

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

**Meeting #1609  
March 27, 2012**

**\*\*\*\*Draft Document Subject to Commission Approval\*\*\*\***

The Meeting was called to order in the Town Hall Meeting Room, 11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. at 7:00 P. M. by Vice Chairman Gowdy.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:**

A quorum was established as four Regular Members (Devaney, Gowdy, Sullivan, and Thurz) and one Alternate Member (Zhigailo) were present. Regular Member Ouellette was absent. Vice Chairman Gowdy noted all Regular Members would sit in, and vote, on all Items of Business this evening; Alternate Member Zhigailo would also join the Board regarding discussion and action on all Items of Business this evening as well.

Also present was Town Planner Whitten.

**GUESTS:** Alan Baker, Board of Selectmen Liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

**LEGAL NOTICE:**

The following Legal Notice, which appeared in the Journal Inquirer on Thursday, March 15, 2012, and Thursday, March 22, 2012, was read by Secretary Devaney:

1. Proposed Text Amendments to the East Windsor Zoning Regulations, Sec. 203 *Definitions, Impervious Surface & Contractors Storage Yard*; Sec. 405 *Temporary Permits/Seasonal Events*; Sec. 502 Permitted Uses in Business & Industrial Districts; Sec. 900.3 *Site Plan Application*; Sec. 902.2 *Zoning Permit*; and Sec. 903.2 *Procedures [For ZBA]*.

**ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** No one requested to speak.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES/March 13, 2012:**

**MOTION:** To APPROVE the Minutes of Regular Meeting #1608 dated March 13, 2012 with the following amendments:

Page #1, APPROVAL OF MINUTES: “APPROVAL OF MINUTES/~~March 13, 2012~~ February 28, 2012: MOTION: To APPROVE the Minutes of Regular Meeting #1607 dated February 28, 2012 as written.”

Page #3, NEW PUBLIC HEARING: Gardner Chapman....., Paragraph 2: “Attorney Famiglietti suggested that with regard to impact on East Windsor’s emergency services, between October 2010 and the beginning of May, 2011 there were zero police calls at Mansions at Canyon Ridge. Attorney Famiglietti submitted a Freedom of Information Act request issued via the State of Connecticut, Department of Public Safety as substantiation of that information. Chairman Ouellette questioned why the information regarding traffic and criminal activities had not come from the local East Windsor Police Department, which has jurisdiction for North Road/Mansions at Canyon Ridge? Attorney Famiglietti suggested she thought Mr. Chapman had requested the information on Mansions at Canyon Ridge and the other complexes. Commissioner Gowdy suggested he had felt that information was presented at the last meeting that there were no fire or police calls.”

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

**RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS:**

Town Planner Whitten noted receipt of the following application:

1. Application of Benson Enterprises, LLC for a Special Use Permit for a residential apartment below a business at 8E Pasco Drive.

Town Planner Whitten noted the Applicant has requested that the Public Hearing is scheduled for April 24, 2012.

**PERFORMANCE BONDS – ACTIONS; PERMIT EXTENSIONS; ROAD ACCEPTANCE:**

Nothing requested this evening.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING: Gardner Chapman** – Text Amendment to Section 802 *Multi-Family Development District (MFDD)* – Sec. 802.4 Applicability; Section 802.6 *Types of Permits*; Sec. 802.10 *Minimum Floor Area, Unit Mix, Utilities and Miscellaneous Design Requirements*; and Sec. 802.22 *Change of Zone* (Deadline to close hearing 4/17/2012):

Vice Chairman Gowdy read the Hearing description. Appearing to discuss this Application was Attorney Dory Famiglietti, of Kahan, Kerensky and Capossela, LLP,

representing Gardner Chapman; Jay Ussery, of J. R. Russo and Associates, LLC, professional engineer; and Gardner Chapman. Also available in the audience was Cliff Chapman of the Gardner Family Group.

Attorney Famiglietti noted the reference in the Minutes of March 13, 2012 to the inquiry of police activity had come from the Department of Public Safety. She submitted tonight a report from the local police department which indicates there were 4 or 5 incidents in the last year; none were problematic calls. Attorney Famiglietti suggested that while the number of police calls wasn't zero 4 or 5 police calls out of 220 units wasn't bad. If the Commission were looking at a subdivision of 220 homes 4 or 5 calls wouldn't be bad either.

Attorney Famiglietti summarized they are presenting a Text Amendment which would allow for apartments under strict criteria for design which include increased minimum unit size, and private entrance, private garage and private laundry as required amenities. She noted the Applicant has not asked for an increase in density but they have asked for the ability to tweak the regulations to "get there". Attorney Famiglietti indicated the Hearing had been postponed to give the Commission the opportunity to review 3 possible alternatives regarding density/garage requirements. The options include:

1. **Option 1:** They have kept everything the way the regulations are written but would allow 1 unit as a bonus for attached garages.
2. **Option 2:** This proposal goes back to the regulations prior to a 2006 amendment and allows 4 units per developable acre with no bonuses. This option moves the garage requirement to Miscellaneous Design Requirements.
3. **Option 3:** This proposal allows 3 units per developable acre with bonuses up to 4 units per developable acre maximum, and moves the garage requirement for all units to the Miscellaneous Design Requirements.

Attorney Famiglietti suggested she felt Gardner Chapman would be happy with any of the 3 options.

Attorney Famiglietti reiterated she had presented the tax benefits for 620 units at the previous Meeting. If the density doesn't change they might get 480 units, but the annual taxes decrease \$350,000, and the one-time sewer hook-up fees would decrease by \$700,000. She suggested the Commission keep in mind taking that chunk of money off the tax rolls for what doesn't seem to be an unreasonable request with regard to density. Attorney Famiglietti suggested this proposal isn't out of whack with surrounding towns.

With regard to the big picture, Attorney Famiglietti suggested this text amendment will satisfy the market demand. Homeownership is down, while rentals have gone up. She reported the Chapmans have owned properties since the 1960s. She cited Pinney Hill which has experienced a 3 – 4% vacancy rate per year. The rental rates have remained the same during the 2008 change in market conditions. Attorney Famiglietti reiterated there is a market demand for upscale apartments; she didn't think the Commission had to be concerned with a glut in the market. She suggested she understood the Commission's

worry that if the rental rates drop it will become another undesirable complex, but if the rates did drop it would be a symptom of a bigger economic problem. Attorney Famiglietti recalled East Windsor's Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) had stated that by 2020 there will be a significant need for apartment units for young adults and seniors. This is a perfect opportunity to meet that community need. With 620 units there could be 800+ residents buying gas and groceries in town. Such a project would help stabilize the tax base, and create a number of construction jobs for 4 to 6 years. The biggest benefit is a massive tax benefit for East Windsor. This property being considered by the Chapman Family will be sold; it's been marketed before the Chapman's came along; it will be marketed again if this deal goes away. Single family development, which would produce 81 houses, is a permitted use as of right for this site. The single family development would result in significantly less taxes, while there would be a potential for 60+/- school-aged children within the development. At a per student education cost of \$15,000 a single family development would cost an additional \$900,000 annually. Attorney Famiglietti suggested she felt it's time to open the doors to a different type of development, which would be the high-end apartments with the consideration of one of the options for density. Attorney Famiglietti suggested multi-family development, if done right, will enhance the Grand List without impacting the schools.

Vice Chairman Gowdy noted Chairman Ouellette had submitted comments in his absence; he read those comments for the record.

Vice Chairman Gowdy opened discussion to the Commission.

Commissioner Sullivan referenced Attorney Famiglietti's statement regarding \$350,000 in lost taxes; he indicated he didn't get that figure (with the 480 unit complex). Attorney Famiglietti suggested she calculated her figure on an assessed value of \$83,000/unit for 480 units. Commissioner Sullivan questioned that the difference resulted from the difference in the number of units? Attorney Famiglietti concurred, noting that the original \$1.5 million tax revenue (based on 620 units) would drop to \$1.2 million with 480 units.

Commissioner Sullivan questioned if the proposal would be down to 3 units/acre rather than 4 using Option 3? Attorney Famiglietti indicated they could still get up to 4 with the density bonus. Commissioner Sullivan asked if the bonus wasn't in there would you be at 480 units? Attorney Famiglietti indicated that based on the current regulations they can build 2 units/developable acre, plus 2 units for each acre of Open Space donated to the Town, which would allow 4 units/acre. Commissioner Sullivan questioned that the size of the units doesn't change, but the amount of Open Space does? Attorney Famiglietti suggested there would be less buildings taking up the land, but that doesn't necessarily mean that all the land not built on goes to Open Space. Commissioner Sullivan requested clarification that the size of the units doesn't change? Attorney Famiglietti replied "no".

Vice Chairman Gowdy suggested he personally liked Option 1, but felt attached garages and the laundries should be required for all units; he also liked the Open Space donations. Attorney Famiglietti clarified that all the scenarios/options presented to the Commission include private laundries. Vice Chairman Gowdy questioned if this Text Amendment would also apply to elderly and condominium complexes? Town Planner Whitten clarified the Text Amendment is only specific to apartments; elderly and condominium complexes are not affected by the Text Amendment at all.

Commissioner Devanney indicated she liked bullets “a”, “b”, “c”, and “d” of Option 1 – which allow 2 dwelling units/acre, with 2 additional units for each acre of Open Space for a maximum of 4 dwelling units. She also felt the private entrances, garages, and laundries should be a requirement, therefore she would delete bullet “e” from Option 1. That would then move current bullet “f” to bullet “e”. Commissioner Devanney felt this is a big change for all projects; the private entrances, garages, and laundries will produce a more upscale complex.

Town Planner Whitten requested clarification that the Commission agreed with Chairman Ouellette’s written recommendation to keep everything the same but allow apartments with the requirement of attached garages rather than a bonus for private garages; nothing would change with regard to density. Everything would stay the same but apartments – with attached garages, private entrances, and private laundries – would be allowed? The Commission concurred.

Commissioner Sullivan questioned that bullet “f” would allow for no more than an average of 4 units/acre? Town Planner Whitten suggested that allows for clustering of units together; that’s in the Regulations currently; 4 dwelling units/acre are allowed but they might be clustered together. Vice Chairman Gowdy questioned if Commissioner Sullivan’s concern was that 6 units could be constructed on an acre? Commissioner Sullivan cited concern with the word “average”. Town Planner Whitten reiterated the 4 units/acre maximum is the current Regulation language. She suggested if the Commission wants to change the number of units/acre she wouldn’t be comfortable making that change without doing studies first. Commissioner Zhigailo offered as a clarification that the language allows the buildings to be in a contained spot, while the amenities would be elsewhere. She indicated she supports that; she suggested to Commissioner Sullivan that the Town wouldn’t be losing land. Attorney Famiglietti clarified that there would be a 10-unit building on an acre, but it works out to 4 units/acre. Town Planner Whitten suggested it’s like transferring the density from an area being used to an area not being used. Mr. Ussery suggested perhaps the Text Amendment needs another sentence clarifying gross density. Town Planner Whitten reiterated she was uncomfortable making changes at this time; she hasn’t had the opportunity to study the ramifications down the line.

Town Planner Whitten referenced the 220 units at Mansion at Canyon Ridge; she questioned how much of the land was actually developed with buildings and structures?

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Meeting #1609 – March 27, 2012**

6

Mr. Ussery suggested there was a little over 50 developable acres on that parcel; he felt the buildings were clustered into 40 to 45 developable acres.

Commissioner Thurz questioned how the site under consideration compares to Mansions at Canyon Ridge; is this site tighter? Mr. Ussery reported this site may be more spread out. The Mansions at Canyon Ridge was a relatively flat site so it was easy to cluster the buildings. This site will require grading of slopes so there will be more spaces between the buildings to make the garages work.

Commissioner Thurz reported he liked Option 1, but noted when someone speaks of apartments everyone thinks of Mill Pond, which, during the last renovation, included Section 8 occupancy. Everyone questions what will happen 40 years down the road; will this turn into Section 8 housing as well? Commissioner Thurz agreed there would always be turnovers. Attorney Famiglietti suggested there are no guarantees in real estate, but the type of complexes the Chapman's have owned have maintained their value well over time.

Mr. Ussery noted affordable housing is a requirement in every town. He believed the requirement is 10%, and East Windsor – at 16% - already exceeds that percentage. Town Planner Whitten clarified that East Windsor's current percentage is 18%. When Mill Pond was renovated that law applied. That couldn't be imposed on this project because East Windsor already meets the requirement.

Discussion continued regarding the applicability of the affordable housing requirement, the public's perception of existing housing stock, and the Commission's responsibility to plan for future needs. Commissioner Thurz reiterated he liked Option 1; he likes the tax base.

Town Planner Whitten questioned if the Commission was comfortable with the proposal requirement for 25 acre parcels? Commissioner Sullivan suggested 25 acres allows for a large complex area; is the 25 acres right because they have the ability to push us over the affordable housing ceiling? Commissioner Sullivan felt it might be better to require smaller parcels. Town Planner Whitten noted that would make more smaller properties open to affordable housing. Commissioner Sullivan questioned if smaller affordable housing complexes are better than larger groups of affordable housing; he didn't want to be held hostage by someone who wants to build 600 units – some of which can be affordable. Town Planner Whitten reiterated that since East Windsor is already over the affordable housing percentage requirement the Commission doesn't have to allow more to be built. Attorney Famiglietti suggested the time the Commission doesn't have an option is when East Windsor hasn't reached the percentage, and East Windsor is already over that number.

Mr. Ussery suggested that with regard to Open Space and the density bonus it would allow 2 units for each acre of Open Space donated, and would take the proposal back to Option 1. It would take it back to a 480 unit development, which wouldn't be as big and

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Meeting #1609 – March 27, 2012**

7

might allow more Open Space. Mr. Ussery felt that Option 1 would probably allow more than 480 units but not as many as 620.

Town Planner Whitten noted that zoning regulations are not perfect; they must allow for flexibility. A Commission can't think of every scenario possible under a new proposal. Attorney Famiglietti suggested that if the Text Amendment is approved it would still require a Special Use Permit process – which gives the Commission a lot of discretion – to develop a project. Discussion followed regarding the effect of past regulation changes.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the Commissioners how they felt regarding Option 1? Commissioner Devaney indicated she liked Option 1 if bullet “d” were taken out. Town Planner Whitten clarified that the change proposed by Commissioner Devaney would mean there would be NO bonus for a garage; the garage would become a requirement. Commissioner Devaney concurred. Commissioner Sullivan questioned that in doing that they would be talking about 3 units/acre? Vice Chairman Gowdy clarified it would be 2 units/acre with a maximum of 4 possible. Town Planner Whitten suggested the Text Amendment would allow apartments under certain provisions, which include attached garages. The garage wouldn't be a bonus any longer. Vice Chairman Gowdy clarified the private entrance and garage would be requirements and they would be providing more Open Space. Vice Chairman Gowdy questioned Commissioner Sullivan if he was comfortable with Option 1? Commissioner Sullivan indicated he liked more Open Space. Commissioner Zhigailo indicated she liked Option 1; she would make the garages a requirement.

Vice Chairman Gowdy opened discussion to the audience:

**Jim Balch:** felt the Town is under-developed and a lot of people are questioning the school and property taxes and those shouldn't be impacted by this. The Chapman family – he questioned how many of the Commissioners had been to the Chapman apartments? He questioned if the Commission was ashamed of them? Mr. Balch suggested the (Chapman) family has done a great job, they keep them up magnificently; he would love to have them as a neighbor. Mr. Balch was concerned with the Commission's concerns. He suggested the family are very nice, and do anything you want. Please allow them to come into Town; the maximum “emptiness” is 3%; they keep their property gorgeous. Go to East Windsor or Texas to see what these people are like. Don't let this opportunity pass you by.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the audience again; no one else requested to speak.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the Commission regarding their preference for closing the Public Hearing tonight? Town Planner Whitten questioned if the Commission was comfortable with the other criteria, which she reviewed again. Discussion noted that the unit mix being proposed is 40% *minimum* for 1 bedroom units, and 60% *maximum* for 2 bedroom units. She reiterated the changes proposed this evening are that *the private*

entrance, internal laundries within each unit, and attached garages would be required; they would no longer be offering a bonus for the private entrance, laundries, and garages. The proposal is only for apartments, not condominiums or elderly housing.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the Applicant regarding closing the Public Hearing this evening. Attorney Famiglietti indicated they have said everything they wanted to say. They would like the ability to tweak the regulations regarding density to get to the 620 units, but that's the Commission's judgment call.

**MOTION:** To CLOSE the Public Hearing on the Application of Gardner Chapman – Text Amendment to Section 802 *Multi-Family Development District (MFDD)* – Sec. 802.4 Applicability; Section 802.6 *Types of Permits*; Sec. 802.10 *Minimum Floor Area, Unit Mix, Utilities and Miscellaneous Design Requirements*; and Sec. 802.22 *Change of Zone*

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

**MOTION TO APPROVE** the text amendments to Chapter 802, the MULTI FAMILY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT (MFDD) as written, including the following modifications:

**Section 802.2 TYPES OF PERMITS:** Paragraph 2, “Non-Elderly Occupancy – Residential condominiums, residential cooperatives, RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS, or other like usages..... bullets “a”, “b”, “c”, and “d” remain as written, bullet “e” is deleted completely, bullet “f” is changed to bullet “e”.

**Section 802.10 .....MISCELLANEOUS DESIGN REQUIREMENTS:** bullets “[A] each dwelling unit shall have individual laundry facilities.....;” “[A] each dwelling unit shall have a private entrance”; “[A] each dwelling unit shall have a private attached garage” are now required miscellaneous design features.

**CONDITIONS:**

1. A copy of the final motion and text amendment shall be filed in the Office of the Town Clerk on the effective date by the applicant. Said amendment shall bear the signatures of the Chairman and Secretary of the Commission, and the approval and effective date of the amendment.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The proposed change shall become effective once filed on the Land Records.

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

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL:** Vice Chairman Gowdy felt it had been proved to the Commission that East Windsor needs affordable housing, and he felt the text

amendment was needed. Commissioner Devanney agreed that East Windsor needs affordable housing; she felt the way the amendment has been tweaked it should be good for many years. Commissioner Thurz liked Mansions at Canyon Ridge; he felt another similar complex will be great. He felt it will bring more people to East Windsor to shop and use restaurants. Commissioner Sullivan reported he is in favor of the text amendment for the following reasons: a) Mansions at Canyon Ridge is a great example; b) the private garages, laundry, and entrance will promote a more upscale project; and c) the text amendment gives the Town more Open Space. Commissioner Zhigailo reported she thought the text amendment was a winner. She agreed with the comments made by the Commission, and the comments made by Mr. Balch regarding the Chapman Family.

**MOTION: TO TAKE A FIVE MINUTE BREAK.**

**Devanney moved/Thurz seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous**

The Commission RECESSED at 8:04 p.m. and RECONVENED at 8:10 p.m.

**NEW PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed Text Amendments to the East Windsor Zoning Regulations**, Sec. 203 *Definitions, Impervious Surface & Contractors Storage Yard*; Sec. 405 *Temporary Permits/Seasonal Events*; Sec. 502 *Permitted Uses in Business & Industrial Districts*; Sec. 900.3 *Site Plan Application*; Sec. 902.2 *Zoning Permit*; and Sec. 903.2 *Procedures [For ZBA]*:

Town Planner Whitten noted the Commission has reviewed these proposed changes previously. The revisions have also been referred to CRCOG (Capitol Region Council of Governments) who find “no apparent conflicts with regional plans and policies or the concerns of neighboring towns.”

Commissioner Sullivan referenced Section 405.B – (temporary use of trailers), and noted the requirement for the need for a Zoning Permit and a Building Permit. He questioned that this requirement might be slapping someone in the face that might be under dire conditions? Town Planner Whitten indicated that these requirements are set by the State Statutes. She suggested sometimes these trailers are at these locations for a year; everyone needs to be sure they are safe.

Vice Chairman Gowdy recalled his continuing concern with the requirement for an A-2 Survey, but noted he sees no problems with the revisions being proposed.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the Commission again; no one else requested to speak.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the audience:

**Alan Baker:** suggested the Commission did a nice job proposing these revisions; well done.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the Commission regarding adoption of the regulation changes?

**MOTION:** To CLOSE the Public Hearing on the Application for Proposed Text Amendments to the East Windsor Zoning Regulations, Sec. 203 *Definitions, Impervious Surface & Contractors Storage Yard*; Sec. 405 *Temporary Permits/Seasonal Events*; Sec. 502 Permitted Uses in Business & Industrial Districts; Sec. 900.3 *Site Plan Application*; Sec. 902.2 *Zoning Permit*; and Sec. 903.2 *Procedures [For ZBA]*.

**Devanney moved/Thurz seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous**

**MOTION** to approve the new definitions and amendments to the Eat Windsor Zoning Regulations, referencing new definition for Impervious Surface and Contractors Storage Yard; and modifications to Chapter 405 – Temporary Permits/Seasonal Events; Chapter 502 – Permitted Uses in Business & Industrial Districts; Chapter 900.3 Site Plan Applications, Chapter 901.1 Zoning Permit; and Chapter 903.2 Procedures for [ZBA].

**CONDITONS:**

1. A copy of the final motion and text amendment shall be filed in the Office of the Town Clerk on the effective date by the applicant. Said amendment shall bear the signatures of the Chairman and Secretary of the Commission, and the approval and effective date of the amendment.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** The proposed change shall become effective once filed on the Land Records.

**Devanney moved/Thurz seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous**

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL:** Commissioner Devanney felt the definitions and amendments were needed to clarify sections of the Zoning Regulations. Vice Chairman Gowdy and Commissioners Thurz and Sullivan agreed with Commissioner Devanney. Commissioner Zhigailo felt the changes clear up the Zoning Regulations.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**BUSINESS MEETING/(1) 8-24 Referral – Community Gardens at Kogut Property:**

Town Planner Whitten reported the Conservation Commission is proposing to offer Community Garden plots to the public on a portion of the Kogut property. The area under discussion is behind the parking area and driveway serving the dog park. An area

approximately 225' x 440' will be divided into several 20' x 25' plots; those plots will then be offered to the residents under a lottery system. There will be a grass parking area associated with the gardens; the parking lot will be maintained by the Town. Town Planner Whitten noted the Kogut property was originally proposed to be mined of its gravel; the area proposed for the parking lot has gravel below the grass which will prevent the cars from sinking into the grass. The vines will be grubbed out and stored in a spoils pile; that pile will turn into soil in a few years and will be returned to the fields. Water will be provided to the plots via a water wagon.

Commissioner Sullivan noted the gardeners would be using the same driveway as the people using the dog park; he questioned if that was a good idea? Town Planner Whitten suggested it's better than creating another driveway, and the area for the gardens will be to the rear of the driveway. Commissioner Sullivan suggested that the parking lot for the dog park be expanded.

Commissioner Sullivan also noted the land slopes down to the brook, which goes into the reservoir. He questioned that the Town would have the ability to control what people use as pesticides. He suggested another berm be constructed to keep the pesticides out of the brook. Commissioner Zhigailo noted as long as there is a grassy area between the gardens and the brook, you would be surprised how much the grass will help. Another option would be to require that the plots near the brook use organic fertilizer.

Vice Chairman Gowdy queried the Commission regarding their preference for this referral?

**MOTION: To APPROVE the 8-24 Referral to the Board of Selectmen for the Conservation Commission to establish community gardens.**

**Devanney moved/Thurz seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous**

**BUSINESS MEETING/(2) Discussion on 10-year required 2004 Plan of Conservation & Development Update:**

No discussion this evening.

**BUSINESS MEETING/(3) Correspondence:**

Town Planner Whitten referenced correspondence recently received regarding the purchase of 272 South Main Street. An application had previously been approved for the renovation of box trucks and cabs for semi-trailers. The turning radius wasn't adequate to accommodate the trailers. The new owner would like to operate a limousine and/or bus service. While that is not presently a permitted use Town Planner Whitten questioned if the Commission considered the proposal a similar use?

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Meeting #1609 – March 27, 2012**

12

Commissioner Thurz suggested there isn't enough room to park limousines and buses; the property drops down in back which prohibits parking in that area. Commissioner Devanney felt it was difficult for her to make a determination without seeing a Site Plan of the proposed parking layout. The consensus of the Commission is they were not opposed to the use but they wanted to see a Site Plan Modification to determine if the site is suitable for the proposed use. They don't want to create more parking issues.

**BUSINESS MEETING/(4) Staff Reports:** None.

**BUSINESS MEETING/(5) Signing of Mylars/Plans, Motions:** None.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION: To ADJOURN this Meeting at 8:31 p.m.**

**Devanney moved/Sullivan seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous**

Respectfully submitted,

---

Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission  
(4535)