TOWN OF MANCHESTER
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

March 18, 2019
7:00 P.M.
Lincoln Center Hearing Room
494 Main Street

AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING:

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


NEW BUSINESS:

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

2. 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)

   • 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)

4. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   • February 20, 2019 – Business Meeting

6. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS
TOWN OF MANCHESTER
LEGAL NOTICE

The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on March 18, 2019, at 7:00 P.M. in the Lincoln Center Hearing Room, 494 Main Street, Manchester, Connecticut to hear and consider the following petitions:


PROPOSED SIDEWALK AND CURB PLAN 2019-2024 – Proposed amendments to the Town Sidewalk and Curb Plan to include updates and recommendations of priority locations for the extension of sidewalks, and proposed amendments to the Sidewalk Location Map to reflect completed projects and other changes pursuant to Article IV Section 279-31 of the Code of the Town of Manchester, Connecticut.

At this hearing interested persons may be heard and written communications received. A copy of the proposed amendments 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
TO: Planning and Zoning Commission
FROM: Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner
DATE: March 13, 2019

Introduction

The applicant is requesting approval of a resubdivision of 21 Adams Street South to create a new parcel for the existing residential structure at 285 West Center Street. The property is located in the Residence A zone, on the northeast corner of West Center Street and Adams Street South. The existing 5.72-acre parcel is the site of the Church of the Assumption, which was recently combined into the St. James Parish. The proposed parcel (Parcel #2) will be 0.58 acres in area and is compliant with applicable area, height and bulk standards of the Residence A zone. The remaining parish parcel (Parcel #1) will be 5.14 acres.

Subdivision Requirements

The applicant states that no new construction or alteration of existing structures is proposed or necessary to create the proposed lot. There is an existing public sidewalk along West Center Street. Access to the lot is provided by an existing driveway and the lot has an existing parking area and garage. The house is serviced by public water and sanitary sewer from West Center Street.

The applicant has provided a property survey depicting existing and proposed conditions in accordance with the Subdivision Regulations. As there are no proposed improvements, no additional information was required.

In accordance with Section 4.07 of the Subdivision Regulations, the Open Space requirement applies to this proposal because it is a residential subdivision of a tract of land greater than five (5) acres. Staff has reviewed this proposal and does not recommend the dedication of physical land from this subdivision for the purpose of developed or undeveloped public open space. Further, due to the atypical nature of the proposed resubdivision of this parcel for a single, existing residential lot, staff recommends that the Commission consider the provisions of Section 4.07.06 (a) which states, “If agreed to by the applicant and the Commission, the applicant can pay the fee of $2,000 per lot to satisfy the open space requirement.” The applicant has expressed their desire to utilize this provision of the regulations. Otherwise, the regulations outlining the process for the appraisal and payment of a fee in lieu of open space would apply.
Staff Review

Staff has reviewed the resubdivision plan and recommends approval with modifications to address a couple minor outstanding comments that could be addressed on final plans. Most notably, the plans must be tied to Town of Manchester Control coordinates.
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Date: 3/13/2019
Author:
TO: Planning and Zoning Commission
FROM: Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner
DATE: March 14, 2019
RE: Review of Proposed Revision to Sidewalk and Curb Plan

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.

The 2014 Plan included several clarifying edits and updates. Therefore, the proposed Plan revisions 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 is the proposed “critical path extensions” provided as it appears 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
- Birch Mountain Road

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.

As required under Article IV Section 279-31 of the Code of the Town of Manchester, we will send the proposed Plan to the Board of Directors for their review and comment prior to adoption of the update.

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>Roadway Classification</th>
<th>Sidewalk Width (feet)</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Bituminous or Alternative</th>
<th>One Side</th>
<th>Two Sides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Scenic Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></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:³

- Broad Street from Middle Turnpike West to Hilliard Street
- **Oakland Street**
- Tolland Turnpike
- **North Main Street**
  - Keeny 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
  - **Birch Mountain Road**

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.

³ Rev. 1/21/09
Rev.7/6/09
Rev.02/13/14
Likewise, other streets may see their sidewalks extended if funding opportunities arise, or if 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 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 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
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• 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\(^6\).

\(^6\) Rev. 7/06/09
TO: Planning and Zoning Commission
FROM: Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner
DATE: March 14, 2019
RE: Hartford CDC, LLC – 61 Chapel Road
Erosion and Sedimentation Control (2019-008)
Special Exception Modification (2019-009)

Introduction

The applicant is proposing to construct a 199,466 sf building addition to the existing Raymour & Flanigan Furniture distribution warehouse. Associated improvements will include a new materials processing facility. The site is currently improved with a 300,650 sf building.

The applicant has stated that the expansion will be to improve Raymour & Flanigan’s furniture storage and delivery logistics. The applicant is requesting approval of a special exception modification in accordance with Art. II, Section 16.15.02 (a) and (b) and certification of an erosion and sedimentation control plan for site improvements that will require disturbance of greater than 0.5 acres.

Existing Conditions

The existing Raymour & Flanigan Furniture distribution warehouse is located at 61 Chapel Road on the northeast corner of the intersection with Tolland Turnpike in the Industrial zone. An existing industrial facility (Hartford Distributors, Inc.) is located to the north and the JCPenney Warehouse and Distribution Center is located to the east. A wetlands system, through which is an Eversource right-of-way, is located to the immediate east of the subject site.

The facility is located on approximately 29.55 acres and according to Town records was built in 1981. Employee parking is located at the southwest corner of the site and the loading docks line the south side of the building. An access drive exists around the entire perimeter of the building.

Proposed Improvements

As shown on the Site Plan (attached), the proposed one-story, 199,466 sf building addition will be constructed to the north side of the existing building. The perimeter access drive will be extended around the addition and 16 new loading docks are proposed to the northwest corner of the addition.
In response to comments from Town and Eighth Utilities District staff, the existing perimeter drive will be enhanced to a 26’ width and a 20’ wide asphalt emergency access will be installed in the northwest corner of the site to provide a secondary means of access for such a large facility. This proposed access point will be gated and a proposed ‘Emergency Access Only’ sign will be installed.

An 8,400 sf materials processing facility is proposed south of the existing building in an area that is currently paved. The function of the proposed materials processing facility is to prepare recyclable material used in the packaging of furniture goods for sale on the secondary market. The existing paved area to the east of the proposed materials processing facility will be restored to grass.

Stormwater runoff collected from the building addition and paved areas associated with the proposed addition will be conveyed to a subsurface infiltration chamber drainage system to be located to the north of the addition, substantially under the proposed loading area. 290 individual chambers, 8’ wide/long and 2.5’ high will be installed under a minimum one foot of cover and wrapped in geotextile fabric. The system will have a stone base to allow water to infiltrate into the ground.

A proposed 6-foot high landscaped berm is proposed between the building perimeter drive and Chapel Road. The berm will be constructed of displaced material stabilized with grassed turf.

**Special Exception Modification**

The applicant is requesting a special exception modification approval in accordance with Article II, Section 16.15.02 (a) and (b) for a use that includes development on a site that is four (4) acres or larger in size and for a use that requires automobile parking spaces in excess of 60. The Commission should determine compliance with the provisions of Article IV, Section 20 in their consideration of this application.

**Erosion and Sedimentation Control**

The applicant is requesting approval of an erosion and sedimentation control plan in accordance with Article I, Section 3.04.02 of the zoning regulations. The proposed plan states that “Erosion control measures shall be in accordance with the 2002 Connecticut Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Controls.” The plan includes installation of silt fence around the perimeter of the disturbed areas. Construction entrance anti-tracking pads are depicted at the southerly extent of the proposed building perimeter driveway and at the project limits where construction vehicles enter/exit the proposed Materials Processing Facility. The proposed berm location will serve as a temporary stockpile area. Erosion control matting is proposed to stabilize the slopes at the northerly extent of the site along the property line. Finally, silt sacks are proposed to be installed in the catch basins to capture sediment during construction.
**Staff Review**

Town staff has reviewed the plans and documents submitted with the application and provided the applicant with comments. Revised plans were submitted and are currently under review. A report on the status of staff review will be provided at the meeting.
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1 inch = 417 feet
Date: 3/14/2019
Author:
MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING
HELD BY THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 20, 2019

ROLL CALL:

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

Alternate Member Sitting: Teresa Ike

Alternates: Julian Stoppelman
Charles Sabia

Absent: Michael Stebe, Secretary

Also Present: Matthew Bordeaux, Senior Planner
Gary Anderson, Director of Planning & Economic Development
Katie Williford, Administrative Secretary

Time Convened: 7:03 P.M.

NEW BUSINESS:

HIGHLAND MEETING ROOM, INC. – To relocate the existing parking, create a one-way internal traffic flow, and expand a portion of the existing building at 127 and 133 Highland Street. – Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-121); Special Exception Modification (2018-122)

Mr. James Waskey, Porter Street, Manchester, a member of the congregation, said the applicant came before the Commission in July 2013 for a pre-application review. He described challenges of the site, including poor traffic flow, insufficient parking, minimal indoor gathering or activity space, and signs of wear to the building. The Commission’s recommendation in 2013 to locate the parking to the rear of the structure has been accommodated in this proposal, Mr. Waskey stated. A lot line revision was done between 127 and 133 Highland Street in order to have sufficient space for the parking. There will be a separate entrance and exit. An addition on the front of the building will give it a facelift as well as adding a new sanctuary area, which will allow the current building to be used as an entryway, foyer, and activity space. He noted that the applicant also needs a waiver of Art. II Sec. 1.00.02(e)(4) to allow a privacy fence in lieu of the required 8 ft. landscaped buffer.

Mr. Mark Reynolds, Professional Engineer, described the neighboring properties and showed the existing layout of the site. He explained that the lot lines have been modified to reduce the size of 127 Highland Street and increase 133 Highland Street. The site currently has parking in front with no traffic flow, he said, and the proposal is to have one-way flow. The reason for proposing stockade fence in lieu of the 8 ft. landscaped buffer is because of space limitations on the sides of the narrow lot, Mr. Reynolds explained. Regarding drainage, he said everything is designed to
slope from the front toward the rear and the proposal includes a catch basin and oil water separator with an infiltration bed underneath the parking lot. Soils on the site are very favorable so, with a proper oil water separator, drainage requirements will be met without any direct runoff to neighbors, Mr. Reynolds said. The existing utilities are water and sewer, which will not change; the only proposed change is the addition of a gas line along the right side of the building. Regarding erosion and sedimentation control, he stated that the plan is to completely encircle the property with silt fence and provide silt fence hay bale protection around the catch basin inlet. He displayed a rendering and described the proposed landscaping. The revised entrance includes a handicap ramp up to the sidewalk, and the end of the existing building will be boxed out into a covered porch area, Mr. Reynolds said. The lot line revision was approved and filed on the land records, he said. Comments from staff on the site plan have come down to adding notes to the plan; no further substantive changes are needed.

In response to questions from Mr. Prause, Mr. Reynolds stated that the existing stockade fence on the east side of the property is owned by the church, and the intent is to maintain it and extend it slightly in both directions.

In response to questions from Mr. Prause regarding the exit on the east side of the building, Mr. Reynolds said it is 16 ft. wide, which is the minimum standard for a one-way drive. The other side is wider. Mr. Prause asked if there is a sight line issue for cars driving down that exit out to the front of the building, and whether there is any expected walkway or sidewalk there. Mr. Reynolds said there are no doors along that side of building and there is no pedestrian way there.

In response to a question from Mr. Prause, Mr. Reynolds confirmed the proposed parking in the rear is currently a grassed area. Mr. Prause asked if the catch basins in back will go to the infiltration system for treatment and then discharge into the soil, rather than into a discharge pipe. Mr. Reynolds confirmed that was correct. There is no formal drainage in this section of the street, and currently there is no defined path for drainage from this area. The soils are so well drained that water does not sit there for long, he said. He confirmed there will be no impact to the Oak Grove Nature Center area. The parking lot is proposed to be completely curbed and is designed to the 100-year storm event, Mr. Reynolds stated.

Mr. Prause asked if the brick pavers that are currently in the southwest corner of the parking lot serve a function. Mr. Waskey stated he was unsure how the pavers got there, but they are not part of the proposal and will be removed.

Mr. Bordeaux said there are four sets of outstanding staff comments from himself, Engineering, the Zoning Enforcement Officer, and the Environmental Planner. Most of the comments are minor and technical, he said.

Regarding the special exception use, Mr. Bergin asked if the application covers both 127 and 133 Highland Street. Mr. Bordeaux responded that that was the way the application was submitted; the first step was a lot line revision, which included both sites. If the lot line revision map has been filed, the subject activities are specific to 133 Highland Street. Both addresses were listed, in the event that the lot line revision has not been officially filed.

Mr. Bergin noted that the driveway at 127 Highland Street is proposed to move from one side of the house to the other, and asked if that requires any erosion and sedimentation controls. Mr. Bordeaux said no application is required for that activity because it is not related to the subject
special exception. Mr. Reynolds stated that erosion and sedimentation control measures for that driveway installation are included in the site plan.

Special Exception Modification (2018-122)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the special exception modification under Art. II, Sec. 4.02.02 to relocate the existing parking, create a one-way internal traffic flow, and expand a portion of the existing building at 133 Highland Street, and to approve a waiver of the landscaped border pursuant to Article II, Section 1.00.02(e)(4), with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. John DiBiasi, Assistant Town Engineer, dated February 14, 2019; and
2. Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner, dated February 12, 2019; and
3. James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer, dated February 7, 2019; and

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.

Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (2018-121)

**MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to certify the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan. Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Ms. Ike asked whether the modifications that were required for the special exception modification also apply to the erosion and sedimentation control plan. Mr. Bordeaux replied that once staff receives one set of revisions they will be reviewing for both applications, but if the Commission would like to include the modifications in the motion, it would be appropriate.

**AMENDED MOTION:** Mr. Kennedy moved to certify the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:

1. John DiBiasi, Assistant Town Engineer, dated February 14, 2019; and
2. Matthew R. Bordeaux, Senior Planner, dated February 12, 2019; and
3. James Davis, Zoning Enforcement Officer, dated February 7, 2019; and

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

VANLOSE ENTERPRISES, LLC – Special exception modification per Art. II, Sec. 24.02.01(h) to construct a building addition and canopy to the existing automobile dealership building and modify the exterior of the existing building at 80 Oakland Street. – Special Exception Modification (2019-002)

Attorney John LaBelle represented Vanlose Enterprises, the owner of 80 Oakland Street. Mr. Steve Carter, a member of Vanlose Enterprises and operator of Mazda of Manchester, and Eric Peterson, an engineer from Gardner and Peterson, were also present.

Attorney LaBelle said the applicant is seeking approval for construction of a 1,575 sq. ft. building addition and an 854 sq. ft. canopy. The addition is located at the northeast corner of the
existing building and the canopy is attached to the addition and immediately to the west of it. The Commission’s approval of this special exception modification is required because this is an automobile dealership and the use is a special exception use in the General Business zone, Attorney LaBelle said. The existing building totals 10,879 sq. ft. and the proposed addition would bring it to 12,454 sq. ft.

Attorney LaBelle stated that the proposed addition and canopy have been designed to Mazda standards. The addition would be 26 ft. in height and there would be a vehicle display on the second floor of the addition, facing Oakland Street. The building design includes a substantial amount of glass and the colors will be black and grey, he said. Oakland Street is heavily traveled and this design would allow passing drivers to see the display vehicles.

Attorney LaBelle described the zoning of the surrounding properties and said the proposal will be compatible with the surrounding properties and will not alter the character of the neighborhood or adversely affect property values.

Regarding traffic counts, Attorney LaBelle said some enhanced business might occur, estimated at 12-18 vehicle trips per day, with 2-4 of those being new employees. Access from Oakland Street will continue, he said; it is expected that most customers will continue to use that Oakland Street curb cut because customer parking for both new sales and service is located to the south side of the building, and that parking will not change with the building addition. The canopy on the north side of the building is a requirement from Mazda, to let people access the dealership in inclement weather. There would probably be a relatively minor increase in traffic on Edward Street due to people using that canopy, particularly in inclement weather. However, that traffic would only go in Edward Street about 50-75 ft. before reaching the curb cut. There would likely also be a small increase in traffic on Edward Street because of the planned employee parking in the three lots across Edward Street.

Attorney LaBelle said the building addition will not require any additional lighting. The property is currently serviced by water and sewer. Emergency access is sufficient and is off of Oakland Street. Landscaping on the corner of Oakland Street and Edward Street will remain. There have been some changes to the plans as a result of staff comments, he said.

Mr. Eric Peterson, Gardner and Peterson Associates, said the comments from staff were generally minor. The one major difference is that the original plans called for moving the curb cut on Edward Street further to the west, and on the revision it has instead been kept where it is but expanded, to be wide enough for two-way traffic in accordance with Town standards. This was done to keep the curb cut directly across the street from the existing curb cut for the potential future parking lots across Edward Street. Mr. Peterson said all comments have been addressed and the applicant would accept them as conditions of approval.

Attorney LaBelle noted that, although the windows appear shaded in the architectural drawings, they are actually proposed to be clear glass, not tinted.

In response to questions from Mr. Bergin, Mr. Carter said there will be no change in vehicles displayed. The vehicle display goes up to the corner of Oakland Street and Edward Street on the northeast side, and that space will stay the same. What will be lost is the employee parking that runs from east to west. The display isn’t moving, although there will be three additional cars displayed inside the building addition, Mr. Carter said.
In response to questions from Mr. Prause about the proposed removal of a staircase on the corner, Mr. Carter said the staircase is to a basement room that will be eliminated.

Mr. Bordeaux stated that the applicant submitted revised plans just this week. He was not able to reach the Fire Marshal’s Office, but all other staff members were satisfied with the revised plans. Mr. Bordeaux recommended approving the application with the modifications outlined in the Fire Marshal's comments, even though applicant has likely satisfied them.

In response to questions from Mr. Prause about landscaping on the north side, Mr. Carter said there is landscaping from Oakland Street going down Edward Street to the curb cut in. There was landscaping past that on the other side but the plantings have tended to do poorly in that area. A segment or two of fencing may be removed and replaced with plantings to balance out the entrance. Mr. Carter said he felt it was a good idea to keep the fence up as much as possible.

Special Exception Modification (2019-002)

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the special exception modification under Art. II, Sec. 24.02.01(h) to construct a building addition and canopy to the existing automobile dealership building and modify the exterior of the existing building at 80 Oakland Street, with the modifications as specified in staff memoranda from:


Ms. Scorso seconded the motion.

Mr. Prause asked about the Deputy Fire Marshal’s comments and Mr. Bordeaux reviewed them. Mr. Prause asked if there was a solution as to where the gas meter will go. Mr. Peterson showed the proposed location on the map and stated there will be two bollards protecting it.

Mr. Prause said, as far as the special exception criteria, there is not much changing as far as interest to the public or any type of safety concern. He said the design is compatible with the rest of the area and fits the building.

All members voted in favor.

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


KRISTINE CARLSON
637 South Main Street

Resubdivision (2018-057) – Request for extension of time under CGS 8-25 for filing approved subdivision plans

MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the request for extension of time under CGS 8-25 for filing approved subdivision plans. Mr. Bergin seconded the motion.

Mr. Bordeaux said the request is the same as the previous extension request. The applicant wishes to extend the time before they have to start paying taxes on individual lots.
All members voted in favor.

The extension is for 90 days, until June 22, 2019.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS:**

Mr. Bordeaux reported that an administrative wetlands permit application was approved today for Jon Keane, 4 Fir Grove Road, for a proposed deck in the upland review area. The disturbance is limited to excavation of concrete pier footings for the deck. The applicant is working with the Wetlands Agent to ensure that erosion and sedimentation controls are maintained until the soil is stabilized.

**DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**North End Workshop**

Mr. Anderson said that Staff is now proposing to hold off on having a workshop. He learned that the budget for this year includes a Park and Facilities Master Plan, and it might be a good opportunity to latch on to that wider planning process to get more people involved and have access to a consultant who could help figure out how to get input from the community. In addition, the SMARTR2 referendum will have an impact on Robertson School and how that is reused. There is also some activity on the co-op property on Apel Place, which may impact the design of that intersection; the design with the two roundabouts may or may not move forward, depending on the reuse of the co-op. Mr. Anderson said staff felt it would be prudent to see how some of these things play out prior to holding a workshop.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if there is any indication what the SMARTR2 plan is proposing for the use of Robertson School. Mr. Anderson said, if the SMARTR2 plan is approved, the school will be used as swing space for the next few years, then after that the Town will have to find a reuse for it. Directors included some money for reuse of empty schools as part of the referendum question.

Ms. Scorso asked if the Planning Department would be the central figure to pull together the three separate initiatives Mr. Anderson had mentioned. Mr. Anderson said it would, along with the Department of Leisure, Families and Recreation. The first time the Parks and Facilities Plan was proposed several years ago, the vision was for the two departments to do it together. They would keep in mind that the individual workshops in different areas of town are driven by the Commission and the 2020 Plan, he said. He said he thought the Commission would get better results by latching on to that other process, because there will be buzz around town about it. The Commission will get better input and leveraging those discussions will be useful, he said.

**CUD Discussion Follow-up**

Mr. Bordeaux said there was a recent workshop about additional uses and how to think about the use of commercial and multifamily buildings in the Comprehensive Urban Development (CUD) zone. He asked for feedback from the Commission prior to submitting a formal application. Some uses are proposed to be added, including indoor agriculture, banquet halls, and conference centers. For conference centers, he recommended one parking space per thousand square feet. The proposal would also change places of worship from a permitted to a special exception use.
Mr. Anderson noted that, during the workshop, there was concern that those uses were allowed by right.

Mr. Bordeaux said stand-alone multifamily or multifamily above the ground floor commercial are currently allowed by special exception. The ability to have several floors of multifamily housing above a commercial structure would only be permitted in a building of 200,000 sq. ft. or larger and within half a mile of existing mass transit, which is quite limiting. Staff suggests allowing up to 60 ft. in height for a building, still within half a mile of existing mass transit, but in a commercial space of only 100,000 sq. ft. For consistency, because the maximum building height for multifamily structures in the General Business zone was changed to 50 ft., this draft proposes a maximum building height of 50 ft.

Mr. Stoppelman asked how Mr. Bordeaux arrived at the suggested 1,000 sq. ft. per parking space for conference centers. Mr. Bordeaux said he did research on other communities that have conference centers. Mr. Stoppelman said he thought that was too little. Mr. Bordeaux said he had not had a chance to talk to the Traffic Engineer to see how that lines up with other uses.

Sidewalk Plan

Mr. Bordeaux said staff would like to update the Sidewalk and Curb Plan by April. The Town Engineer will update the map for all projects that were done in the last five years, and then the Commission can reconsider the list of priority areas for filling in gaps. A public hearing must be held and the Board of Directors has to approve the plan, Mr. Bordeaux said. He hoped to hold a public hearing on March 18th in conjunction with the regular meeting.

Mr. Bordeaux referred to a discussion during the hearing on the subdivision on the corner of Line Street and South Main Street, about the appropriateness of the bituminous path that was required per the Sidewalk Plan. He suggested perhaps the Commission would want to take a close look at where those bituminous paths are called for and their appropriateness. Mr. Sabia asked if the bituminous path was to get access to the new development. Mr. Bordeaux said it was not; a bituminous path is called for on rural roads instead of a concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Prause asked how many more subdivisions are possibilities for removing additional sidewalks, where there are streets with sidewalks on both sides. Mr. Bordeaux said there were three on the last plan. For one of them, between Pitkin Street and Porter Street, it was determined that it would be appropriate to keep the sidewalk, based on the neighborhood’s feedback. According to the Town Engineer, Mr. Bordeaux said, they would try to hold a neighborhood meeting or reach out to individuals in the neighborhood for their input. Now there are just two locations where that reduction option would be considered, he said.

Mr. Bordeaux said he would send out a draft of the plan and the list of priorities, so the Commission could see those that have been completed and some that have been added, based on the Town Engineer’s recommendation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

January 23, 2019 – Public Hearing/Business Meeting
MOTION: Mr. Kennedy moved to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Ike seconded the motion and all members voted in favor.
RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS:

WOODBRIDGE MILLS, LLC – Inland Wetlands Permit (2019-006); Special Exception (2019-007) – Request a special exception per Art. II, Sec. 9.14.03 for multifamily historic mill conversion with 24 units of senior housing at 501 Middle Turnpike East.

HARTFORD CDC, LLC – Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (2019-008); Special Exception Modification (2019-009) – 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.

Mr. Stoppelman asked if the Woodbridge Mills application includes removing part of the building. Mr. Anderson said the applicant’s intent is to remove a non-historic portion of the building.

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

The Chairman closed the business meeting at 8:38 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.