reported that his concern is regarding the removal of soil, based on the history of the State building's clearing. He expressed his trepidation about the increased traffic in the area.

Mr. Michael Paradis, 33 Arcellia Drive, introduced himself. He stated that he is concerned about safety with the secondary exit and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Orlando Sanchez, 56 Eva Drive, noted that he owns rental properties in town and is concerned about potential Section 8 tenants. That situation presents problems without a property management team on site.

Mr. Dave Dumaine, 86 Tracy Drive, introduced himself. He informed the Commission that he currently works in the State building and opposes the proposed zone change. Mr. Dumaine gave the history of the building, including soil contamination, which he stated was poorly remediated. He reported that the area is still contaminated at this time. He said he is very concerned about water runoff, parking for the State building and the CT Transit Bus in the neighborhood.

Ms. Jackie Perreault, 60 Arcellia Drive, explained that the proposed apartments are directly across from her home, and the neighborhood is not ready for this type of development. She believes that the neighbors should not have to contact an off-site management company.

Mr. Jack Prior, 66 Hilltop Drive, introduced himself. Mr. Prior said the neighborhood is called Jarvis Acres and the land in question was part of Jarvis Acres, and according to the Declaration of Restrictions it could not be built on for 25 years without written permission from Jarvis Acres, Inc. It extended 10 years for every 10 years until it was rescinded, he said, and he asked if the applicant has contacted Jarvis Acres, Inc. According to the 2020 Manchester Green Corridor study, Hilltop Drive, Plaza Drive and St. Paul Drive were cited as roads with potentially increased traffic. It was Mr. Prior's opinion that drivers will utilize the smaller exit and cause increased traffic in the neighborhood. He did not believe that the buildings are in keeping with the neighborhood's esthetics, and he worried about the retention basin. Mr. Prior agreed with the

concerns regarding the impact to Town schools. He sought clarification about the level of the property and whether there will be berms placed.

Ms. Judi Lyon, 30 Elsie Drive, stated she has concerns about the traffic and the safety of the neighborhood.

Mr. Charlie Moulard, 30 Eva Drive, noted his concern about foot and bus traffic to the State building and how that will be regulated. He stated that, with the potential of renting to low-income tenants, there would be a drop in property value in the neighborhood.

Mr. Keith Ferry, 37 St. Paul Drive, concurred with all the problems that have been brought up to this point. He is very worried about cars exiting from the rear of the property, which will cause lights directly into his home.

Mr. Chris Scheffler, 70 Eva Drive, introduced himself. He agreed that having tall buildings in the neighborhood does not seem viable. In addition, Mr. Scheffler is concerned about the increased traffic and water runoff.

Ms. Becky Scheffler, 70 Eva Drive, worried about dust control during construction and water erosion. She questioned whether there is an aquifer protection zone. Her other concerns were traffic studies, children, safety and pedestrians. She appealed to the Commission to imagine this was proposed in their neighborhood.

Ms. Joan Ward, 51 Arcellia Drive, reported that she will be facing the corner of the property. She explained there is a large problem with water, which flows into her backyard. In addition, she is concerned about the bus and its path through the development. She expressed her unease about the streets in the neighborhood and the traffic on Middle Turnpike East.

Ms. Melanie Ferry, 37 St. Paul Drive, expressed her dismay over the traffic in front of her home, street parking and speeding cars.

Ms. Janet Prior, 66 Hilltop Drive, inquired whether the applicant has considered a smaller development such as senior housing with the amenities in the area. Such a change would alleviate some of the neighbors' concerns.

Mr. Matthew Bordeaux read a letter submitted by Mr. Doug Klotzer, 89 Hilltop Drive, to express his concern over the proposal. The streets were not designed to handle the increased traffic, according to Mr. Klotzer. In addition, the project will not enhance the neighborhood and he appealed to the Commission to deny the application.

Attorney Mark Shipman sought to respond to items the Commission raised. He stated that the applicant is flexible on the colors and design of the units. Attorney Shipman stated they would be amenable to requiring locks on the dumpster area with a form of entry for residents only.

Regarding pet walking areas, he believed the green walking areas provide nice pet areas, and there will be rules regarding pets. Attorney Shipman noted that the property will not stay vacant as neighbors desire. The permitted use at this time would provide more traffic, less attractive buffering, and a less compatible use for the neighborhood, he explained. Attorney Shipman advised that there is a separate walkway being created that will be outside of the parking lot. He further informed the Commission that the developer cannot control snow removal by the State, though the applicant's management company will be in control of their section of the property. The applicant also has no control over who receives a Section 8 voucher. The units will be market rate and thus not conducive to Section 8 housing. Senior housing generally requires some form of subsidy, which the developer is not pursuing.

Attorney Shipman acknowledged the prior hazardous spill on the property, which has been remediated under the supervision of the Department of Environmental Protection, and detailed those steps. After recent testing for this development with new wells and monitoring, the reports have been provided to the State of Connecticut, according to Attorney Shipman. In addition, there will be quarterly monitoring going forward. He reiterated that the property is currently permitted to have 25,000 sq. ft. of commercial retail space with apartments above. Attorney Shipman reported that they will submit a traffic study.

Mr. Alford explained the construction and placement of the detention basin. He detailed the plan for the water runoff, noting that there will be no water sitting in the detention basin. All water will be dropped to or below the level of the ground, according to Mr. Alford.

Attorney Shipman interjected that the plans do not exceed the height of the current zone.

Mr. Prause questioned the potential impacts to property values.

Attorney Shipman stated that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. The applicant believes this is a transition parcel and comports with the style and quality of the surrounding homes, which will provide more value protection than the existing permitted use.

Mr. Prause noted questions about the long-term maintenance of the property. He also inquired about the Jarvis Acres deed restriction.

Attorney Shipman explained that, as with private property, trees die and have to be replaced. If an owner wishes to maintain rental values, the property will have to be maintained. Attorney Shipman stated that he had done the title search, noting that the property was owned by Jarvis, but Jarvis Acres no longer exists.

Mr. Prause spoke to the concerns about the second entrance, the traffic flow and impact on neighboring roads.

Mr. Schechinger reminded the Commission that the applicant has conferred with the Commission since 2015. He stated that the Fire Marshal disapproves of a dead-end road, and for

health, safety and welfare, there are two access/egress points. The road is kept to the 24 ft. maximum to minimize pavement and still accommodate safe two-way traffic, he said. He reiterated that they will clarify the traffic report.

Attorney Shipman commented that the plan is at least the sixth iteration, and described the details of the prior plans. He reiterated that the traffic will be less than if the property were developed as currently permitted.

Mr. Prause questioned whether the St. Paul entrance was ever suggested as an emergency entrance only, routing all traffic out to Middle Turnpike East. He noted that in the past, emergency entrances have been created to encourage proper traffic flow.

Mr. Anderson responded that he does not recall there having been such a conversation.

Attorney Shipman agreed with Mr. Anderson. He confirmed Mr. Schechinger's statement about blocking the entrance, which could be accessed by emergency responders. In the applicant's estimation, there will be residents that will be eager to utilize the bus system, thus reducing the traffic flow.

Mr. Bordeaux reported that the Engineering Staff has outstanding comments, which he detailed. The Engineering Division indicated that, subject to the Commission's decision, the outstanding items could be addressed as a modification.

Ms. Scorso inquired whether the Staff received environmental reporting.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that the question was asked and it was indicated that the remediation project is complete; DEEP has certified to that effect. In addition, Water and Sewer is aware of the pre-existing condition.

Mr. Stoppelman requested the Engineer state that no water will leave the property over ground during a storm.

Mr. Schechinger acknowledged there may be some shoulder water running off the lawn, but all the water from the buildings and the pavement will go through the storm drainage system and be piped into the existing storm drainage system. The detention basin and the water quality basins have been sized to ensure a reduction in the rate of flow off the property after construction, he explained.

Mr. Stoppelman referred to the comments about the berm and the fact that the four buildings will be 5 ft. below the berm level.

Pointing to the plan, Mr. Wilson described the sidewalk and the grade of the ground.

Mr. Jack Prior again questioned the grading of the lot, noting that it is frequently wet. Looking at the design, he questioned whether there will be a berm so the plantings are actually 5 ft. up, or if the applicant is dropping the level by 5 ft. He did express concern about a bus turning in the parking lot if snow has been stockpiled.

Ms. Joan Ward inquired whether there will be a storm drain added to handle the runoff, as the current drains are not sufficient.

Ms. Herman referred to the statement that the State would not allow employees to work in an unsafe building. She gave 25 Sigourney Street in Hartford as an example of an unsafe condition where the employees worked for 20 years and people were dying of cancer. The building was eventually closed down and the State also closed another building recently, she reported, and she is not comforted by an as-yet unseen report.

Mr. Sanchez acknowledged that something will be built on the property but does not understand why it must be rental units. He suggested condominium units where the owners would take pride in the upkeep.

Mr. Scheffler impressed upon the Commission that the neighbors have developed a community atmosphere and he is worried about the changes to the neighborhood.

Mr. Ferry expressed his dissatisfaction about the dumpster placement, as they will be in the back yard of the homes on Middle Turnpike East. He is concerned about the potential for Section 8 housing. In his opinion, a field where children can play is far more attractive than new buildings. He went on to list his concerns about traffic and animals.

Ms. Scheffler listed her concerns about off-site management, traffic, more children and adults.

Ms. Ferry suggested a community garden as an alternative use for the property to make it more attractive and useful.

Mr. Alford spoke to the elevation of the lot and the buildings.

Attorney Shipman assured the residents that emergency responders would have access by a remote device to unlock a gate. He agreed that there are many alternatives to the development of the land, and explained the owner is not going to donate the land. He recognized that residents are unhappy about the planned use for the land.

Mr. Anderson remarked that issues such as emergency access and potential relocation of the dumpsters would require the Staff to review the plans. If the Commission needs more information, Staff would like the opportunity to look at how those may impact the site, which cannot be done if the public hearing is closed.

Mr. Prause sought clarification that if the Commission has concerns and the Staff would like to review the plan again, the public hearing should be kept open.

Mr. Anderson confirmed that if there are concerns that may impact the Commission's decision, the public hearing should be kept open. However, if the answers to the questions would not change the Commission's opinion, keeping the public hearing open would not matter.

Mr. Prause restated that if the Commission tried to add the concerns as conditions or modifications, Staff would like to have the opportunity to review it first, with which Mr. Anderson agreed.

Ms. Ike questioned whether the Commission sought to combine the preliminary and the detailed plan, and only keep the detailed plan open.

Mr. Anderson stated that such issues would be captured in both plans, as they affect the site, and he was not sure if splitting those would make a difference on those two items in particular.

Mr. Bergin commented that the emergency vehicle access only is a way of approaching the traffic issue to satisfy some of the concerns. Given that the applicant is willing to entertain that, he felt it was important to see it through.

Mr. Prause was of the opinion that if the matter came to approval, he would strongly prefer the emergency access only.

Mr. Anderson concurred, stating that Staff, including Traffic, Engineering and Fire, would speak with the applicant about the impacts.

Ms. Scorso agreed with keeping the hearing open to discuss relocating the emergency access and dumpsters.

Mr. Stoppelman noted that he would prefer to see the traffic study first due to the potential increase per hour in traffic.

PRD Zone Change and Combined Preliminary and Detailed Plan of Development (2019-011) and Resubdivision (2019-012)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to continue the public hearing. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION – Revisions to Art. II, Sec. 8 (Comprehensive Urban Development zone) to remove places of worship and schools from the list of permitted uses; to modify building height requirements for stand-alone multi-family and multi-family above ground floor commercial; and to add aquaculture, aquaponics, horticulture, hydroponics, banquet halls, conference centers, places of worship, and schools as special exception uses. Revision to Art. IV, Sec. 9 to add provisions for parking for conference centers. Revision to Art. I, Sec. 2 to add a definition for Conference Center. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2019-031)

Mr. Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner, informed the Commission that, after a workshop and Staff preparation, he was presenting proposed regulation amendments in the CUD zone. The proposal is for a series of additional special exception uses as outlined below:

- Move schools and places of worship from the list of permitted uses to the list of special exception uses, which would be more consistent with the regulation of business zones across the town.
- Add flexibility to the potential uses in larger buildings, substantially made up of the mall and surrounding hotel, commercial and entertainment sites.
- Add aquaculture, aquaponics, horticulture, hydroponics, banquet halls, and conference centers.
- Modifications to the regulation of multi-family housing in the zone in an effort to make it more economically feasible to have stand-alone multi-family and to align this zoning district with the General Business zone. This is an effort to make use of larger buildings in the zone, the details of which Mr. Bordeaux explained.
- Define “conference center” to differentiate from convention center and assign a parking standard.

Ms. Ike sought clarification of the need for sleeping accommodations for a conference center.

Mr. Bordeaux explained that, based on research, to accredit a conference center and make it more attractive to professional organizations, onsite or nearby accommodations are necessary.

Mr. Bergin suggested the word “can” in Mr. Bordeaux’s definition for Conference Center be changed to “may.”

Mr. Prause questioned whether there could be an issue with the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act because the requirements are being changed for places of worship. He speculated that making the process more stringent could be interpreted as being more discriminatory.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that the regulation of the use in this zone is actually an outlier in the regulations. Substantially, in business or commercial zones, places of worship and schools are special exception uses.

Mr. Prause sought to confirm the rationale that the CUD zone is different and should be aligned with other zones, which Mr. Bordeaux confirmed.

Mr. Stoppelman questioned whether the regulations currently allow 80 ft. building height in business zones if the space is 200,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Bordeaux reiterated that, under the current regulations, if the existing commercial use is 200,000 sq. ft., a maximum building height of up to 80 ft. is allowed.

Mr. Stoppelman inquired what buildings would qualify currently.

Mr. Anderson replied that Sam's is an example of a building that would not be included in the current regulations. The number of buildings in the CUD zone that are over 200,000 sq. ft. may only be the mall and perhaps one other. He noted that the Plaza at Burr Corners and the Plaza at Buckland Hills are in the General Business zone. During the workshop discussion, there was a desire to allow some flexibility for the larger buildings that may not reach 200,000 sq. ft. to allow residential density to be part of those developments, he explained.

Mr. Bordeaux reported that CRCOG's response to the proposal was that they found no apparent conflict.

There were no members of the public to comment.

Zoning Regulation Amendment (2019-031)

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION – To revise the zoning regulations at Art. I, Sec. 4.06(2) to delete the requirement that soil erosion and sedimentation control plans must contain a signature block to be signed by a design professional. – Zoning Regulation Amendment (2019-032)

Mr. Bordeaux, Senior Planner, reported that the proposed regulation amendment, generated internally, refers to the steps post-approval. The signature blocks required for erosion and sedimentation control plans often are missing from the final plans, simply by omission. It is the Planning Department's opinion that the stamp is redundant and its elimination would save Staff and the applicant time and, potentially, printing costs. Mr. Bordeaux remarked that the compliance with the Town of Manchester's regulations as well as the State's regulations is within the narrative, and further detailed the proposed language.

Mr. Bergin questioned the wording within the regulation.

Mr. Prause responded that there is one signature block that the Commission signs and one that the design professional signs. The proposal would just have the Planning Commission signing the plans, but the paperwork would contain the design professional's stamp.

Mr. Bordeaux concurred, stating that engineers work with multiple communities and it is generally standard that the Commission's approval block will be included on the plans but the additional signature block is unique to Manchester, leading to the omission of the additional block.

Mr. Bergin commented that the proposed additional text and removal of the signature block seemed incongruent, but he supports the purpose of the amendment.

There were no members of the public to comment.

MOTION: Mr. Stebe moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 10:10 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

June 17, 2019

Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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