

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Public Hearing #1583
January 25, 2011**

*******Draft Document subject to Commission Review*******

The Meeting was called to order in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. at 6:32 P. M. by Chairman Ouellette.

ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:

A quorum was established as five Regular Members (Devanney, Gowdy, O'Brien, Ouellette, and Thurz) and one Alternate Member (Mulkern) were present. Chairman Ouellette noted all Regular Members would sit in, and vote, on all Items of Business this evening. Alternate Member Mulkern would also join the Board regarding discussion on all Items of Business this evening as well. Also present was Town Planner Whitten.

GUESTS: Selectmen Richard Pippin and John Burnham; Kathy Pippin, Board of Finance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES/January 11, 2011:

MOTION: To APPROVE the Minutes of Public Hearing #1582 dated January 11, 2011 as amended:

Page 13, OLD BUSINESS: Armster Reclaimed Lumber Co. – Modifications of Approved Site Plan for property at 232 & 244-246 South Main Street, owned by All American Products Corp. and Balch Bridge Street Corp., to add a concrete loading dock to the existing building. [M-1, B-2 & A-2 Zones; Maps 33/38, Block 5, Lots 84-1 & 87; MOTION TO APPROVE, General Conditions, Condition #14: (Correction of identification of Regulation Section referenced) “In accordance with Section 13.5.4 900.3h of the Zoning Regulations,.....”

Devanney moved/Gowdy seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS:

Chairman Ouellette noted receipt of the following Applications:

- Application of Herb Holden Trucking, for a Special Use Permit/Excavation for renewal of earth products removal permit for property located on Wapping Road (Rear), owned by Northern Capital Region Disposal Facility, Inc. [M-1 & A-2 Zones; Map 41, Block 49, Lot 17C].

- Application of 53 Bridge Street LLC for a Special Use Permit to allow renovation of 3 existing residential apartments to 3 larger apartments with 3 to 4 bedrooms each at 53 Bridge Street. [R-1 Zone; Map 1, Block 8, Lot 6].

WORKSHOP: INCENTIVE HOUSING ZONE:

Town Planner Whitten welcomed the public to the Workshop, noting it was nice to see people come out showing an interest in this discussion.

Town Planner Whitten recalled that about a year ago the State offered grants for \$20,000 for Towns to participate in studies for Incentive Housing Zones which promote workforce housing for the average/everyday person. The State is trying to keep people in the state; these studies require an increased housing density, and promote mixed used – commercial and business such as Pasco’s Commons. On behalf of the Town of East Windsor Town Planner Whitten applied for, and received, a grant to enable this study. After review of several specific parcels the Commission requested the consultant, Milone & MacBroom, prepare conceptual plans on the 3 parcels under discussion this evening.

Chairman Ouellette noted the Commission would hear the presentation by the consultants, then take a break to provide the public time to review the plans/maps, and the Commission would then take comments after reconvening the Meeting. (Members of the audience who participated in discussion are identified when possible, and their names and address are shown in **bold and underlined** type.). Town Planner Whitten introduced Michael Looney and Rebecca Auger, both Senior Planners with Milone and MacBroom.

Mr. Looney reported they studied two specific areas, the Route 140 corridor, and the Warehouse Point section of town. Several potential properties were identified; feasibility studies were prepared on those properties and the Commission narrowed the potential properties down to the 3 for which they have prepared the conceptual plans.

The intent of the study is to develop workforce housing, which is a denser type of housing, in appropriate areas – areas in which clusters of housing already exist and which are supported by infrastructure such as sewers, access to highways, transit, or rail. The goal in a town such as East Windsor allows this program to develop growth by concentrating denser housing, such as these projects, in appropriate areas while retaining the rural character in other areas.

Ms. Auger noted that the State offered a monetary incentive to allow this type of development, however, with the current budget constraints it looks like that money won’t be continuing. As a result of this study East Windsor now has an idea of where more dense housing can coexist along with economic development. The minimum allowable densities under the Incentive Housing Zones (IHZ) are:

- 6 units of single-family detached housing
- 10 units for duplex or townhouse units
- 20 units for multi-family housing units

Ms. Auger noted that with regard to the Route 140 corridor and the Warehouse Point section of East Windsor the infrastructure either must be existing or likely to be approved; the recent approval of the sewer for Route 140 was important. The consultants took a broad look at both these areas and weeded out areas with constraints such as wetlands, access problems, etc. They initially identified the 30+/- parcels shown in pink on Map 15, Round 1 Analysis, IHZ Study.

Mr. Looney reported they brought those 30 parcels to the Commission for review and developed a table of pros and cons for each site. The Commission narrowed down the sites to the 3 for which they have prepared these conceptual plans. Two of the sites are located in the southerly end of the Warehouse Point area, and the 3rd is located off Prospect Hill Road behind Route 140. The consultants worked with a landscape architect to develop the 3 concept plans being presented this evening. Ms. Auger noted that they did review other sites with the Commission but several of those were ruled out because the density wasn't right for the location of the parcel.

David Hirshfield questioned if the cinema site was included in the study? Ms. Auger replied affirmatively, noting that site seems to be a good location for a mixed use development but for various reasons, including topography, it was felt the site required more extensive study and review than was possible under this proposal.

Ms. Auger reported that they are proposing conceptual plans on the 3 parcels at this stage; no engineering plans have been done to date.

David Hirshfield questioned what was meant by the models/acre mentioned; did that mean that the town wouldn't get the money if they didn't following the model specified? Ms. Auger replied affirmatively, noting if the town was going for the money. Mr. Hirschfield questioned that you would need 10 units/acre? Ms. Auger replied affirmatively.

An unidentified member of the audience referred to Ms. Auger's comment that there was no longer any State money; did he understand that comment correctly? Ms. Auger reiterated it is unlikely there will be any funding at the State level for this type of housing at present.

Deborah Krenshaw, Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums: suggested she thought the purpose of this study was for incentive housing, and if there is no money why are we doing this? Town Planner Whitten suggested the town needs workforce housing; whether or not we get the incentive payments the Town has an opportunity to use money from the original grant to study what would be good growth for the town. Ms. Auger concurred, noting that other towns received grants, and - realizing there wouldn't be any further State funding - continued their studies for future planning development.

Robert Slate, 30 Deerfield Drive: suggested it would also benefit the town to get our ducks in a row if the State funding becomes available in the future.

Mr. Slate questioned if Enfield and East Windsor had a location together could they combine that? The consultants felt that might be possible.

Henry Krenshaw (Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums): questioned if the units are to be owner-occupied, or rentals? Ms. Auger felt the multi-family and townhouse units could be rentals. Mr. Krenshaw questioned if a developer is locked into these proposals or could they ask for something different when they come in? Mr. Looney noted that if the IHZs were adopted they would assist with writing regulations which would include parameters of what a developer could do; it wouldn't be opened ended. Mr. Krenshaw questioned when the finalized plan comes through will it have density requirements? Chairman Ouellette replied these proposals would have to proceed further before writing regulations.

Barry Weinberg, Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums: suggested – that with regard to transportation – this is a one lane road with no bus or rail and one way roads; traffic is already overwhelming. He questioned how it could be rationalized to put this proposal here? Ms. Auger noted there is highway access nearby, and train access is available in Windsor Locks. Chairman Ouellette suggested the transportation accessibility isn't a program requirement; it's a consideration. Ms. Auger suggested the idea is to be prepared. Mr. Looney indicated it isn't a requirement that a bus station or direct access to rail be available in the vicinity; it's really about highway access which is provided up the street.

John Simonelli, 71 Depot Street: suggested these areas are already zoned for residential development; he questioned if we were really talking about regular residential development or low income housing? Mr. Simonelli questioned if the consultants had done a benefit analysis on the grand list, and the impact on the schools, AND, he questioned if there were any stipulations from the State that some of this must be set aside for Section 8; has that been included in the consultant's study?

Mr. Looney reported that 20% of the housing must be available for people making 80% of the median income for this area. At a median income level of approximately \$85,000 Mr. Looney suggested 80% of that figure would work out to a salary of \$60,000.

With regard to the existing zoning Mr. Looney didn't feel that all the areas under consideration are zoned for single family dwellings presently. The IHZ would be an overlay zone which would sit on top of the existing zone.

Mr. Looney noted a benefit analysis was not within the scope of the IHZ program. Ms. Auger reported that inclusion of economic development was important to the PZC, which is the reason that some of the plans include retail components.

Anthony Markelon, 160 Prospect Hill Road: cited that earlier studies indicated that Prospect Hill Road was better suited for industrial development; he questioned why that

focus was being changed? Town Planner Whitten suggested the Commission is looking at alternative options.

Town Planner Whitten suggested Mr. Looney and Ms. Auger continue with their presentation and then take questions.

Ms. Auger then referenced **Concept Plan #1, which involves Parcels 8 & 9 located off Main Street and Wagner Lane.** As the surrounding area is all residential they went with a straight residential plan which includes 169 dwelling units (condominiums) contained within 26 buildings (6 – 7 units per building). Wetlands to the rear of the parcel, and existing set back requirements, were taken into consideration when drafting this plan. The site would be accessed off of Main Street, and two additional driveways off Wagner Lane, which would require improvement of Wagner Lane. Ms. Auger suggested if you look at the site you will understand how it's difficult to meet the density requirements because parking requirements take up much of the site area.

Ms. Auger then referenced **Concept Plan #2, which includes Parcels 10 through 13 located off of South Main Street and South Water Street and runs through to Wagner Lane.** This proposal has been drafted as a mixed used plan containing retail space with 36 dwelling units above extending back from South Main Street, and 70 detached single family units to the rear for a total of 106 dwelling units. Access for the retail space would be provided off South Main Street, while access for the dwelling units in the rear would be provided off of South Water Street. They have reduced the town's existing parking requirements to 4 parking spaces/1,000 square feet of retail space, and are providing 2 parking space for the dwelling units. Mr. Looney noted the site is providing 3 dwelling units/acre compared to the 6 dwelling units required under the IHZ program; therefore, this concept plan as shown no longer meets the State IHZ requirements. They have prepared this concept plan to show what could be developed as a mixed use complex similar to Pasco's Commons.

Concept Plan #3 includes Parcels 15 through 23 which front on Prospect Hill Road and extends to the rear of Route 140. Ms. Auger reported this proposal provides 100,000 square feet of retail space with 65 apartment style dwelling units fronting on Prospect Hill Road, and 10,000 square feet of restaurant space. The 65 dwelling units works out to 3 dwelling units/acre, which also falls below the minimum requirement for the State promoted IHZ. Development on these parcels must be kept to the front as there are wetlands constraints to the rear. Parking requirements have been lowered, and parking has been located to the rear to promote a more pedestrian-friendly development. Mr. Looney suggested this proposal heightens the commercial development in this area.

An unidentified resident who currently lives along Prospect Hill Road questioned if acquisition of properties via eminent domain would be involved in this proposal? Ms. Auger replied negatively, noting these proposals would require a developer to come through and acquire all the parcels and then propose development. She noted there are a

lot of steps which have to occur between these concept plans and actual development, and none of these developments are anything the Town would take on itself.

Chairman Ouellette called for a motion to take a 5 minute break for everyone to digest the presentation.

MOTION: To TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.

Gowdy moved/Thurz seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

The Commission RECESSED at 7:10 p.m. and RECONVENED at 7:22 p.m.

Mr. Looney requested comments or questions concerning Concept Plan #1 (Main Street and Wagner Lane). Ms. Auger recalled this is the only plan that currently meets State requirements for the IHZ.

Al Rodrigue, Mahoney Road: questioned if the proposals require taking out the existing structures? Ms. Auger replied affirmatively, noting it's a concept plan which would require development of regulations for the future. Mr. Rodrigue queried that the concept plan was based on clear land? Ms. Auger agreed.

Richard Covill, 4 Margaret Drive: questioned that no developer has come forward with these proposals; he requested clarification that this is a feasibility study to show what's feasible and possible under the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development. Ms. Auger replied affirmatively.

Alan Baker, 43 Spring Street: suggested that two proposals show overlay/density zones; shouldn't that come first? Out of all of these zones which has more potential? Ms. Auger reported that the Town came to them and asked them to look at these areas, for which they did a feasibility study which included consideration of constraints or limitations such as wetlands, access or sewer availability. Approximately 30 locations were reviewed with the Commission. As there is no way the Town wants to develop that many properties the list of potential properties was narrowed down to the 3 before you for which concept plans have been developed. The concept plans will assist the Commission to decide if they want to go forward to achieve these IHZs. Mr. Baker questioned if the intent was to approve these proposals? Chairman Ouellette reiterated the plans before the public are just conceptual.

Jim Richards, 43 Rockville Road: Since there is no money from the State – with the existing zones, could any of these projects be built? Mr. Looney replied negatively. Mr. Richards questioned the current zones. Town Planner Whitten indicated Concept Plan #1 is presently zoned residential; Ms. Auger noted the concept plan includes an increase in the current density allowable.

David Hirschfield questioned if the maximum density was 4 units/acre, and were they proposing townhouses or flats? Ms. Auger reported they are proposing townhouses.

Alan Marsh, 43 North Road: questioned the anticipated time frame to completion – baring any complications – would it be 5 to 10 years? Mr. Looney reported the Commission needs to adopt the overlay zone, public hearings are held, regulations must be drafted, and then the Town must wait for a developer to come along willing to put forward a project allowable under the new regulations. Mr. Marsh questioned again that it could be 5 or 10 years? Chairman Ouellette reported that it might never happen; this is a discussion workshop at this point.

Jim Richards, 43 Rockville Road: questioned what the value would be for the Town; what could go there now vs. this concept plan? Mr. Richards pointed out that a cost analysis wasn't done. Ms. Auger reported a cost analysis wasn't done at this stage. Mr. Richards questioned that it was because a cost analysis wasn't required? Mr. Looney indicated this isn't a firm development plan which would provide the level of details from which a cost analysis could be done. Ms. Auger suggested there are many things that could change about the development project that would change the cost analysis; the Town must first decide what it likes about the project as presented, or part of the project. At this point they are just trying to get the Town's feelings for these concept plans.

Deborah Krenshaw, Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums: before she would consider this she would want to see a cost analysis. What is the point unless there is a benefit and she doesn't know that. She would like to see a traffic study and the number of increased children in schools before considering this. Chairman Ouellette suggested under this discussion we seem to be forgetting the need for workforce housing.

Jim Covell, 4 Margaret Drive: noted this is a feasibility study prepared for the PZC; the Town needs to plan. He understands there is no developer involved at this point but the Town needs to look forward. Chairman Ouellette noted that many times the Commission must be reactive to a development plan; this is a chance to see what fits under the Plan of Conservation and Development

(Selectman) Richard Pippin, 43 Woolam Road: doesn't feel we should be destroying active and productive farmland. Maybe the Prospect Hill Road project might merit another look as it's on Route 5, but to destroy a farm..... Once it's gone it's gone for eternity. Once a farm is gone it won't come back.

Scott Stanton, 105 South Main Street: questioned that the Commission was looking at only these 3 parcels? Chairman Ouellette reiterated that there is no intent to approve anything; the Commission is just looking for public feedback. Mr. Stanton questioned if "you" were going to try to develop this? It's Donnie Wagner's land, and it's a farm. Chairman Ouellette noted the proposal is for an overlay zone; the original zone remains and this overlay zone is added over the underlying zone. Mr. Stanton suggested it seems

like spot zoning. He would rather see a ring drawn around the whole area and not narrow it down.

Bob Starvish, 140 Prospect Hill Road: questioned that 80% would be done with what you want, or 20% is.....? Mr. Looney clarified that the 80% is 80% of the median income for East Windsor. Mr. Starvish questioned how you incorporate townhouses in that area and 20% must be able to accept people that can't afford them. Ms. Auger noted that 20% of the housing must be deed restricted to lower income housing residents. Mr. Starvish questioned how do you make that work? **David Hirschfield** indicated by the size of the unit. Ms. Auger concurred, noting that the greater density enables the developer to do that. Mr. Starvish questioned that you would have to make it more dense? Ms. Auger suggested not for all the properties. Mr. Hirschfield indicated you make smaller units. Commissioner Gowdy noted that part of the project is up to the developer. As an example if a developer builds 100 units he would construct a percentage of the units smaller, or with less amenities, than the other units, and the smaller units would be on the market for the people who can afford them. Mr. Starvish questioned if these are feasible? Has anything been built, and do they work? These are just a picture; where are they so we can see them? Ms. Auger referenced completed projects in Avon, Farmington, and Wallingford. Mr. Starvish questioned how they get 20% of those? Chairman Ouellette suggested the developer would have to make it work, and if he couldn't he wouldn't be able to do the project. Ms. Auger suggested these projects – in Avon, Farmington, and Wallingford – show that when the developer does it it works because of the regulations. Ms. Auger suggested anyone can research similar projects under the website Partnership for Strong Communities.

Kathy Pippin, Board of Finance Member: questioned if the developer starts the project and can't continue is the Town stuck with it? She cited Mill Pond. Is it up to somebody else to do this? Chairman Ouellette suggested the Commission would be striving for these units to be owner-occupied.

Richard Covill, 4 Margaret Drive: reported he has seen the units in Avon, which are located off Route 44; the units in Farmington are not far from Devonshire, and Wallingford – they have above average income but all the projects were done by developers. East Windsor would tell them we want something along those lines, with no units less than the 80% median income. We are planning the feasibility of what type of housing and development we want in East Windsor.

Deborah Krenshaw, Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums: We are trying to keep people in the state and trying to keep lower income housing for recent grads to keep people from leaving the state. What type of housing might they want? Maybe something like Evergreen Walk so they could walk to the market. So if the goal is to keep people in the state.....

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for a show of hands if they liked Concept Plan #1 (Main Street and Wagner Lane)? The majority of the audience disliked this proposal.

Scott Stanton: questioned if someone qualified for low income housing and then their salary doubled would they have to leave that housing? Mr. Starvish explained the process for Mr. Stanton.

Ms. Auger requested comments or questions concerning Concept Plan #2 (South Main Street and South Water Street and runs through to Wagner Lane). Ms. Auger noted this proposal does not currently meet the density requirements. The proposal is for a mixed used plan containing retail space with 36 dwelling units above which extending back from South Main Street, and 70 detached single family units to the rear for a total of 106 dwelling units

Al Rodrigue, Mahoney Road: questioned because this is proposed as a group of parcels can it be set up for one density on one parcel and another density on another property? Ms. Auger and Mr. Looney replied affirmatively. Ms. Auger suggested that by mixing the types they can increase the density.

Jim Richards, 43 Rockville Road: suggested this property makes him question how it will affect the capacity of the sewer plant; he heard it's at 59% capacity. Mr. Richards questioned again how this affects the cost to the town, and how do you reap back the cost? Even if the cost analysis is a shot in the dark.....

Commissioner Gowdy clarified that the sewer plant is currently operating at 25% capacity; there is already a sewer line in the street at this location. Commissioner Gowdy felt other people will be coming forth shortly to speak about the apartments that have been constructed across from Revay's (The Mansions at Canyon Ridge, North Road). They have found the impact on the schools to be that only 2 children out of the 200 units go to East Windsor schools.

Donald Hirschfield: felt someone could make that site easily come within the regulations by having a midrise building in the mix, and the whole site would then conform. He felt there was no reason you couldn't have a midrise building. Ms. Auger indicated they tried to respect the surrounding properties when developing the plan. Mr. Hirschfield suggested the surrounding properties are all residential. Mr. Looney suggested when the State talks about multi-family dwelling units they talk about multi-pods of the same type of units. He felt they could get 20 units of multi-family units on "this sub-parcel". He suggested the density requirements are for each type of style. Mr. Hirschfield noted they were taking people's properties and putting them together and there is no reason, if you are proposing a unified development, why you couldn't have the midrise building. Mr. Looney suggested there are a number of different ways to divide the properties. **Mr. Rodrigue** suggested then you wouldn't have to use up all the property.

Barry Weinberg, Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums: suggested the land is beautiful farmland, which is nice. But if you put 500 people and 500 cars going in

the morning and coming home in the evening and shopping on Saturday on Route 5 – how will it affect the rest of the area? He felt the plan was overwhelming as shown. Chairman Ouellette noted traffic hasn't been looked at but would be if the plans moved forward.

(Selectman) Richard Pippin, 43 Woolam Road: suggested if the Commission proposes an overlay zone he would stay away from M-1 business zoned properties – which is what this land is. It's too valuable to be wasted; there is so little of that in Town. If you did that as an overlay zone you should replace it with similar acreage elsewhere in town.

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for a show of hands if they liked Concept Plan #2 (South Main Street and South Water Street and runs through to Wagner Lane)? The majority of the audience disliked this proposal.

Ms. Auger then referenced Concept Plan #3 includes Parcels 15 through 23 which front on Prospect Hill Road and extends to the rear of Route 140. Ms. Auger recalled this proposal does not meet the State density requirements as presented.

(Unidentified), Brookwood Court: questioned the restaurants in relationship to the residential units. Ms. Auger suggested they were trying to keep the residential units away from and not above the restaurants.

Scott Stanton: thought that as consultants they would come in with plans that conformed. Ms. Auger suggested the idea was that the Town might change its regulations and requirements but when they reviewed the properties they found it was difficult to achieve the density requirements in East Windsor. Chairman Ouellette suggested if there was incentive money some of these concepts wouldn't be appropriate for that program. Mr. Looney suggested that was the nature of a feasibility study – to see if it's achievable in each town.

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for a show of hands if they liked Concept Plan #3 includes Parcels 15 through 23 which front on Prospect Hill Road and extends to the rear of Route 140. The majority of the audience LIKED this proposal.

Mr. Looney advised the audience they would take the comments and feedback under consideration and work with the Commission regarding tweaking the proposals or dismissing some of them. They will finalize the feasibility study and work with the Commission before deciding if they will move forward on the regulations. Ms. Auger suggested it was helpful for the Commission to hear the public comments/input.

Jim Richards, 43 Rockville Road: wondered what the next step was; is option "d" to do nothing? He assumed the consultants would be looking at the people's comments. Maybe some of these would be feasible 5 or 10 years down the road, or could you come

back and say “do nothing”? Ms. Auger and Mr. Looney replied affirmatively. Town Planner Whitten suggested that option – to do nothing – has been chosen with 75% of the properties she and the Commission reviewed.

Al Rodrigue, Mahoney Road: questioned regarding Concept Plan #2 (South Main Street and South Water Street and runs through to Wagner Lane) – if you break out the parcels individually – maybe 3 parcels – how would that work out regarding the feasibility and density? The problem with combining parcels is you are combining individual owners and who would be the main person/owner? He felt it might work out better individually. Ms. Auger suggested that some of the parcels are so small and others are not well situated – as an example, Parcel 10 is provided access via Wagner Lane which would require road improvements. Mr. Rodrigue clarified that Parcel 10 also has access off South Water Street and Main Street. Mr. Looney suggested the concept is really 2 plans – single family residential in the back and 36 apartments over the retail; he felt the mixed use makes the site work better.

Bob Starvish 140 Prospect Hill Road: suggested when you have a mixed use with residential above the businesses it’s not attractive; he felt it’s dangerous. Chairman Ouellette questioned if Mr. Starvish was familiar with Pasco’s Commons – across the street from this proposal? Mr. Starvish indicated he was not. Town Planner Whitten noted Pasco’s has business units below and apartments above the businesses; it’s geared towards single people. Commissioner Gowdy noted a lot of people that own the businesses live above their business units, and there are very few children to impact the schools.

Chris Ruoss, Rockville Road: questioned which was the most desirable site? Ms. Auger felt it was Concept Plan #3 (Prospect Hill Road and extends to the rear of Route 140.). Mr. Ruoss questioned that it was really around Sofia’s? Ms. Auger replied affirmatively.

Town Planner Whitten recalled that a point made by Mr. Stanton was he would like to see a mixed use zone as a general area, which is something that can be done. This study was done to review possibilities. The public shouldn’t think it has to be a site specific regulation.

Deborah Krenshaw, Riverview Drive, Wolcott Landing Condominiums: questioned if the Commission does decide to go forward with the regulations would it be done as it was before? Commissioner Devaney noted the Commission would hold more workshops like this one. Chairman Ouellette suggested it would be handled as the adoption of the Plan of Conservation and Development. If regulations are proposed there would be Public Hearings and the public would have more opportunities to speak.

Al Rodrigue, Mahoney Road: recalled many years ago the Town didn’t have regulations for condominiums and now here are people who live in the condominiums making comments about or against the density of other areas. The Town is trying to

make regulations and move forward. The overlay regulations would apply if a developer came in with a project proposal. Mr. Rodrigue felt people need to be more open-minded and less negative. The Town needs to move forward. Mr. Rodrigue recalled he himself served on the Planning and Zoning Commission 20 years ago and people had the same conversations about condominiums. The school population today is less than when his children were in school. He suggested the people of East Windsor should be progressive

Commissioner O'Brien reported he grew up in Enfield but has lived in East Windsor for 10 or 12 years. East Windsor is a unique town. What the Board is trying to do is keep the blend and character of the town. Commissioner O'Brien felt that's why people move to East Windsor. This is the people's town and everyone is included in the decision and nothing is going to get steamrolled through. Like Mr. Richards said – the Commission might do nothing. These proposals must be done by a developer and if there is no money to be made this might all fall flat.

MOTION: To TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.

Gowdy moved/Thurz seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

The Commission RECESSED at 8:15 p.m. and RECONVENED at 8:30 p.m.

BUSINESS MEETING/(1) Discussion – Farm Regulations:

Town Planner Whitten referenced her memo of January 20, 2011 which summarized public comments from Farm Regulation Workshop #3. The following revisions were considered:

Definition – Agricultural Buildings of Structures – revised to: Buildings or structures used in connection with agriculture, not to be used for human habitation unless approved as a field hand quarters.

Definition – Commercial Farm – revised to: A farm, with a minimum of three contiguous acres, that is operated primarily as an income producing operation and is permitted in any zone.

The Commission reviewed public input from the previous meeting during which the speaker felt regulations should be more restrictive for commercial farms. The speaker suggested set-backs from property lines should be increased, farming practices regarding manure storage should be more strictly enforced, allowable acreage and lot sizes should be increased, revisions should be made to site suitability to increase the requirements, and other recommendations. It was felt the speaker was concerned with farms occurring on smaller parcels or within residential areas. The Commission felt that most, if not all, commercial farms have existed prior to surrounding residential development, and that most commercial farms occur on larger parcels. The Commission noted the waiver

provision included in the regulations which allows a property owner/farmer to request deviation from the proposed regulation specifications.

Definition – Usable pasture – revised to: A contiguous area used for keeping of livestock which excludes areas utilized for dwelling units, non-agricultural buildings, onsite sewage disposal systems, and meets general criteria as described I Section 305.2.c entitled Site Suitability and Impact. Animal shelters are permitted within the usable area.

Section 305.2 – Keeping of Livestock, subsection a, bullet #2 revised to: Most recent techniques and guidance as provided by CT. DEP, CT Horse Council, UCONN, or Farm Bureau and NRCS.

Same section, bullet #3 revised to: The CT Public Health Code/NCHD.

The Commission retained the **100’ setback from side yard for animal shelters**, as that number is consistent with side yard setbacks for any structure in other existing regulation sections. The Commission again noted the availability of the waiver provision.

Roosters/a/k/a little boy chickens: L-E-N-G-T-H-Y discussion occurred. The Commission compromised on not allowing the keeping of roosters in residential zones unless the property contains 3 or more acres. The shelter must be 100’ from the property lines.

Requirement of sketch for compliance: The Commission reviewed their original concerns regarding site suitability, especially for small or non-commercial parcels. It was noted the sketch is only required for the initial assessment of compliance. The Commission continues to favor this requirement.

Storage of manure, request for setback reduction (Section 305.2 – Keeping of Livestock, subsection e – General Livestock Requirements): The Commission retained the language as proposed and did NOT reduce any set back requirements. Language for **Section 205.2 – Keeping of Livestock, subsection c, bullet 6** retained as proposed.

Permitted Use of Crops Section: Retained as written.

Usable area over septic system, request was to reduce for smaller animals: Retained as written.

Directional Signs: Discussion continues

Recommendation to consider more control near schools, especially with spraying: The Commission considered this function would be handled under Best Management Practices by the farmer.

Recommendation to keep styes and slaughterhouses away from residential: Language retained; operation of slaughterhouses to be added under Special Use Permits.

Recommendation to consider 6 weeks, rather than 6 months, as downtime for farm stands, and recommendation to consider “permanent” farm stands for year round farming, such as the selling of beef: Town Planner Whitten noted the downtime defines the farm stand as temporary. The question has arisen as to how that affects a farmer who raises beef and for which sale of the product is part of the operation and an ongoing process. The availability of the waiver provision was noted. The concern was that allowing a permanent farm stand circumvents requirements for Building Permits, parking plans, etc. The Commission continued review of this recommendation.

Recommendation to lower the number of chickens and rabbits in residential areas from 50 to ten due to smell and attraction of rodents: The Commission felt these issues would be handled under Best Management Practices used by the owner.

Recommendation to handle removal of manure via health code requirements. The Commission concurred.

The Commission planned to hold another workshop during the second Meeting in February; final revisions will be posted on the website as well.

BUSINESS MEETING/(2) Route 140 – Sewers: Tabled.

BUSINESS MEETING/(3) Correspondence: None.

BUSINESS MEETING/(4) Staff Reports: None.

SIGNING OF MYLARS/PLANS, MOTIONS:

- Armster Reclaimed Lumber Co. - Motion

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN this Meeting at 10:13 p.m.

Gowdy moved/Devanney seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

Respectfully submitted,

Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission
(6079)