TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

May 6, 2019
7:00 P.M.
Lincoln Center Hearing Room
494 Main Street

AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. 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)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 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.
   - Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2019-015)
   - Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-015)
   - Special Exception (2019-016)
   - Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-017)

2. HAIR BY JEICOBY SALON SPA – 789 Main Street
   - Referral to the Planning & Zoning Commission per Art. II, Sec. 15.04.02 (2019-048)

3. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS
   - Administrative Approvals:
     - Jyoti Patel – Lot Line Revision (2019-028) – 428 and 400 Tolland Turnpike

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   - April 17, 2019 – Business Meeting

5. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS
TOWN OF MANCHESTER
LEGAL NOTICE

The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on May 6, 2019 at 7:00 P.M. in the Lincoln Center Hearing Room, 494 Main Street, Manchester, Connecticut to hear and consider the following petitions:

**KIMLAR, LLC** – PRD Zone Change and Combined Preliminary and Detailed Plan of Development (2019-011); Resubdivision (2019-012) – 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.

**SANRICO ASSOCIATES, LLC** – Special Exception (2019-016) – 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, Industrial zone.

At this hearing interested persons may be heard and written communications received. A copy of the proposed zoning district change may be reviewed in the Town Clerk’s office, 41 Center Street, during regular business hours, 8:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, or in the Planning Department, 494 Main Street, during regular business hours, 8:30 – 4:30, 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 Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner / Wetlands Agent David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner / Wetlands Agent
DATE: May 2, 2019
RE: Sanrico Associates, LLC – 58 Sanrico Drive
Inland Wetlands Permit and Determination of Significance (2019-015)
Special Exception (2019-016)
Erosion Control Plan (2019-017)

Introduction

The applicant is proposing to construct 43 contractor bays in three (3) buildings on the 5.2 acre site in the Industrial zone. The parcel is the last undeveloped pad remaining on Sanrico Drive. Proposed site improvements include a driveway for two-way traffic in a loop around the site, installation of a significant retaining wall, a stormwater basin and underground utilities.

An unnamed brook runs along the westerly property line, flowing from south to north before leaving the site in a culvert under Sanrico Drive. An inland wetlands permit is required for activity proposed in the regulated area. The applicant is also requesting approval of a Special Exception permit in accordance with Article II, Section 16.15.02 (a) and (b) for a use that includes development on a site which is four acres or larger in size and for a use that requires automobile parking spaces in excess of 60 spaces. Finally, the applicant is seeking certification of an erosion and sedimentation control plan.

Project Description

The proposed development of the subject property will be the construction of 43 small business rental units in three (3) separate buildings, with a total gross floor area of 43,000 square feet. The applicant anticipates that the primary market for the proposed rental units will be for the small business building and maintenance trades and skilled craftspersons, such as electricians, plumbers, carpenters, home improvement contractors, roofers, painters, woodworkers, handymen/women, graphic artists, event stagers and the like, who use the units as a base of operations for an office, storage of materials and supplies used in their trade or business, assembly and fabrication of parts, materials and products used or produced in their business, and parking of motor vehicles and utility trailers used in the trade or business in which they are engaged.

Each of the proposed units will contain 1,000 square feet gross floor area, and will have an overhead door and two external parking spaces. The construction of the proposed buildings
containing the rental units will be modular, so that each unit could be rented individually for the smallest business operation, or two or more contiguous units could be rented by one entity for a larger business operation.

The proposal includes substantial earthwork around the perimeter of the buildable pad. The Hop River Linear Trail State Park is a rail trail located immediately to the east of the proposed development site and approximately 30 feet higher in elevation than the proposed floor grade of the rental units. This is not a unique condition for developed sites in this industrial park adjacent to the former railroad bed. The applicant is proposing to construct a maximum 12-foot high retaining wall and regrade the steep slope along this property boundary. A 6-foot high chain link fence is proposed on top of the retaining wall. The applicant is proposing to stabilize the earthen slope above the retaining wall with an erosion control blanket and grass.

Traffic Impact

Sanrico Drive, a Town-owned loop road providing access and egress to properties within the industrial park, connects to Parker Street at two locations on the west side of the industrial park. Parker Street is classified as a “minor arterial” between its intersections with Tolland Turnpike and Colonial Road.

The traffic impact of the proposed development will depend on how the proposed rental units will be used and occupied once the site is fully developed. The applicant’s engineer, Mr. Raymond Nelson, states in the Traffic Impact Statement provided with the application that “the development of the subject property as now proposed and the additional traffic movements which will occur as a result of the proposed development are anticipated to have a minor impact on traffic use, volume and patterns on the local and State roads in the vicinity which will be used as access to and egress from the subject project site.”

Utility Impact

Sanrico Drive has existing infrastructure including a 16-inch diameter water main, a 10-inch diameter sanitary sewer main, a 6-inch diameter natural gas main, and electric and telecommunications services along the frontage of the subject property, all of which infrastructure is expected to adequately provide for the needs of the proposed development project. Each rental unit, whether singular or a multiple of modules, would have bathroom facilities consisting of sinks and toilets; no showers are expected to be included. Mr. Nelson states in the Utility Impact Statement that “the proposed work on the subject property is expected to have a minimal impact on the established public water supply, sanitary sewer, natural gas, electric supply, telecommunications, storm drainage and other public utility systems in the immediate surrounding area.”

Stormwater Management

The stormwater runoff from nearly the entire proposed development area will be collected, conveyed and discharged to the proposed stormwater retention/infiltration basin. Only runoff from a 1,160 square foot section of the proposed driveway entrance and grass shoulder entering
the subject property from Sanrico Drive will flow toward and discharge to Sanrico Drive, where it will be collected and conveyed by the existing storm drainage system in the road. The drainage from all roofs will be connected to the proposed on-site storm drainage facilities.

The southern end of the subject property will remain undeveloped and undisturbed, and the runoff from this area and hydraulically connected abutting property, totaling 1.22 acres, will continue to flow overland directly to the watercourse.

The proposed storm drainage facilities for this project will include catch basins, yard drains, manholes, piping and grass swales. The retention/infiltration basin will be a linear grass-lined basin, which will be constructed uphill of the wetlands boundary associated with the watercourse along the western border of the subject property, and just downslope of other proposed development on the site. Discharge from the basin will be by way of an outlet control structure in the basin, through an outlet culvert to the previously described watercourse. An emergency riprap spillway will also be constructed for the basin, with overflow to the watercourse.

**Inland Wetlands Permit**

The proposed activity will occur in the regulated wetlands and upland review areas located on the site. The plans do not indicate that there will be a direct physical impact to the watercourse. The proposed impacts to the wetlands are permanent and involve a rip-rap fill slope on the west side of the site entrance and a spillway and outlet structure associated with the proposed retention/infiltration basin. The activity within the upland review area will be permanent impacts associated with site grading, paving, and the physical structures of the buildings and associated utilities.

The applicant states that the proposed activity will impact approximately 0.027 acres of wetlands and approximately 1.59 acres within the upland review area. As described in the wetland report, the unnamed watercourse is a perennial stream which enters the property from the south through a stone culvert under a former railroad bed, flows in a northerly direction, and exits the property to the north through a culvert under Sanrico Drive. The forested wetland system, which flanks the stream, exhibits a wide range of functions and values. The principal functions and values, as determined by the wetland scientist, include Groundwater Recharge / Discharge, Floodflow Alteration, Shoreline Stabilization, Sediment / Toxicant Retention, Nutrient Removal / Transformation, Production Export, and Wildlife and Aquatic Diversity / Abundance. The report also indicates that the values associated with the wetland in relation to the existing trail include Recreation and Uniqueness / Heritage.

**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**

Town staff has reviewed the proposed plan for compliance with the requirements of the Town of Manchester regulations and the Connecticut Guidelines for Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control dated 2002, as amended. The plan (see Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan attached) includes an anti-tracking pad construction entrance, hay bale and silt fencing down-gradient of disturbed areas, catch basin protection and temporary soil stockpile areas. As noted, an erosion control blanket will be applied to the steep slope above the proposed retaining wall and to regraded slopes at the southern portion of the site. An erosion and sediment control sequence and inspection checklist is included on the plans.

**Staff Review**

Town staff has reviewed the plans and documents submitted with the application and provided the applicant with comments. Revised plans were under review at the time this report was drafted and the status of that review will be provided to the Commission at the meeting.
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 appropriate sources available.
Katie Williford

From: Gary Anderson  
Sent: Thursday, May 2, 2019 3:25 PM  
To: Katie Williford; erprause@hotmail.com; Eric Prause  
Cc: Jim Davis; Matthew Bordeaux  
Subject: RE: 789 Main St - Signs and Facade (Hair by Jeicoby)

Katie,
As per section 15.04.02 of the regulations, the Chairman requests that this itm be referred to the full Commission. Please add to Monday’s agenda.
Thanks,
Gary

From: Katie Williford  
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 9:09 AM  
To: Gary Anderson; erprause@hotmail.com; Eric Prause  
Subject: 789 Main St - Signs and Facade (Hair by Jeicoby)

Good morning Gary and Eric,

Attached are two submission for your review, one for signage and one for the façade, for 789 Main Street (Hair by Jeicoby).

Thank you,

Katie Williford  
Administrative Secretary  
Town of Manchester Planning Department  
494 Main Street  
Manchester, CT 06045-0191  
Phone: 860-647-3048  
Fax: 860-647-3144  
E-mail: kwilliford@manchesterct.gov
HAIR BY JEICOBY
SALON SPA

PLEASE REFER TO FINAL 2 SHEETS FOR DESIGN

FINAL DESIGN
ALL WILL BE 4"x4" BLOCKS & WOOD
TO: Planning & Zoning Commission
FROM: Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner
DATE: May 2, 2019
RE: Lot Line Revision

Pursuant to the Planning and Zoning Commission’s policy statement regarding lot line revisions adopted May 18, 1992, we are notifying the Commission that staff has approved a lot line revision at the following location: 428 and 400 Tolland Turnpike.

The plan was submitted for this revision and reviewed by town staff prior to the approval. A copy of the plan is attached for your reference. The applicant has been asked to submit copies of the plans for stamping, and will be advised to file the stamped mylar of the lot line revision with the Town Clerk for recording at their earliest convenience.

mb/kw

Attach.

cc: File 2019-028
MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
APRIL 17, 2019

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Eric Prause, Chairman
Patrick Kennedy, Vice Chairman

Alternates: Julian Stoppelman
Teresa Ike

Absent: Michael Stebe, Secretary
Timothy Bergin
Jessica Scorso
Charles Sabia

Also Present: Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner
David Laiuppa, Environmental Planner/Wetlands Agent
Katie Williford, Administrative Secretary

Time Convened: 7:04 p.m.

Mr. Prause announced that there were no items scheduled for public hearing at this meeting. He noted that the application submitted by Kimlar, LLC is scheduled for May 6, 2019, and public hearing notices would be sent to the abutting property owners.

OLD BUSINESS:

WOODBRIDGE MILLS, LLC – Special Exception Detailed Site Development Plan for multifamily historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing at 501 Middle Turnpike East, Special Design Commercial Business zone. – Special Exception Detailed Site Development Plan (2019-007)

Mr. Prause stated that the Commission made a decision on the preliminary plan and wetlands permit at the last meeting, and requested information about the detailed plan.

Mr. Steve Kowalski, owner of Woodbridge Mills, from Hebron, Connecticut, introduced himself and provided samples of the proposed colors.

Mr. Kowalski said the area on the left that is brick would stay the same, along with the foundation that is brick colored. The main building would be Rockwood Red, similar to a brick color and to the original color of the main building. The tower would be Colonial Revival Stone, which is a khaki tan. Throughout the building, the trim would be dark Hartford Green.

Mr. Kowalski displayed an example of the proposed garage doors, which are carriage style but are overhead doors. They would be metal doors with a wood look, he said.
Mr. Arthur Hall, an architect working in Vernon and Manchester, said the overhead garage doors are steel with an insulated core and patterning to make them look like wood.

Mr. Hall said they have spoken with Green Mountain Window Company, which has done numerous historic building restorations. The windows are insulated glass windows and are also wood, so they are modern windows but are visually a replica of the original historic windows. They would be painted green, he said.

Mr. Hall discussed a staff comment the applicant received from Fire Inspector James Jennings regarding an outdoor staircase at the back of the building. He said he revised the drawings as a result. He displayed the floor plan, indicated the original location of the staircase, and said it has been eliminated and a new staircase has been added inside the building.

Mr. Hall said the clapboards are to be 4” exposure cedar clapboards and the corner boards are to be cedar also.

Mr. Prause asked whether the latest drawings showing the internal staircase have gone through staff review with Engineering. Mr. Bordeaux said they have not, but because the note came from the Fire Inspector, that is one of the modifications included in the Commission’s draft motions. The modifications described in the draft motion would address Mr. Jenning’s comments, and this kind of detail would ultimately be reviewed in the building permit process, Mr. Bordeaux explained.

In response to a question from Mr. Stoppelman, Mr. Hall stated that the trim around the garage doors would be a cedar trim painted a dark green.

Mr. Bordeaux discussed the two outstanding sets of staff comments. The first was from the Engineering Division, relating to information that has yet to be discovered on site about the capacity of existing infrastructure for water and sewer, which will require subsurface investigation. The Water and Sewer Department is willing to work with the applicant, and supports approval with a modification. The second comment is from the Fire Inspector and was substantially addressed by the applicant, Mr. Bordeaux said. Those are comments that Planning receives because they want the Fire Inspection Division to be involved as early as possible, but they are mostly comments that will be addressed in the building permit application process.

Mr. Bordeaux also noted that the applicant will require two waivers. One is to allow parking spaces 15 feet from the principal building because some of the spaces to the northeast are adjacent to the building due to the existing site layout. The second waiver is of the requirement for a landscaped border not less than 8 feet in width on the east boundary, which is shared with a commercial facility. The two parking lots abut with a rail between the two, but there is no landscaping provided, and that is an existing feature of the site. In response to a question from Mr. Prause, Mr. Bordeaux said it is like a guardrail that transitions to chain link fence. Mr. Kowalski said it's like a guardrail bumper that separates the property and then there is a fence in the back.

Mr. Prause asked what is on the abutting property to the east and if there are abutting parking spaces on that side; Mr. Kowalski said it is a driveway.

**Special Exception Detailed Site Development Plan (2019-007)**

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the special exception detailed plan for
multifamily historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing at 501 Middle Turnpike East, with the waivers of:

1. Article II, Section 9.14.03 (d) (8) (B) (1) to allow vehicle parking within the required 15-foot distance between parked vehicles and the principal building, and
2. Article II, Section 9.14.03 (d) (13) (D) (1) to waive the requirement to provide a landscaped border not less than eight feet in width on the east property boundary;

and with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. John DiBiasi, PE, Assistant Town Engineer, dated March 26, 2019; and

Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion.

Ms. Ike said she appreciated that the applicant addressed the concerns from last meeting and she was in favor of the proposal.

Mr. Kennedy stated that he was not at the last meeting but had familiarized himself with the record. He thought most of the material pertaining to this specific application was presented at this meeting. Mr. Prause said he was also not at the last meeting but had read the minutes and was aware of what was discussed. Most of the outstanding issues had to do with the compatibility with the neighborhood as far as the design criteria, he noted. The location is suitable, the structure will be suitable after some work, it has enough parking and good streets for the use, it has been reviewed for emergency access and public utilities, and there are no environmental concerns, Mr. Prause stated. He said it seems that the applicant has tried to preserve as much as possible. He realized that parts of the building had to be removed for feasibility and to add parking that is required, but he appreciated that the applicant is able to preserve as many features as possible. More senior housing is a use that is needed in town, he added.

Mr. Stoppelman said that this building has been an issue since he joined the Commission a number of years ago, and this seems like the best use of the property. He thanked the applicant for making the effort.

All members voted in favor of the motion.

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

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**1852 CT OPCO LLC – Design Overlay zone review for a new entrance and pay terminals at 672 Hartford Road. – Design Overlay Review (2019-035)**

Mr. Steve Sause, Director of Operations for Cloud 10 Car Wash at 672 Hartford Road, presented the application to modify the area where vehicles stack up prior to entering the car wash process. Customers currently pay when they enter the building, he said. Installing pay stations 65 feet away from the entrance to the conveyor will allow consumers to control the purchase process
and allow employees to focus on directing the customer. The proposal is to have two islands, break up the lane of traffic coming in, and get vehicles off of Hartford Road faster. Driving up, there would be two lanes with a 36 inch island between the two, then the cars would merge together.

Mr. Prause noted that the Commission has a picture of what the pay stations look like and they are very colorful. Mr. Sause described the canopies and said the colors are better than the colors there a year ago.

Mr. Prause asked if the new stations are noticeable from the road, or if they are more visible once you get onto the property. Mr. Sause said they are more on the property. The canopies will be slanted up out towards the road on a slight incline and the blue will be facing the highway side of the property. There is a height bar that is a requirement for safety, which is a white bar with a yellow sticker. There will be a purple or blue bollard column with white reflective tape to stay within the color palette. The pay stations will be a grey plastic vinyl enclosure about the size of a drive-up ATM. Mr. Sause said the machines will power off at closing and will not be illuminated.

Mr. Prause asked how they will balance the need for the carwash to attract customers with the goal of not standing out too much from the neighbors. Mr. Sause said the Dairy Queen stands out with loud red and white colors. When the applicant purchased their building, it was very bright, red and yellow with a checkerboard stripe around it. As trends have changed in the industry, colors have changed. McDonalds and Dunkin Donuts have toned down their colors. Mr. Sause said they hired a marketing firm to help choose the colors, and were advised not to use the colors that were there previously.

Mr. Bordeaux said there were no outstanding comments from staff.

### Design Overlay Review (2019-035)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the design overlay review for a new entrance and pay terminals at 672 Hartford Road. Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

### DIANA MANNER – For vegetation clearing for landscaping at 40 Fir Grove Road.

Diana Manner, 40 Fir Grove Road, presented her application. She explained that she and her husband moved in 11 years ago and planned to clear another area in the yard, but never got to it. After her husband passed away in fall, she decided to do the project because they had planned to. Ms. Manner said she was not aware she needed the Commission’s approval first.

Ms. Manner said she discussed the work she had done with David Laiuppa, the Wetlands Agent. She indicated on a map where she had removed underbrush and smaller invasive bushes; she did not touch larger trees. The work does not interfere with the town drainage easement area, she said. She requested permission to continue the work, and said she would work with Mr. Laiuppa to choose new shrubbery and trees to plant.

Mr. Prause asked about erosion controls. Ms. Manner replied there is silt fence with straw against it.
Mr. Prause asked if Ms. Manner planned to reseed the area. She confirmed that she did. She and Mr. Laiuppa have discussed what plants to use and will continue working together to determine good options.

Mr. Laiuppa said Ms. Manner has been working well with him to accommodate the requirements for the permit application and to install erosion controls quickly. He said he would work with her to come up with a planting plan suitable for bank stabilization and restoring the functions and values that existed prior to vegetative clearing. He noted that there is a stockpile of woody debris from clearing the site. Ms. Manner had told him there was a stockpile in that location when the house was built and she had asked the young man doing the clearing to put the material on top of that. Mr. Laiuppa said there is a suggested condition of approval to remove the woody material that has been placed there for this project.

Mr. Prause asked if the planting plan would just include the gray area that is delineated wetlands. Mr. Laiuppa said he planned to discuss what Ms. Manner envisioned for the larger lot and then to work on the gray area and possibly a transition into the upland area as well, so it is not an abrupt change from grass to shrubs.

In response to a question from Mr. Stoppelman, Mr. Laiuppa said the area is not mapped as a flood plain and every indication is that there has not been flooding in that area. Ms. Manner added that the brook is usually small; when it rains a lot it rises, but it has never come near the top edges of the bank.

Mr. Prause asked if there are still undisturbed wetlands to the east so Mr. Laiuppa could see what the functions of those are. Mr. Laiuppa replied that he could get a good sense of what was there on the immediate north of the brook so they could incorporate something that would work. Some dogwoods would probably be appropriate, he said.

Mr. Laiuppa noted that the map shows the wetland line crossing the stream. The wetland delineation was done for the original development in 2004 and Mr. Laiuppa drew on the aerial interpretation from 2016. He said he suspected that the stream wanders, so it may have been further south in 2004 when the original delineation took place.

**Inland Wetlands Permit – Determination of Significance (2019-041)**

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to find the proposed activity at the above referenced location as shown on the inland wetlands permit application 2019-041 will not have a significant impact on the wetlands and therefore will not require a public hearing. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.

**Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-041)**

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the inland wetlands permit for vegetation clearing for landscaping at 40 Fir Grove Road, with the conditions:

1. That the applicant prepares a planting plan to stabilize the streambank to be installed prior to June 15, 2019. Such planting plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Town Wetlands Agent.
2. That the woody debris associated with this project is removed from the regulated area.
Ms. Ike seconded the motion.

Mr. Prause asked if the woody debris is right next to cul-de-sac. Ms. Manner said yes, material was added into that pile that already existed. She asked for clarification of which area the debris would need to be removed from. Mr. Laiuppa said the condition states "within the regulated area," so that would be the blue line on the map. He added the caveat that if, while in the field, he recognizes that the blue line is not quite right, he may ask her to go a little further. As it stands now, the regulated area is the area within the wetland, not the entire upland review area, Mr. Laiuppa said. Ms. Manner said she would be happy to move it sideways so it is definitely not crossing over that line and is still kept out of the drainage easement area.

Mr. Prause asked about the concern about being so close to that drainage easement. Mr. Laiuppa said the drainage easement covers that larger area but the actual drainage area is further to the east of the stock pile area. Adjustments could be made in the field to make sure the Town easement area is not impeded, he said.

All members voted in favor of the motion.

The reason for the approval is that the proposed activity does not disturb the principal functions or values of the wetland system by significant impact or major effect.

The approval is valid for 5 years. The work in the regulated area must be completed within one year of commencement.

JOSE CORREIA - Pre-application review to discuss a Planned Residential Development at 55 Parker Street.

Gerry Hardisty from Civil Engineering Services presented the proposal on behalf of Jose Correia. The proposal is for a Planned Residential Development (PRD) on Parker Street. The area is in a residential zone that requires 100 feet of frontage for each lot, but lots of that size would be out of character because the adjoining lots in the neighborhood have 50 feet of frontage, Mr. Hardisty said. The parcel is an open field with two trees, and Mr. Correia would like to develop it, but the current regulations require the lots to be too large for economic development. He would like to do a PRD so the lots can be closer in size to the other lots in the neighborhood, which would be more affordable. The development would require existing sanitary sewer to be extended about 200 feet, but everything else is there, Mr. Hardisty said.

Mr. Hardisty said there are no sidewalks on Parker Street but there are sidewalks on both sides of Green Hill Street. He asked how the proposal would fit in with the Town’s Sidewalk Plan.

In response to questions from Mr. Stoppelman, Mr. Hardisty confirmed that both the subject property and the surrounding lots are zoned Residence A. The surrounding lots are probably 50 feet wide because they are pre-existing, he said.

Mr. Prause said the recently approved Sidewalk Plan had no change to Parker Street.

In response to questions from Mr. Prause, Mr. Hardisty said the existing lots he was comparing to were 50 feet wide and the proposal is for 75-foot-wide lots. The surrounding area is primarily small Cape-style houses, he said, and he believed the intent is to have single-family homes in these four lots, not condos or duplexes. He had suggested to Mr. Correia that he include in-law
apartments, because they are becoming desirable. Mr. Hardisty said he could not answer for Mr. Correia on that question.

Mr. Prause said nothing about the proposal stood out to him as concerning. He asked if Mr. Hardisty had questions about possible concerns. Mr. Hardisty said he thought the proposal is very compatible, so the only question he really had was about sidewalks.

Mr. Bordeaux said the Sidewalk Plan does not call for sidewalks there. He said he would need to ask the Zoning Enforcement Officer for his interpretation of the PRD zone requirements. The regulations state that sidewalks shall be provided on at least one side of all roadways and private driveways, Mr. Bordeaux said, but he believed that would be if new roadways were constructed, so for existing roads they would defer to the Sidewalk Plan.

Mr. Stoppelman noted that this is a pre-application review and the Commission is not making any promises; they would have to understand what is involved. Currently, the lot does not create any value, he said.

Regarding sidewalks, Mr. Kennedy said if a sidewalk is required and if the Commission can waive that requirement, his inclination would be to waive it because it would be one sidewalk that is not connected to anything and does not make practical sense. He said his only reservation about the proposal is that he is a little leery about PRDs in general after the situation a few months ago. The proposal does not strike him as a problem, Mr. Kennedy said.

Mr. Bordeaux said he did not have the opportunity to review the proposal with Engineering staff regarding the capacity of the utilities. He said the lots in that neighborhood are undersized per the zoning requirements, so in that sense the proposal would be relatively compatible. The application would require a zone change, which requires a public hearing, so there is an opportunity for the public to provide input, Mr. Bordeaux said.

Regarding the zone change, Mr. Prause said one thing to think about is making sure the proposed development will not diminish property values, but in this case the proposal is to put in houses that are of more value than the ones that are on the smaller lots in the same area. If the square footage is comparable or greater than the houses that are there, Mr. Prause said he would not be concerned, but he would be concerned if they tried to make smaller homes. He said his experience with PRDs is more with larger scale development, for which things such as sidewalks naturally apply. For a smaller PRD like this, he suggested checking with staff that they are all interpreting things the same way, as some things may be burdensome for a small lot like this.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:

Mr. Bordeaux said he had no reports to provide, but he reminded the Commission that there will be a workshop soon regarding parking in front yards. Research has been done into this issue and the Board of Directors is seeking the Commission’s input. He suggested the second meeting in May might be an appropriate time.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

April 1, 2019 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting
MOTION: Ms. Ike moved to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Stoppelman seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.
RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:


2. **KENNETH BOYNTON** – Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-036); Subdivision (2019-037); Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-038) – Proposed 44-lot residential cluster subdivision served by sanitary sewer and public water at 426 Wetherell Street.

3. **DIANA MANNER** – Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-041) – For vegetation clearing for landscaping at 40 Fir Grove Road.

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:24 p.m.

I certify these minutes were adopted on the following date:

__________________________________________________________________________

Date ___________________________ Eric Prause, Chairman

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