

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
MAY 6, 2019**

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman
Patrick Kennedy, Vice Chairman
Michael Stebe, Secretary
Timothy Bergin

Alternate Members Sitting: Jay Stoppelman

Alternate Members: Teresa Ike

Absent: Jessica Scorso

Also Present: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning
Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner
David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner/
Wetlands Agent

The Chairman opened the Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. The Secretary read the legal notice when the call was made.

SANRICO ASSOCIATES, LLC – Request a special exception per Art. II, Sec. 16.15.02 (a) and (b) for development on a site which is four (4) acres or larger in size and a use which requires automobile parking spaces in excess of 60 spaces, for construction of 43 small business rental units in 3 buildings at 58 Sanrico Drive. – Special Exception (2019-016)

Attorney Stephen Penny, Manchester, CT, introduced himself. Attorney Penny explained the application as well as the location and owner of the subject property. He described the parcel's dimensions, noting the utilities available.

Attorney Penny described the building in detail as well as the building features. He explained that the applicant anticipates the primary market for the rental units would be for small building and maintenance trades as well as skilled craftspeople. The property near the wetland area will remain undeveloped and undisturbed other than 0.027 acres of wetland and approximately 1.59 acres within the upland review area. Attorney Penny reported the details of the activity in those areas. He requested that the hearing apply to all three pending applications.

Mr. Raymond Nelson, Professional Engineer registered with the State of Connecticut, introduced himself and explained his credentials. Mr. Nelson reported the total square footage of the building and property, discussed the utilities, and explained the wetlands on the property. He added that the proposal includes paved driveways and parking areas, onsite utilities to serve construction at each building, construction of a retaining wall, construction of a storm water

management facility and installation of fencing and landscaping. Mr. Nelson noted that the wetlands will be protected by temporary erosion and sediment control measures, detailed on the project site development plan.

The Senior Planner's report offers a comprehensive overview of the site development, aspects of the project and more specific detail on the proposal, according to Mr. Nelson. He reiterated the report's comments on the proposed storm water management facility, noting that after the development is completed, storm water will flow to onsite catch basins and yard drains with sumps, and in turn will be pumped to a proposed storm water retention infiltration basin to be constructed on the western side of the development. Mr. Nelson continued to detail the specifics of the storm water management plan. The proposed development of the subject project site will not have a significant impact on the inland wetlands and watercourses, he said. Additionally, according to Mr. Nelson, the proposed activity will not substantially diminish the natural capacity of the inland wetland or water courses that support aquatic plant or animal life, prevent flooding, supply water, facilitate drainage, or provide recreation, open space or other functions. Mr. Nelson listed the modifications and refinements to the proposed design in response to discussions with Town Staff.

Attorney Penny summarized that the proposed activities will not create a significant deleterious impact on the wetlands and watercourse in any of the particular manners set forth in the regulations and, in fact, it is believed that the conditions at the site will improve, which he explained in detail. A report by the soil scientist was delivered to the members of the Commission, which stated "There should be no significant impacts to wetland or water course resources on site or off as a result of the proposed project, provided strict compliance with the design criteria proposed and all erosion and sediment control measures outlined on the site plans are implemented."

Mr. Stebe did not notice separators and also questioned what will be allowed to utilize the building.

Mr. Nelson described the option of installing trap hoods on the terminal catch basin.

Attorney Penny interjected that the Fire Marshal declined to comment until potential tenants are identified. At that point, the Fire Marshal would take jurisdictional control. The property owners' insurance companies will scrutinize the contents of the building, and would place restrictions, according to Attorney Penny.

Mr. Prause pointed out that the watercourse flows from the southeast to the northwest, which Attorney Penny confirmed.

Mr. Nelson reported there will be a retaining wall behind which will be an erosion control blanket installed on the slope. He noted that installing the pine trees will help curb the invasives on the property, and will provide cooling for water.

Mr. Prause requested more information on the spillway, which Mr. Nelson explained in detail.

Mr. Kennedy prompted a discussion of voting on the Determination of Significance prior to proceeding to the public hearing on the special exception.

Mr. David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner/Wetlands Agent, reported that the application was discussed with the Conservation Commission and there were no outstanding comments. He explained the Conservation Commission's prior concerns. Mr. Laiuppa's estimate of the total area of disturbance was discussed.

Mr. Stoppelman requested that Mr. Laiuppa state on the record whether, in his opinion, there is significant impact that would require a public hearing.

Mr. Laiuppa reiterated that, in the Commission members' memo, there is information on where the project would have a direct physical impact to wetlands; i.e., the spillway, which was discussed. He stated that the applicant has stated that the spillway will be pulled back to the wetland edge. Another permanent direct impact to the wetland is the widened driveway entrance. There will be a riprap slope into the wetland area, according to Mr. Laiuppa, though in his opinion the overall impact to the larger wetland system is probably not significant from a functionality perspective.

Mr. Stebe reported his opinion is that the Commission should continue with the applicant's presentation. A discussion followed about the order of the public hearing.

Mr. Bergin sought clarification of the name of the trap mentioned by Mr. Nelson.

Mr. Nelson explained the trap hood is an L-shaped device that attaches to the end of a pipe which discharges downward.

Mr. Stebe requested the location of the fencing on the western edge not represented on the diagram, which Mr. Nelson explained in detail.

Mr. Kennedy observed that the thrust of the comments between the Town's Wetlands Agent, the soil scientist and Mr. Nelson was the location of the white pines and the fence, and detailed the history of those placements.

Attorney Penny referred to the regulations that apply in the Industrial zone and detailed the permitted uses. He explained that the proposed use is one that is permitted in the Industrial zone. The applicant's proposal, Attorney Penny reported, is compatible with the local Plan of Conservation and Development. He also pointed out that the property is close to the I-84 corridor, accessed by arterial roadways.

Mr. Nelson described the engineering aspects of the property, including the existing topography, geographic features, location of the access drive, structures, parking, the general system of utilities, the impact of the development on the existing utility infrastructure, and expected traffic. He additionally informed the Commission of the location and purpose of the fencing on the property.

Mr. Sudhakar Nagardeolekar, Architect with NSN Architect, LLC in Tolland introduced himself. Mr. Nagardeolekar reported the design elements of the proposed industrial buildings and detailed the building exterior, materials and colors.

Mr. Bergin questioned whether the walls between the units will run floor to ceiling.

Mr. Nagardeolekar explained the walls will satisfy the Fire Marshal and the Building Inspector's requirements.

Mr. Prause inquired about the height of the building and whether it is compatible with surrounding properties.

Mr. Nagardeolekar reported that the building will be 25 ft. in height. He stated it is consistent with area buildings.

Attorney Penny continued to restate and elaborate on the regulations pertaining to this proposal. He noted that there are no Staff comments that would preclude a favorable decision; the principle proposed use is permitted as of right in the zone for smaller projects and by special exception for this particular application; and the proposal is compatible with the pre-existing commercial uses in the neighborhood and those contemplated by the 2012 local Plan of Conservation and Development. Attorney Penny added that the project can be accommodated on the site without impact to the local roadways, and the design of the proposed structures is compatible in height, size and design with the eclectic neighborhood.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that there are three minor outstanding comments outlined in the Commission's motion memo. All issues will be satisfied at the time of building permit application.

There were no members of the public to speak.

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

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 8:20 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

May 20, 2019

Date

Eric Prause, Chairman

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