TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

April 1, 2019
Lincoln Center Hearing Room
7:00 P.M.
494 Main Street

AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. WOODBRIDGE MILLS, LLC – Request a special exception per Art. II, Sec. 22.04.10 for multifamily historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing at 501 Middle Turnpike East.
   - Special Exception (2019-007)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. WOODBRIDGE MILLS, LLC – Request a special exception per Art. II, Sec. 22.04.10 for multifamily historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing at 501 Middle Turnpike East.
   - Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2019-006)
   - Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-006)
   - Special Exception (2019-007)
2. FUSS & O’NEILL, INC. – To replace the windows using a product that is identical in style at 160 Hartford Road (a.k.a. 158 Hartford Road).
   - Historic Zone Site Plan Modification (2019-024)
3. CHANEL VERASTEGUI – For an in-ground swimming pool in the rear yard within the 100 foot upland review area at 35 Steele Farm Drive.
   - Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2019-025)
   - Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-025)
4. TOWN OF MANCHESTER ENGINEERING DIVISION – Reconstruction of Hillstown Road from Wetherell Street south to Bush Hill Road.
   - Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2019-026)
   - Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-026)
   - Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-027)
6. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS
   - Downtown Architectural Design Guidelines Update
7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   - March 18, 2019 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting

8. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS
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TOWN OF MANCHESTER  
LEGAL NOTICE

The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on April 1, 2019, at 7:00 P.M. in the Lincoln Center Hearing Room, 494 Main Street, Manchester, Connecticut to hear and consider the following petition:

WOODBRIDGE MILLS, LLC – Special Exception (2019-007) – Request a special exception per Art. II, Sec. 22.04.10 for multifamily historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing at 501 Middle Turnpike East, Special Design Commercial Business zone.

At this hearing interested persons may be heard and written communications received. A copy of this petition is in the Planning Department, Lincoln Center Building, 494 Main Street, and may be inspected during regular business hours (8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday).

Planning and Zoning Commission
Eric Prause, Chair
TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency

FROM: Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner MB

DATE: March 28, 2019

RE: Woodbridge Mills, LLC – 501 Middle Turnpike East
Inland Wetlands Permit and Determination of Significance (2019-006)
Special Exception (2019-007)

Introduction

The applicant is requesting approval of a special exception permit in accordance with Art. II, Section 22.04.10 for a multi-family historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing. As part of the project, the applicant is also requesting an inland wetlands permit to expose a portion of the Bigelow Brook, which flows beneath the mill in a culvert.

The historic mill building, originally occupied by the Glastonbury Knitting Co., is located adjacent to the Manchester Green, northeast of the intersection of East Center Street, Woodbridge Street and Middle Turnpike East (MTE). The building sits north of a one-way access drive on the north side of MTE that provides egress for the Town of Manchester Senior Center and access to a couple small commercial buildings located to the east of the mill. An historic house maintained by the Historical Society and Woodbridge Pizza are located to the west of the subject site.

The historic mill building is located in the Special Design Commercial Business (SDC) zone. In 2018, the Planning and Zoning Commission amended the zoning regulations to permit the conversion of an historic mill structure to a multi-family residential use subject to a special exception approval in accordance with the requirements of Art. II, Section 9.14.03.

Project Description

The applicant is proposing to develop the 32,410 sq. ft. (0.74 acres) site with 24 units of senior housing, 31 total parking spaces and associated improvements. Andrew Bushnell, Licensed Land Surveyor and Professional Engineer of Bushnell Associates, LLC, prepared a “Limited Property/Improvement Location Survey” depicting portions of the existing building to be removed, utility infrastructure, parking lot layout and landscaping.

Demolition

Three (3) portions of the existing building are proposed to be removed. Portions of the building to be removed are highlighted in yellow on the attached plan. According to the applicant, these
portions of the structure were additions constructed subsequent to the original construction of the mill. The historic images included for your review provide some indication of the original building configuration on the mill site. On the east side of the building, a row of seven (7) proposed garage bays will face the parking area where a portion of the building will be removed. A reconfigured entrance will be constructed in the southwest corner of the building where an existing building addition will be removed.

The plans also include the removal of a significant portion of the building, in terms of building footprint, in the northwest quadrant of the building. This area will be improved to provide an outdoor amenity including access staircase, concrete patio, concrete walkways and the proposed exposure of the Bigelow Brook.

Parking

In accordance with Art. II, Section 9.14.03 (d) (9) of the zoning regulations, parking spaces shall be provided at a ratio of one (1) space per unit, plus one additional parking space for each employee on the largest shift, plus one for every five units for visitors. The applicant has provided 31 proposed parking spaces, accounting for two (2) employees and 5 visitor parking spaces.

Façade Rehabilitation

The applicant is proposing to renovate the building using materials and architectural features of the original Glastonbury Woolen Mill. A proposed elevation rendering prepared by Arthur W. Hall, Jr., Licensed Architect, is included for your review. The existing stucco finish (currently painted purple/red) at the ground level will be removed and the original brickwork will be restored. 4" exposure clapboard siding will be installed and cornice and beam ends will be restored and painted. Windows and doors will be replaced with more energy efficient models that will match the appearance of the originals. The existing tower and mansard roof will be restored, shingles will be installed on the roof pitch, and the siding over the dormer windows will be removed.

Floor Plan

The proposed 24-unit multi-family building will include eighteen (18) 1-bedroom units and six (6) 2-bedroom units. There will be four (4) units on the first floor, twelve (12) units on the second floor and eight (8) units on the third floor. As noted earlier, the building will include seven (7) garage bays, an office, laundry room, activities & exercise room and storage & utility rooms on the first floor. The second floor will include a community room. An elevator is proposed and a wheelchair lift to the first floor is proposed near the site entrance at the southwest corner of the building.

Inland Wetlands Permit

The Bigelow Brook flows in culverts under the subject building. The brook enters the underground system on Cook Street, south of the commercial strip plaza at 534 MTE. The brook
does not “daylight” until it passes entirely under the subject mill property and reaches the property line at 495 MTE. The applicant is proposing to open approximately 30 linear feet of the culvert located to the rear of the building where the outdoor patio will be constructed when the existing portion of the building is removed. A 42” high railing will line both sides of the exposed brook and a proposed storm drain will be installed to discharge into the brook in the exposed area.

The majority of the proposed activity on site will occur in the upland review area of the brook; however, short- or long-term impacts to the brook are not anticipated.

**Determination of Significance**

The Inland Wetlands Agency is required to make a determination of the significance of the impact of the proposed activities on the wetlands, watercourses, and/or water bodies. In making its determination, the Commission should be guided by the definition of "Significant Impact Activity" as found in the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, which means any activity, including, but not limited to, the following activities which may have a major effect or significant impact:

a. Any activity involving a deposition or removal of material which will or may have a substantial effect on the wetland or watercourse or on wetlands or watercourses outside the area for which the activity is proposed; or

b. Any activity which substantially changes the natural channel or may inhibit the natural dynamics of a watercourse system; or

c. Any activity which substantially diminishes the natural capacity of an inland wetland or watercourse to support aquatic, plant or animal life, prevent flooding, supply water, assimilate waste, facilitate drainage, provide recreation or open space or perform other functions; or

d. Any activity which is likely to cause or has the potential to cause substantial turbidity, siltation or sedimentation in a wetland or watercourse; or

e. Any activity which causes a substantial diminution of flow of a natural watercourse or groundwater levels of the wetland or watercourse; or

f. Any activity which is likely to cause or has the potential to cause pollution of a wetland or watercourse; or

g. Any activity which damages or destroys unique wetland or watercourse areas or such areas having demonstrable scientific or educational value.

If the Agency finds the proposed activity will have a significant impact on the wetlands, a public hearing is required. Should the Agency find this activity will not create a significant impact, then no public hearing is required.
Special Exception

The proposal for a multi-family historic mill conversion in the Special Design Commercial Business zone is a use subject to special exception approval in accordance with Art. II, Section 22.04.10. In addition to the general requirements of Art. IV, Section 20 which outlines the compliance criteria for special exception uses, Art. II, Section 22.04.10 states that a multi-family historic mill conversion should be permitted in accordance with the provisions of Art. II, Section 9.14.03. This section describes the purpose and criteria for approval of the mill conversion, as well as criteria for the building rehabilitation and site development. While Town staff is substantially satisfied with the proposed improvements under its jurisdiction, the Commission should give consideration to the impacts of the proposal on unique historical or architectural qualities, the appropriateness of the structure for the use and the compatibility of the use with the character of the neighborhood.

Staff Review

Town staff has reviewed plans and documents submitted with the application and provided the applicant with comments. The only outstanding comments come from the Engineering Division regarding the proposed demand for water and capacity of existing public water and sewer utility connections to the building. The Engineering Division recommends approval with modifications to address this outstanding information prior to endorsement of final plans and mylars.

MRB

Attachments
DISCLAIMER: This map is compiled from other maps, deeds, dimensions and other sources of information. Not to be construed as accurate surveys and subject to final changes as a more accurate survey may disclose.

NOTES: Original planimetric and topographic data were compiled by stereophotogrammetric methods from photography dated April 1999 in accordance with ASPR accuracy standards for 1 inch = 40 ft large scale Class I mapping. The updating of the GIS data is performed by the GIS/Maps & Records Unit on a continual basis utilizing the best and most appropriated sources available.
Introduction

The applicant is requesting approval of an Historic zone site development plan modification to replace the existing windows using a product that is identical in style. The proposed window replacement project will occur at the Clark Building, occupied by Fuss & O’Neill, Inc., at 160 Hartford Road. The building is located on the south side of Hartford Road, north of the Hop Brook and opposite the intersection of Elm Street.

Historic Zone Site Development Plan Modification

As per the applicant’s submission, the proposed windows are double-hung, PVC fixed windows to match the windows installed in the building in 2008. The windows are colored “Hartford Green” in an effort to match the oft referred to “Cheney Green”. In accordance with Article II, Section 18.04.01, the exterior rehabilitation of all segments of the visible structure shall be subject to review and approval by the Commission. The Commission should review this section of the regulations for the appropriateness of the proposed project.

Cheney Commission Recommendation

At its March 21, 2019 regular meeting, the Cheney Brothers National Historic District Commission voted to recommend approval of the proposal from Fuss & O’Neill to replace exterior windows at 160 Hartford Road.

Staff Review

Town staff had no concerns with this application.

MRB

Attachments
TO: Planning and Zoning Commission
FROM: Gary Anderson, Director of Planning and Economic Development
DATE: March 22, 2019
RE: Cheney Commission Recommendation
160 Hartford Road

At its March 21, 2019 regular meeting, the Cheney Brothers National Historic District Commission voted to recommend approval of a proposal from Fuss & O’Neill to replace exterior windows at 160 Hartford Road. As per the applicant’s submission, proposed windows are double-hung, PVC fixed windows to match the windows installed elsewhere in the building in 2008.

GAA
DISCLAIMER: This map is compiled from other maps, deeds, dimensions and other sources of information. Not to be construed as accurate surveys and subject to final changes as a more accurate survey may disclose.

NOTES: Original planimetric and topographic data were compiled by stereophotogrammetric methods from photography dated April 1999 in accordance with ASPR accuracy standards. The updating of the GIS data is performed by the GIS/Maps & Records Unit on a continual basis utilizing the best and most appropriate sources available.
Pictures of existing windows
Picture of new windows manufactured by Mercury Excelum with exterior color Hartford Green and interior color white
Picture of new window showing Hartford Green exterior, white interior
Pictures of a building at Mystic Seaport with windows from Mercury Excelum

Mystic Seaport, pictured above and below
TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission / Inland Wetlands Agency

FROM: David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner / Wetland Agent

DATE: March 27, 2019

RE: Chanel Verastegui – 35 Steele Farm Drive
Inland Wetlands Permit and Determination of Significance (2019-025)

Introduction

The applicant, Chanel Verastegui, is proposing the construction of a new in-ground swimming pool behind an existing house at 35 Steele Farm Drive.

The parcel does not contain wetlands, although there are wetlands to the east of the parcel. The proposed project on the parcel falls within the 100 foot upland review area for the wetlands to the east of the parcel. Additionally, there is a Town of Manchester Conservation Easement on the east end of the parcel, east of the proposed project.

Project Description

The proposed activities, which include excavation of soil material, installation of an in-ground pool, and installation of a 4 ft. fence around the pool, are entirely within the regulated upland review area.

The submitted plans indicate that there may be a need to stockpile soil on site. The stockpile locations have been indicated on the plans and do fall within the 100 foot upland review area. A note has been included on the plans that silt fences will be installed as needed. The location of the silt fence has been indicated on the plans and does fall within the 100 foot upland review area. The area of the pool, as indicated on the plan sheet, will be approximately 20 ft. x 40 ft.

Background information

The house at 35 Steele Farm Drive was constructed under the Steele Farm Subdivision permit that was issued in 2004. The plan sheet used for this application depicts the 50 foot upland review area, as it applied to the 2004 permit application. Although not shown on the current plan sheet, all proposed activities associated with this application fall within the current 100 foot upland review area buffer. The border of the Town Conservation Easement is also depicted on the plan sheets.
Inland Wetlands Permit

The proposed activity will occur in the upland review area located on the site. The proposed activity will not have a direct impact on wetlands or watercourses.

Proposed activities will include excavation for and the installation of an in-ground pool and the installation of a fence around the pool. The in-ground pool will have a permanent impact to the upland review area of 800 square feet. As shown on the plans, erosion and sedimentation controls will be installed as needed during the construction process.

Determination of Significance

The Inland Wetlands Agency is required to make a determination of the significance of the impact of the proposed activities on the wetlands, watercourses, and/or water bodies. In making its determination, the Commission should be guided by the definition of "Significant Impact Activity" as found in the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, which means any activity, including, but not limited to, the following activities which may have a major effect or significant impact:

a. Any activity involving a deposition or removal of material which will or may have a substantial effect on the wetland or watercourse or on wetlands or watercourses outside the area for which the activity is proposed; or

b. Any activity which substantially changes the natural channel or may inhibit the natural dynamics of a watercourse system; or

c. Any activity which substantially diminishes the natural capacity of an inland wetland or watercourse to support aquatic, plant or animal life, prevent flooding, supply water, assimilate waste, facilitate drainage, provide recreation or open space or perform other functions; or

d. Any activity which is likely to cause or has the potential to cause substantial turbidity, siltation or sedimentation in a wetland or watercourse; or

e. Any activity which causes a substantial diminution of flow of a natural watercourse or groundwater levels of the wetland or watercourse; or

f. Any activity which is likely to cause or has the potential to cause pollution of a wetland or watercourse; or

g. Any activity which damages or destroys unique wetland or watercourse areas or such areas having demonstrable scientific or educational value.

If the Agency finds the proposed activity will have a significant impact on the wetlands, a public hearing is required. Should the Agency find this activity will not create a significant impact, then no public hearing is required.
Staff Review

Town staff has reviewed the plans and documents submitted with the application and have no outstanding comments.

DWL
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Attachments
TOWN OF MANCHESTER  
PLANNING DEPARTMENT  

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission/Inland Wetlands Agency  
FROM: Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner  
        David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner / Wetlands Agent  
DATE: March 28, 2019  
RE: Town of Manchester Engineering Division – Hillstown Road from Wetherell Street south to Bush Hill Road.  
Inland Wetlands Permit and Determination of Significance (2019-026)  
Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-027)  

Introduction  

The Town of Manchester Department of Public Works is proposing to reconstruct approximately 5,800 linear feet of roadway on Hillstown Road from Wetherell Street south to Bush Hill Road. This will be the final phase of Hillstown Road reconstruction.  

Hillstown Road is a two-lane collector road located between Spencer Street and the Glastonbury town line. The road currently varies in width from 20’ to 36’ within the project area and is in generally poor condition.  

The project area includes several regulated resources that exist adjacent to or flow beneath Hillstown Road. The wetlands were flagged by Mr. John P. Ianni, Professional Soil Scientist of Hillstown Soils, LLC. An inland wetlands permit is required for direct impacts to the regulated resources and activity proposed in the upland review area.  

Certification of an erosion and sedimentation control plan is required as the overall project disturbance will exceed 0.5 acres.  

Project Description  

Proposed work includes full-depth reconstruction of the road and improvements to provide a generally consistent road width of 26 feet. New curbing, road surface, a 6-foot wide multi-use trail along the east side of the road, and installation of storm sewer drainage improvements are proposed.  

The majority of the road will be reclaimed, which is described by the Town Engineering Division as a process that pulverizes and mixes the existing pavement into the subsurface to create a suitable base material for installation of a new pavement section on top. Limited areas where the road will be widened and/or where final grades will be lower than existing will require excavation and installation of a full-depth road section that includes both processed aggregate base material and bituminous concrete pavement.
Existing bituminous concrete curb will be replaced with extruded concrete curb and existing granite curbing will be relocated as necessary. The proposed 26' width is narrower than Town standards based on considerations for the rural character, existing topography, road geometry and existing utility pole locations.” The Public Works Department is also proposing to straighten the road and provide a more uniform vertical curvature that will allow for the installation of an approximate 6-foot wide bituminous concrete trail in accordance with the current Town of Manchester Sidewalk and Curb Plan.

Drainage improvements include the installation of new curbing, resetting of existing catch basin tops, installation of new catch basins and five (5) new hydrodynamic separators (highlighted in orange on the plans attached), drainage piping for four new stormwater outfalls, grass swales, and riprap and erosion control blanket for scour protection.

The project will utilize a new connection to an existing storm sewer drainage system on Bramblebush Road, which discharges to Town of Manchester property at #381 Hillstown Road (see the bottom of Sheet 10 of 18). In addition, there is an existing storm sewer drainage system on Hillstown Road between #455 Hillstown Road and #7 Redwood Road that will be repaired and expanded as part of the project (see the bottom of Sheet 11 of 18).

The first phase of the project will be installation of a majority of the utility work and drainage improvements followed by phased reconstruction of the road. At this time, the project is expected to commence in early summer 2019 and be completed in the summer of 2020.

**Inland Wetlands Permit**

Incidental work is proposed within existing wetland areas to properly construct new outlets and associated outlet protection. The approximate wetlands disturbance is 0.03 acres and there is approximately 1.98 acres of disturbance within the 100 foot non-wetland regulated review area.

The installation of curbing along the road edge, in combination with the addition of catch basins and piping that will discharge to wetlands and watercourses, has the potential to increase volume and concentration of flow from stormwater discharge in the wetlands and watercourses. While an increase in stormwater runoff volume is anticipated, catch basin sumps and hydrodynamic separators are proposed to reduce flow concentrations, velocity of discharge and course suspended sediment. In some cases the proposed project will have no additional physical impact, in the form of structures being placed in the wetland or watercourse. There are a few locations where physical impacts to wetlands and/or watercourses are proposed. Throughout the project corridor many of the proposed construction elements will be within the 100 foot upland review area.

The following list describes those locations with new or additional physical impacts to wetlands and/or watercourses:

- Bottom of Sheet 9, north of Star Farms Drive
  - Installation of box culvert, endwalls, and riprap on both sides of the road
- This is a replacement of an existing drainage system but includes a larger impact to wetlands and watercourses than the existing conditions
- **Sheet 12**
  - Construction of grass swale and installation of erosion control blanket at end of riprap pipe outfall
  - New grass swale and erosion control blanket will be placed in a wetland and will directly abut an unnamed watercourse
- **Bottom of Sheet 13, north of driveway at #619 Hillstown Road**
  - Construction of flared end outlet and installation of modified riprap scour hole
  - Newly constructed drainage system will be collecting stormwater and discharging flows to wetland system and seasonal waterbody
  - Outfall and modified riprap scour hole will be in wetland and directly adjacent to waterbody
- **Top of Sheet 14**
  - Construction of grass swale and installation of erosion control blanket at end of riprap pipe outfall
  - New grass swale and erosion control blanket will be placed in a wetland and will directly abut Buckland Pond

**Conservation Commission Review**

This application was reviewed by the Manchester Conservation Commission at its March 19, 2019 meeting. The Commission members offered the following comments:

- With regards to the outfall and handling of stormwater discharge in the vicinity of Buckland Pond the Conservation Commission questioned whether or not the designer had considered all feasible and prudent alternatives (as required in the Town Wetland Regulations).
  - Overall preference of the idea of having stormwater discharge as far away from Buckland Pond as possible – encouraging infiltration and overland flow so that the upland portions of the field can act as a buffer before any toxicants or sediments are allowed to reach the sensitive resources (pond and wetlands).
    - Based mostly on point of discharge (in relation to the pond) this is their order of preference:
      1. Level Spreader. This system, placed near the road, would allow for the maximum amount of overland flow and infiltration.
      2. Pipe with outlet pulled away from the pond. They like the idea of stone at the outlet and a well thought out vegetated area between the stone and the pond. Plants that would either take up excess nutrients and/or serve as a sediment trap are preferred.
      3. Pipe with the outlet closer to the pond edge. If this option is used they are most concerned with bank erosion – understanding that there is little opportunity for nutrient or sediment trapping with this option.
The Commission is concerned with larger storm events which could affect the flow calculations. They thought that a pipe option might reach capacity and get “backed-up” into the street – where the level spreader would just over top.

- Due to this concern they thought that it might make sense to either eliminate the curb near the outfall or to have a lower elevation curb there to act as an emergency spillway so that water doesn’t pond on the road.

**Determination of Significance**

The Inland Wetlands Agency is required to make a determination of the significance of the impact of the proposed activities on the wetlands, watercourses, and/or water bodies. In making its determination, the Commission should be guided by the definition of "Significant Impact Activity" as found in the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations, which means any activity, including, but not limited to, the following activities which may have a major effect or significant impact:

a. Any activity involving a deposition or removal of material which will or may have a substantial effect on the wetland or watercourse or on wetlands or watercourses outside the area for which the activity is proposed; or

b. Any activity which substantially changes the natural channel or may inhibit the natural dynamics of a watercourse system; or

c. Any activity which substantially diminishes the natural capacity of an inland wetland or watercourse to support aquatic, plant or animal life, prevent flooding, supply water, assimilate waste, facilitate drainage, provide recreation or open space or perform other functions; or

d. Any activity which is likely to cause or has the potential to cause substantial turbidity, siltation or sedimentation in a wetland or watercourse; or

e. Any activity which causes a substantial diminution of flow of a natural watercourse or groundwater levels of the wetland or watercourse; or

f. Any activity which is likely to cause or has the potential to cause pollution of a wetland or watercourse; or

g. Any activity which damages or destroys unique wetland or watercourse areas or such areas having demonstrable scientific or educational value.

If the Agency finds the proposed activity will have a significant impact on the wetlands, a public hearing is required. Should the Agency find this activity will not create a significant impact, then no public hearing is required.

**Erosion and Sedimentation Control**

Erosion and sedimentation controls will primarily include installation of silt sacks in catch basins and silt fence downstream of all disturbed areas. The Town is providing a 150’ by 75’ size area
for the stock piling of equipment and construction material at #40 Hills Street. A construction entrance will be provided at an existing curb cut opposite #605 Hillstown Road and silt fencing will surround the entire provided area. The sequence for installation of control measures, grading and construction activities, and sequence for final stabilization have been included in the contract plan set.

The contractor will be required to continuously monitor weather forecasts during construction and ensure sufficient erosion control measures are provided. All sedimentation and erosion control devices will be installed per project standard details in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control prior to the start of construction and maintained or replaced by the contractor as required by the Town.

Staff Review

Town staff has reviewed the plans and documents submitted with the application and a report on the status of those comments will be provided to the Commission at the meeting.
TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

TO: Planning and Zoning Commission

FROM: Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner

DATE: March 28, 2019

RE: Town of Manchester Sidewalk and Curb Plan Update

Pursuant to the Town Sidewalk and Curb Ordinance, the Planning and Zoning Commission must review, and if appropriate amend, the Sidewalk and Curb Plan (the Plan) every five years. The Plan articulates policies for where new sidewalks should be installed; deals with new installations in developed areas; sets guidelines on how and whether to remove sidewalks in certain areas and identifies priorities for filling in gaps and/or extending the existing system. The current Plan was most recently adopted with revisions in April 2014.

Enclosed is a copy of the proposed 2019 Plan with draft revisions suggested by Town staff and public input. The proposed changes are limited to the correction of dates and staff recommendations for streets to be added to the list of “critical path extensions” on pg. 3 of the Plan. The following list identifies the proposed “critical path extensions” provided as they appear in the draft plan. Proposed text amendments are shown underlined in blue and deletions struck-through and highlighted red.

“The priority streets identified as part of this Plan are:

- Broad Street from Middle Turnpike West to Hilliard Street
  -— Oakland Street
  - Tolland Turnpike
  - North Main Street
- Keeney Street from Bush Hill Road north
- Parker Street from Mather Street to East Center Street
- Sheldon Road
- Woodland Street
- Woodbridge Street from Parker Street to Weaver Road
- East Center Street from Goodwin Street to Middle Turnpike East
- Sheldon Road
- Charter Oak Street
- Wyllys Street

Although these are priority streets for extensions, such extensions are dependent upon the availability of funds and may not be included during the 2019-2024 planning period.”
The proposed deletions correspond to projects completed in the past five year Plan period. The proposed additions (underlined in blue) are gaps in the existing sidewalk system that staff recommends for the Commission’s consideration.

**Plan Update Process**

A public hearing was held at the Planning and Zoning Commission’s March 18th regular meeting. The Commission discussed the revisions to the list of “critical path extensions” and debated both the value of adding Birch Mountain Road and the feasibility of the project being completed considering the challenges of the landscape on this street. As a result, following consultation with Town staff, Birch Mountain Road has been removed from the priority list of “critical path extensions.”

As required under Article IV, Section 279-31 of the Code of the Town of Manchester, the Plan was sent to the Board of Directors for their review and comment prior to adoption of the update. No comments have been received from the Board at the time this memorandum was prepared. An update on the status of any comments from the Board will be provided at the meeting.

TOWN OF MANCHESTER

SIDEWALK AND CURB PLAN

Prepared by:

Manchester Planning Department
Manchester Public Works Department

Adopted April 7, 2014
Planning and Zoning Commission
SIDEWALK PLAN

Introduction

Providing paths for pedestrians has always been fundamental to community building, and while the need for and function of sidewalks has changed, it has not disappeared. The purpose of sidewalks is to provide a safe location for people to walk separated from motorized or mechanized vehicles. Sidewalks are an elemental form of transit, connecting people to public transit, schools, work, shopping, services, and cultural or recreational facilities and activities. They provide a space for spontaneous social interaction. They are increasingly used as a recreation and health amenity in themselves for walkers and joggers. For families with young children sidewalks provide a safe dedicated space for youngsters to learn to ride a bike or rollerblade.

For all of these reasons, Manchester has long required individuals and businesses developing land in Manchester to construct sidewalks. The goal is to provide pedestrian connections within neighborhoods, connections between neighborhoods, and connections from homes to services, facilities, and amenities in the community.

The Town’s Sidewalk Plan was first adopted in 1980. Since that time there have been at least two periods of significant new industrial, commercial and residential development in Manchester. Because development has extended to previously undeveloped areas and away from the Town center, the Planning and Zoning Commission reviewed the Sidewalk Plan considering current conditions and anticipated future trends. Our sidewalk and curb policies, and the location map that will serve as a guide for the implementation of this Plan, have been revised to reflect these new realities. The Plan articulates policies for where new sidewalks should be installed; effectively and sensibly deals with new installations in developed areas; sets guidelines on how and whether to decide to remove sidewalks in certain areas, identifies priorities for filling in gaps and/or extending the existing system; and provides guidance on what types of curbs should be installed in various locations or conditions.

Policy for New Sidewalk Installation

As a general policy, the Sidewalk Plan calls for concrete sidewalks on all streets in the Town of Manchester. The amount and location of sidewalks will vary depending on the type of street and its function. Table One describes the minimum standards and locations for sidewalks. Roadway classifications are shown on the Roadway Classification Map, Town of Manchester Sidewalk Plan, dated July 2009.1

1 Rev. 1/21/09
On all new local streets, sidewalks will be constructed as required in Table One unless the judgment is made by the Planning and Zoning Commission, with the recommendation of the Public Works Department (PWD), that payment in lieu of installation is warranted. On all existing local streets, sidewalks will be required as identified on the Sidewalk Location Map, unless the judgment is made by the Planning and Zoning Commission, with the recommendation of PWD, that payment in lieu of installation is warranted.

Table One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Standards for Sidewalks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadway Classification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Scenic Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of the general policy and standards recommended in this Plan and contained in Table One above, the location of sidewalks on existing streets shall be based on the Sidewalk Location Map which is a part of this Plan. Sidewalks will be required on all street segments identified as Proposed Sidewalk Extensions, and repairs, if necessary as required by the Town Sidewalk Ordinance (see Appendix A), will be required on all segments identified as existing sidewalk. The Plan may require that sidewalks be built on both sides of an existing local street if it is deemed necessary for pedestrian safety given the proximity to schools, the housing density of the neighborhood, and other factors.

When required on only one side of the street, sidewalks shall be installed on the north and east sides of the roadway to facilitate snow melt and ease of maintenance. While this general standard should always apply, there may be circumstances where the location, width, or material requirements may be waived. Conditions that may warrant a deviation from these standards include the following:

- Infill development in neighborhoods or on streets where the sidewalks should match the dominant pattern on the street or in the neighborhood.

- Physical features of the area including the available right-of-way, grades, rocks/ledge, specimen trees or other important natural features which should be preserved, etc. In these cases the Director of Public Works may recommend, and the Planning and Zoning Commission may approve, alternate locations.

---
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All sidewalks shall be built according to the design and construction standards contained in the Town of Manchester Public Improvement Standards, as amended.

**Critical Path Extensions**

The Sidewalk Plan has identified the desirable locations for sidewalks throughout the Town of Manchester. Keeping in mind this Plan will be updated every five years, the Plan identifies selected streets as priorities for the extensions of new sidewalks. Criteria for determining these critical path connections include the following:

- The desire to provide safe pedestrian connections to schools, shopping, or transit facilities, with consideration given to the school location, residential density and nature of the streets and traffic.
- The desire to provide safe pedestrian walkways on arterial or collector streets where such pedestrian systems are not now available, in particular highly populated or highly traveled areas.
- The desire to close gaps in sidewalk systems in areas of high pedestrian traffic.

The priority streets identified as part of this Plan are:

- Broad Street from Middle Turnpike West to Hilliard Street
- Oakland Street
- Tolland Turnpike
- North Main Street
- Keeney Street from Bush Hill Road north
- Parker Street from Mather Street to East Center Street
- Sheldon Road
- Woodland Street
- Woodbridge Street from Parker Street to Weaver Road
- East Center Street from Goodwin Street to Middle Turnpike East
- Sheldon Road
- Charter Oak Street
- Wyllys Street

Although these are priority streets for extensions, such extensions are dependent upon the availability of funds and may not be included during the 2014-2019 2019-2024 planning period. Likewise, other streets may see their sidewalks extended if funding opportunities arise, or if

---
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circumstances arise during the planning period that warrant sidewalk extensions on non-priority streets.

**Removal of Sidewalks**

In some circumstances in older residential neighborhoods where there are sidewalks on both sides of the street, it may be desirable to remove sidewalks to meet the current standard of sidewalks on only one side of the street. Removing walks on one side of the street would bring older neighborhoods in line with current practice for local streets. The removal of sidewalks within narrow rights-of-way provides opportunities to create greater separation of pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Selective removal would allow more neighborhood sidewalks to be repaired or replaced over the long-term, and the Town’s long-term maintenance and liability costs would be reduced.

Sidewalk removal projects will be pursued only after an analysis of neighborhood conditions has been completed and public meetings with neighborhood residents have been held. Conditions which may warrant the removal of sidewalks include the following:

- The amount of right-of-way available in the existing public street area.
- The density of housing in the neighborhood. Generally the lower the housing density and the smaller the resident population, the more unlikely sidewalks will be necessary on both sides of the street.
- On streets with low traffic volumes and/or which are not major pedestrian corridors, sidewalks will less likely be necessary on both sides of the street.
- Neighborhoods whose distance from commercial or service uses would generate less pedestrian traffic may not require sidewalks on both sides of the street.
- Neighborhoods with wide rights-of-way, exclusively residential areas and neighborhoods not in proximity to non-residential uses.

**Granite Curbing Installation**

- Installation of granite curbs shall be required on all new local streets and extensions of existing local streets.
- Granite curbs shall be required on all collector and arterial streets as shown on a Town of Manchester Roadway Classification Map.
- When individual lot development occurs within a developed local street, the type of curb required should be consistent with the predominant material currently existing on that
street, as determined by PWD.

- When existing roadways and sidewalks are reconstructed on local streets, curbs should be replaced with the predominant curb type that exists within the neighborhood, as determined by PWD.

- On rural/scenic roads, the determination whether to install granite curbs or alternate materials will be based upon such factors as the street grade, stormwater management considerations, and natural features and topography.

**Rural/Scenic Roads**

Although Manchester is a largely developed community, there are some roads that are, and should remain, rural and scenic in character. These are roads in outlying areas that are mostly identified as natural or rural/agricultural on the proposed character map in the Town’s Plan of Conservation and Development. Future development in these areas is anticipated to be at low densities that would not conflict with rural or scenic roads. In these areas a pedestrian path should be provided, but a bituminous or stone dust pedestrian path may be more appropriate than granite curbs and concrete sidewalks.

**Good Cause for Payment in Lieu of Installation**

The Plan identifies desirable locations for sidewalks and curbs\(^4\) throughout the community. The Plan recognizes that, depending on the amount of Town financial resources available, and the development pattern in various areas, it may not be prudent or practical to install sidewalks and curbs\(^5\) in all new developments approved during the five year planning period. Where the Plan calls for sidewalk and curb installation, but where there is good cause not to install them at the time of the development, payment in lieu of installation shall be required in accordance with the Town Sidewalk Ordinance (see Appendix A).

Criteria to be considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission when requiring payment in lieu of installation would include but not be limited to the following:

- There are no other sidewalks or curbs within a reasonable distance of the area where the sidewalks would be required.

- There are no sidewalks or curbs in the area or on the street where new walks would be otherwise required.

---

\(^4\) Rev. \(1/21/09\)

\(^5\) Rev. \(7/06/09\)
• There is no project funded by the Town that would fill in the gaps that exist in the sidewalk and/or curb system on the street where the development is proposed.

• There are plans in the near term for major street reconstruction which would provide opportunities to fill gaps in the sidewalk and/or curb system, but it would be better to construct the required sidewalks as part of the larger reconstruction project.

• When a sidewalk and or granite curbs are to be located within the right of way of a State road and the State denies a permit for the installation\(^6\).
ROLL CALL:

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

Alternate Members: Teresa Ike
Charles Sabia

Absent: Julian Stoppelman

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

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

SAINT JAMES PARISH CORPORATION – Resubdivision of 285 West Center Street from 21 Adams Street South. – Resubdivision (2019-010)

Attorney Karen Casey of the law firm of Cooney, Scully and Dowling, 10 Columbus Boulevard, Hartford, CT 06106, introduced herself as representing Saint James Parish Corporation. Attorney Casey reported they are seeking the Commission’s approval for the division of a residential lot from the Church of the Assumption campus, the owner of which is Saint James Parish Corporation. Attorney Casey proceeded to explain the lot details and compliance with the Zoning Regulations. She noted that the remaining campus would be left on 5.12 acres, also compliant with zoning. They are also seeking the Commission’s agreement, she explained, to allow the parish to pay a $2,000 fee in satisfaction of the open space regulations.

Attorney Casey described the history of the above parcel. She explained that the parcel is completely utilized and has been, without change, since its inception. In 2017, the Saint James Parish and the Church of the Assumption merged. With that merger, Father Cavanaugh became pastor of both church sites, which are still being used.
The total parcel on which the Church of the Assumption is located consists of 5.72 acres, according to Attorney Casey, which would be deemed a residential subdivision, which requires open space of 10%. She noted that the dedication of open space is not feasible, as the property is already constructed.

Mr. Prause reiterated that there would be no change to the lots other than the subdivision.

Attorney Casey concurred, stating it is the creation of one lot.

Mr. Prause sought clarification that the parcel conforms to Residence A standards for the zone, with which Attorney Casey agreed.

Mr. Bordeaux stated there are no outstanding comments from Staff, noting the proposed lot is in compliance with the zoning dimensional standards, has sidewalks and utilities, and for all intents and purposes is an existing residential home without its own property lines.

Mr. Prause commented that there is a request for approval relative to the lack of open space based on Section 4.07.06 (a) of the Subdivision Regulations, with a $2,000 payment in lieu of open space. He questioned if that was the intent of that section of the regulations.

Mr. Bordeaux was unaware whether that was the intent when the section was drafted. In his opinion, the strict application would be unreasonable.

Mr. Kennedy noted that in the staff review, Mr. Bordeaux said the plans must be tied to the Town of Manchester control coordinates, and asked whether that was in the staff memoranda from Mr. DiBiasi referenced in the proposed motion of approval. Mr. Bordeaux confirmed it was.

Mr. Kennedy questioned whether the $2,000 fee must be listed in the motion. Mr. Bordeaux reported it would be appropriate to amend the motion to include the $2,000.

There were no members of the public to speak.

**MOTION:** Mr. Stebe moved to close the public hearing on application 2019-010. Mr. Kennedy seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.


Mr. Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner, stated that his plan is to discuss and gather feedback from the public and the Commission concerning the required update to the Town’s Sidewalk and Curb Plan pursuant to the Town’s Sidewalk and Curb Ordinance. He explained that the plan must be updated every five years and was last updated in April 2014.
The previous plan update, he noted, included editorial improvements to the plan itself; there were no recommendations of changes to the plan other than to update the dates of the upcoming plan period. Mr. Bordeaux reported recommendations for priority streets to be considered by the Commission that the Engineering Division sees as the potential for the next round of gap closures. He also noted deletions for streets that were approved in the last five-year cycle. Mr. Bordeaux comprehensively detailed the map of proposed projects to the Commission. He explained that the recommendations from the Engineering Division and the Planning Department would be to add some additional streets to the list of priority streets, noting that his information does not reflect a schedule.

Mr. Bordeaux reiterated that there are not many proposed revisions to the plan itself; the five-year plan would be replaced and updated, and the list of priority streets would be improved. The map will then be amended to show the improvements that have been made in the previous five-year period and to eliminate the removal area.

The next steps in the process, according to Mr. Bordeaux, would be to gather feedback, make any revisions considered necessary and then share the proposed plan with the Board of Directors.

Mr. Bergin questioned whether the financing of the bituminous connections to the greenway are any different from the actual expansions of sidewalks being proposed. He asked about the criteria for determining that the sidewalk or path is in an inappropriate location.

Mr. Bordeaux proceeded to explain the funding options. He reported that if a path or sidewalk has no connections or accessibility, Engineering may determine to hold off on the connection until the entire project could be completed.

Mr. Bergin asked whether there are any other considerations, such as utility poles.

Mr. Bordeaux replied that the Engineering Division would determine the logistics.

Mr. Prause questioned if there are regional bike path plans for trail extensions.

Mr. Bordeaux asserted that the bituminous paths are not trails, and have been determined to be more appropriate than a concrete sidewalk due to the rural character of the area. He noted that the regional bike path is shown on the plan, and where appropriate they do integrate.

Mr. Prause noted the map legend and inquired about the proposed removals; Mr. Bordeaux explained the areas marked for removal.

Mr. Anderson clarified that there is a regional bike and pedestrian plan by CRCOG, which utilizes a proposed multi-use path map that highlights connections which are to be made regionally. He reiterated Mr. Bordeaux’s point that many proposed connections are to connect to the regional assets.
Mr. Stebe referred to Line Street and a prior discussion about the current plan and questioned whether Birch Mountain Road would be a good idea, similar to Line Street, or if it is even feasible.

Mr. Bordeaux suggested that the Commission could consider adding Birch Mountain Road to Dennison Ridge North to ensure that gap closure is more of a priority than the entire street.

Mr. Stebe referred to the “payment in lieu of” provision for sidewalks and assumed there is nothing in the regulations that differentiates between a sidewalk and a trail bike lane. Mr. Anderson explained that there is no distinction, though that could be looked into.

Ms. Christine Ladd, 14 Niles Drive, introduced herself. She asked whether residents are required to shovel bituminous paths.

Mr. Bordeaux noted that the subject had arisen at the Hillstown Road meeting. He reported that, at this time, the bituminous paths are considered rural in character and there would not be a requirement for the homeowner to remove the snow.

A general discussion was held to determine whether the hearing should be held open, and there was a suggestion to change the color for proposed sidewalk removals.

Mr. Bergin commented that there is value in connecting the recreational systems and neighborhood assets. However, his priority would be the walkability of neighborhoods, rather than holding all segments of the plan equal.

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

The Chairman closed the public hearing at 7:55 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

________________________________________  ______________________________________
Date                                               Eric Prause, Chairman

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

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

Alternate Members: Teresa Ike
Charles Sabia

Absent: Julian Stoppelman

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

The Chairman opened the Business Meeting at 7:55 P.M.

SAINT JAMES PARISH CORPORATION – Resubdivision of 285 West Center Street from 21 Adams Street South. – Resubdivision (2019-010)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the resubdivision of 285 West Center Street from 21 Adams Street South with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. John DiBiasi, Assistant Town Engineer, dated March 11, 2019;

and to accept a $2,000 payment in lieu of the open space requirement.

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

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity meets the Subdivision Regulations.

HARTFORD CDC, LLC – To add a 199,466 sq. ft. addition to the existing 300,650 sq. ft. warehouse building and to construct a new 8,400 sq. ft. recycling facility at 61 Chapel Road. – Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-008); Special Exception Modification (2019-009)

Mr. Michael Marinis, Engineer with Barrett, Bonacci & VanWeele, Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of Connecticut, introduced himself.
Mr. Marini reported the property site details, the specifications of the proposed building addition, and the construction of a separate material processing facility. The expansion meets Town code, he explained, and no variances are requested.

Mr. Marini described the associated site improvements as well as the purpose of the proposed addition. He noted they have received staff comments from the Engineering Division, the Eighth Utilities Fire District, and the Environmental Planner. Site plans were revised and resubmitted last week.

Mr. Marini reported the proposal’s compliance with special exception, zoning, and parking requirements, lack of impact on neighboring parcels, and neighborhood compatibility. He reported the suitability of the street network as well as the application to the State DOT. In addition, there is adequate emergency access in the plan. There are adequate public utilities, according to Mr. Marinis. He detailed the environmental conservation aspects of the project. According to Mr. Marinis, the purpose of the materials processing center is to recycle all paper, Styrofoam and plastics used in the process of furniture delivery.

Mr. Prause requested confirmation of the emergency access plan, which was provided. He also inquired about the building addition’s exterior along with the materials processing center as there are no renderings of color schemes.

Mr. Lawrence Rousell, Senior Vice President of Real Estate and Construction for Raymour & Flanigan, introduced himself. Mr. Rousell explained the color scheme and details of the addition as well as the materials processing center. He also described the proposed heights of the buildings and the berm.

Mr. Prause suggested to Staff that the Commission could approve the plan and then an administrative review could be done to make sure that it meets the suitable structure requirement, if detailed renderings are provided.

Mr. Anderson stated that could be possible. He also suggested the Commission members could see the street view of the building via Google Map.

A general discussion of the property was held between Mr. Anderson, Mr. Prause and Mr. Marinis.

Mr. Stebe requested information about the buffer trees, road size, road condition, expected traffic, and traffic impact, which Mr. Marinis explained.

Mr. Bordeaux reported three minor and technical comments from Staff.

Ms. Scorso expressed concerns about the inability to review design plans and would support having them submitted for review. She asked for clarification of the erosion and sediment plan.

Mr. Rousell explained the storm water management report he prepared.
Mr. Marinis stated they will forward the building renderings as soon as possible.

Mr. Rousell pointed out that there are renderings in the Building Department.

Mr. Bordeaux reported he had elevation renderings and submitted them to the Commission members for review.

Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-008)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the erosion and sedimentation control plan with the modifications as specified in Staff memoranda from:


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

Special Exception Modification (2019-009)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the special exception modification to add a 199,466 sq. ft. addition to the existing 300,650 sq. ft. warehouse building and to construct a new 8,400 sq. ft. recycling facility at 61 Chapel Road, with the modifications as specified in Staff memoranda from:


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

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


**Extension of Previously-Approved Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-019)**
**Extension of Previously-Approved Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-020)**
**Extension of Previously-Approved PRD Zone Detailed Site Development Plan (2019-021)**
**Extension of Previously-Approved Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-022)**
**Extension of Previously-Approved Resubdivision (2019-023)**

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the request for a 5-year extension of the previously-approved Inland Wetlands Permit (2014-009), Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2014-010), PRD Zone Detailed Site Development Plan (2014-011), Inland Wetlands Permit (2014-041), and Resubdivision (2014-042) at 626 Tolland Turnpike (formerly 594 Tolland Turnpike).

Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.
Mr. Stebe referred to a prior discussion about the property and expressed his concerns, which were addressed by Mr. Bordeaux, Mr. Anderson and Mr. Kennedy.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Bordeaux requested comments regarding the proposed CUD regulation revisions. He noted that he will make an application tomorrow to begin the process.

Mr. Anderson stated the topic had been discussed at the last meeting. He reiterated they were seeking comments.

Mr. Bordeaux reported that he will make proposals of minor revisions to the regulations to omit redundancies.

Mr. Anderson made two comments. Looking at the PRD regulation, he remembered that some language was added to strengthen and clarify PRD changes. Art. II, Sec. 7.05.03(c) states, “Major changes to the detailed plan, including, but not limited to, overall site layout, design, density and building design shall constitute an amended application which shall require new preliminary and detailed plans which are to be approved by the Commission after a public hearing is held in the same manner as any new PRD application as outlined in Sec. 7.05.01.” In addition, a revocation stipulation was added, stating that if a preliminary plan expires, the PRD shall revert to the previous zoning district.

Mr. Anderson reported that he and Ms. Scorso have been involved in the Downtown Architectural Guidelines update along with Mr. Kidd. The guidelines are close to being ready for preliminary review with the Commission, hopefully at the next meeting.

Ms. Scorso expressed that the group is comprised of many different stakeholders. She noted that they have walked Main Street to get a first-hand view and ideas, specifically blending historical and modern.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 20, 2019 – Business Meeting
MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes of the business meeting of February 20, 2019. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS


2. KIMLAR, LLC – PRD Zone Change and Combined Preliminary and Detailed Plan of Development (2019-011); Resubdivision (2019-012); Special Exception Modification (2019-013); Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-014) – For a PRD zone change, 2-lot resubdivision, and construction of 32 residential units at 699 and 719 Middle Turnpike East.
3. **SANRICO ASSOCIATES, LLC** – Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-015); Special Exception (2019-016); Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-017) – For construction of 43 small business rental units in 3 buildings at 58 Sanrico Drive.


5. **FUSS & O’NEILL, INC.** – Historic Zone Site Plan Modification (2019-024) – To replace the windows using a product that is identical in style at 160 Hartford Road (a.k.a. 158 Hartford Road).

6. **CHANEL VERASTEGUI** – Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-025) – For an in-ground swimming pool in the rear yard within the 100’ upland review area at 35 Steele Farm Drive.


The Chairman closed the public hearing at 9:00 P.M.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

_________________________________________  Eric Prause, Chairman

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