

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

**REGULAR Meeting #1794  
January 12, 2021**

Meeting held via ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
Town Hall closed to the Public by  
Executive Order of First Selectman Bowsza  
due to Coronavirus pandemic

***MEETING MINUTES***

***\*\*\*\*\*Minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting\*\*\*\*\****

Chairman Ouellette called Regular Meeting#1794 of the East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission dated January 12, 2021 to Order at 6:30 p.m. The Meeting is being held via teleconference due to closure of the Town Hall to the public as the result of the coronavirus epidemic.

**PRESENT:**    **Regular Members:** Joe Ouellette (Chairman), Anne Gobin, Michael Kowalski, and Jim Thurz.  
                  **Alternate Members:** Frank Gowdy.

**ABSENT:**     All Regular and Alternate Members are present this evening.

Also present was Interim Town Planner Michael D'Amato.

**GUESTS/SPEAKERS:**     First Selectman Bowsza hosted the meeting. Also present were Alan Baker, Board of Selectman Liaison to the Planning and Zoning Commission; Deputy First Selectman DeSousa, Selectman Nordell, Selectman Muska.  
**PZ-2020-18, 87 South Main Street:** Jay Ussery, J. Russo & Associates; Christine Desroche.  
**PZ-2021-01, 111 South Main Street:** No public discussion/application received.  
**PZ-2020-19, 198 South Main Street:** Tim Coon, J. R. Russo & Associates; Bill Ezedine.  
**PZ-2020-22, 89 Bridge Street:** Tim Coon, Chief James Barton, Warehouse Point Fire District.  
**PZ-2020-20 and PZ-2020-21, SJK Properties, LLC:** Christopher Smith, Attorney, representing SJK Properties, LLC; Marek Kement; public: Jennifer Abbe, Marsha Andzans, Alan Baker, Elizabeth Bragg, Tom Bulgajewski, Jason Bowsza, Michael Costa, Gina Couture, Marie DeSousa, Karen Gaudreau, Roberta Hambach, Linda Kane, Leonard Dion,

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

2

Nick Macsata, Chris Mickey, Joshua Pacheco, Craig Rutkowski, Mike Stiles, Tony Santacaterina & Katie Slivinsky, Doug Wyse.  
**Warehouse Point Planning Study:** Terri Hahn, LADA, Land Planners, PC.

**Public (as identified in the Meeting participation list):** Paul Anderson, Alan Baker, Joe Carnemolla, Marie DeSousa, Paul Kenna, Sarah Muska, Charlie Nordell, and others identified only as follows: Antoinetta. Cathryn, Chris, CS WTF, Ed Davis, Elizabeth's i-pad, Linda, Marsha, Rich's i-pad, Richard & Nita, rwinot, Tim P, ZombieHQ's phone.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:**

Chairman Ouellette acknowledged four Regular Members present this evening. He questioned if Regular Commission Moore had signed in via phone? The recording secretary indicated that Commission Moore's term has expired; Chairman Ouellette noted, for the record, that Commissioner Moore is not present at 6:31 p.m.

Chairman Ouellette noted a quorum was established as four Regular Members and 1 Alternate Member was present at the Call to Order. He requested Alternate Member Gowdy to join the Board regarding discussion and action on all Items of Business this evening as well.

**LEGAL NOTICE:**

The following Legal Notices were read by Chairman Ouellette:

**LEGAL NOTICE #1:**

**PUBLIC HEARING LEGAL NOTICE,  
EAST WINDSOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

The East Windsor Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a regular meeting and public hearing on Tuesday, January 12, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via the remote video conferencing platform, Zoom.

**Zone Change Application: Applicant Dave Mason, 87 South Main Street, for a zone change from TZ5, R-3, and A-1 to TZ5 and A-1. Map 052, Block 20, Lots 029 069.**

A full copy of the application is available on the Town Clerk's webpage and on the Planning and Zoning Commission's webpage of the Town website. All interested persons may attend the online meeting and public hearing to be heard on this topic.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

3

Dated December 31, 2020, East Windsor, CT

Journal Inquirer editions: December 31, 2020 and January 7, 2021

**LEGAL NOTICE #2:**

**LEGAL NOTICE  
EAST WINDSOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

The East Windsor Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 12, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via the remote video conferencing platform, Zoom.

**PZ-2020-20 Text Amendment Application – from SJK Properties, LLC to East Windsor Zoning Regulations Section 802 Multi Family Development District (MFDD).**

A full copy of the application is available on the Planning and Zoning Commission's and the Town Clerk's webpage of the Town website. All interested persons may attend the online meeting and public hearing to be heard on this topic.

Dated December 29, 2020, East Windsor, CT Journal Inquirer editions: December 31, 2020 and January 7, 2021.

**LEGAL NOTICE #3:**

**LEGAL NOTICE  
EAST WINDSOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

The East Windsor Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 12, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via the remote video conferencing platform, Zoom.

The following public hearing will be held: **PZ-2020-21 Zone Change Application – Applicant: SJK Properties, LLC, requesting a zone change from R-3 to MFDD of real properties known as the Quarry Meadows Subdivision adjacent to Depot Street and the Town of Ellington, Connecticut, located in the northeast corner of East Windsor, Connecticut, which subdivision and associated real properties comprise approximately 48.78 acres located in East Windsor, Connecticut, including 48 building lots, six parcels, road areas designated as Quarry Road, Sullivan Farm Road and Boulder Court, and other portions of property associated with subdivision improvements, as depicted on plans entitled, "Quarry Meadows; Off**

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

4

**Depot Street, East Windsor, Connecticut;** Assessor's Map 27, Block 77, Lots 6 & 9; 'Subdivision Plan'", as approved and recorded on the land records of the Town of East Windsor, Connecticut, and such lots, parcels, road areas and other portions of property associated with subdivision improvements that are the subject of this zone change application are owned by SJK Properties, LLC, Jolanta H. Kement, Marek L. Kement and John T. Barney, and designated by the Town Assessor of East Windsor, Connecticut as:

**Map 100, Block 77, Lots:** 006-01, 006-02, 006-03, 006-04, 006-05, 006-06, 006-07, 006-08, 006-09, 006-10, 006-36, 006-37, 006-38, 006-39, 006-40, 006-41, 006-42, 006-43, 006-44, 006-45, 006-46, 006-47, 009-02B, 009, 009-11, 009-12, 009-13

**Map 110, Block 77, Lots,** 009-14, 009-15, 009-16, 009-17, 009-18, 009-19, 009-20, 009-21, 009-22, 009-23, 009-24, 009-25, 006-26, 006-27, 006- 28, 006-29, 006-30, 006-31, 006-32, 006-33, 006-34, 006-35, 006-34A

**Map 090, Block 77, Lots:** 006-48, 006, 006A, 006B

A full copy of the application is available on the Planning and Zoning Commission's and the Town Clerk's webpage of the Town website. All interested persons may attend the online meeting and public hearing to be heard on this topic.

Dated December 29, 2020, East Windsor, CT

Journal Inquirer editions: December 31, 2020 and January 7, 2021

**ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:** None.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for comments regarding items/issues not posted on the Agenda. No one requested to speak.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES/A. December 29, 2020 Special Meeting:**

**MOTION: To APPROVE the Minutes of Special Meeting #1793 dated December 29, 2020 as presented.**

**Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE by show of hands: In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Kowalski/Thurz/Gowdy  
(No one opposed/No Abstentions)**

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

5

**RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS/ A. PZ-2021-01, 111 South Main Street** (Map 052, Block 20, Lot 061) Zone Change Application, United Ag & Turf Northeast for a zone change from R-3 to TZ5:

Chairman Ouellette acknowledged the following new application:

1. **PZ-2021-01, 111 South Main Street** (Map 052, Block 20, Lot 061) Zone Change Application, United Ag & Turf Northeast for a zone change from R-3 to TZ5.

A full copy of the application is available on the Planning and Zoning Commission's and the Town Clerk's webpage of the Town website. All interested persons may attend the online meeting and public hearing to be heard on this topic.

Dated January 13, 2021, East Windsor, CT

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

No requests presented under this Item of Business this evening.

**CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

There are no Continued Public Hearings pending before the Commission.

Chairman Ouellette noted next up on the Agenda were the Public Hearing applications.

Chairman Ouellette addressed the public to provide some general information regarding the Public Hearing process, and what a person might expect being in the audience tonight.

After he reads the application into the record in a few minutes the applicant and his team will give a presentation or overview regarding their request before the Planning and Zoning Commission. Depending on the amount of content that they have, or complexity of the application, the length of their presentation can be just a few minutes, or could take the better part of an hour, or even longer. Chairman Ouellette indicated he just wanted everyone to fully understand that.

After the applicant has completed their presentation he will ask each one of the Planning and Zoning Commission members if they have any questions for the applicant. After all the Commission members have had an opportunity to speak he will then open up the

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

6

Public Hearing to the general public. If there are any comments from the audience, or questions, he will ask that you raise your hands and he will call on you. When he does that he'll ask you to state your name and address for the public record.

Chairman Ouellette offered a couple of other points of clarification. He also wanted to mention that it's not uncommon for the Planning and Zoning Commission to continue or not close the Public Hearing for any meeting, and that includes tonight's meeting. But, if we do elect to close the Public Hearing tonight under the Statutes the Commission has 90 days to render a decision.

And, the final point of clarification, any approval for a Text Amendment or a Zone Change does not mean any development is approved. What that approval allows is the next step in the process, which is a Special Use Application, which is yet another Public Hearing. It is at this point in the land use process details regarding the site design, layout, access, landscaping, traffic, and numerous other elements or details will be discussed. Chairman Ouellette suggested he didn't want anyone to get the opinion that if this Commission decides to take action tonight nothing, no approvals to build anything, will be granted.

**NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS/A. PZ-2020-18, 87 South Main Street** (Map 052, Block 20, Lots 029, 069) Zone Change Application, TZ6, R-3, and A-1 to TZ5 and A-1.  
Owner/Applicant: David Mason.

Chairman Ouellette read the description of this Public Hearing.

Joining the Commission virtually was Jay Ussery, of J. R. Russo & Associates, LLC., representing the applicant, David Mason.

Mr. Ussery shared the proposed Zone Change Map with the Commission. He noted this parcel is located on the east side of South Main Street, south of Tromley Road. The property is currently comprised of 3 zones (situated from Route 5 to the rear of the property): TZ-5 closest to Route 5, R-3 to the rear of the TZ-5 Zone, and A-1 to the rear of the property. Mr. Ussery indicated the TZ-5 Zone allows for business/commercial uses, while the R-3 Zone allows for small residential lots of higher density, and the A-1 allows for 1-acre single-family residential lots.

Mr. Ussery indicated Mr. Mason's proposal is to change the R-3 and a small portion of the A-1 residential zones to the TZ-5 Zone. The entire parcel is approximately 12+/- acres. Mr. Mason would like to propose a used car dealership which would provide service for those vehicles as well. As currently zoned the TZ-5 area is not large enough to build the dealership. Mr. Ussery noted the infrastructure – sewer, public water, gas, electrical – currently serve the TZ-5 area.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

7

Mr. Ussery suggested the proposal is in harmony with the Town's POCD (Plan of Conservation and Development) as it speaks of transitioning from residential uses to business uses along the Route 5 corridor. He suggested the Route 5 Corridor Study speaks of the transition of uses as well, although it suggests more commercial development than recommended in the POCD. Mr. Ussery referenced the CRCOG (Capitol Region Council of Governments) draft technical memorandum Route 5 Corridor Study, of September, 2020 which discusses traffic conditions along Route 5 which need to change to facilitate the proposed use changes. Mr. Ussery referenced page 5, the Build Development Scenario, noting "...more commercial and less residential development than suggested in the current POCD." Mr. Ussery also referenced a possible development map, suggesting 2 parcels to be considered for industrial parks; both parcels are in the vicinity of the subject parcel.

Mr. Ussery indicated he feels this proposal is in harmony with the Route 5 Corridor Study and the POCD regarding development areas and zone changes along Route 5. He suggested the property is suitable for the used car dealership Mr. Mason would like to do. The site is served by the required infrastructure. Regarding zone change proposals, Mr. Ussery suggested the Commission will consider other applicable uses as well.

Chairman Ouellette opened discussion to the Commissioners.

**Commissioner Gobin:** She noted that along the back yards of several homes located on south side of 4<sup>th</sup> Street there's a chain link fence with barbed wire above the fencing; she questioned if that belongs to the developer, or will that fencing be replaced with a nice buffer? Mr. Ussery suggested that the fence is owned by the property owners of lots 13, 14, and 15 on the south side of 4<sup>th</sup> Street; this developer has no interest in those properties. Mr. Ussery noted that the Putriment family lived on lot 70; that home may be occupied by a daughter. This parcel was the previous location of East Windsor Tool & Die, which manufactured commercial aircraft parts and was owned by the Putriment family. The fence may have been put up by them. Mr. Ussery noted the current Zoning Regulations would require a buffer between residential and business properties or uses. Commissioner Gobin suggested it would appear to be an improvement for the abutters; Mr. Ussery concurred.

**Commissioner Kowalski:** He suggested the applicant would be talking about a 100-foot buffer around nearly all of the property. Mr. Ussery concurred, although he questioned if it would apply to the rear as the developer is buying the entire piece. It would apply, however, to lot 65 to the south – single family residences located behind Stanton Equipment, and lot 66 or 67, and the motel which is considered a residential use. Mr. Ussery noted Mr. Mason's application is for a 12-acre parcel, but the developable acreage would be significantly reduced. Commissioner Kowalski questioned the amount of developable land; Mr. Ussery estimated the developable area as 8 to 9 acres.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

8

Commissioner Kowalski suggested there appears to be mature vegetation on the north side; would that remain? Mr. Ussery felt that was possible; he also noted the south side of the parcel includes Mason's Brook which is impacted by steep slopes and wetlands which provide a natural buffer.

**Commissioner Thurz** indicated most of his questions had been answered during the informal discussion held previously, or the questions had been raised by the other Commissioners.

**Commissioner Gowdy** indicated his questions had been answered. He requested if Mr. Ussery's estimate of a reduction to 8 acres of developable land had actually been calculated? Mr. Ussery took a few minutes to calculate the developable acreage. Chairman Ouellette suggested that was a site development question. Mr. Ussery suggested with regard to this parcel they would be talking acres due to the buffer requirements; it would be taking out house lots, not just a few feet of land.

Chairman Ouellette noted no development would be approved this evening. He noted the owner has an idea he's proposing, he questioned what other types of land uses could fit in this changed zone? Mr. Ussery suggested other commercial uses could be permitted in the front, while the land to the rear might be multi-family uses, such as condominiums or apartments. The commercial uses could be retail, like Tartsinis' Plaza, or Sofia's Plaza further north, or businesses, or a medical office. It would not be heavy industry. Mr. Ussery noted the land to the rear may be restricted by wetlands.

**Commissioner Kowalski:** Commissioner Kowalski suggested the only permitted uses for TZ-5 that is permitted-as-of-right is farming; everything else would have to come before the Commission under a Special Use Permit application.

Hearing no further comments from the Commissioners Chairman Ouellette opened the Public Hearing to the audience. No one responded at this time.

Chairman Ouellette asked Interim Town Planner D'Amato to offer comments.

Interim Town Planner D'Amato felt that Mr. Ussery did a good job of explaining the relationship between the POCD and the Route 5 Corridor Study, which is more recent than the POCD. He suggested the POCD doesn't have a lot of support information for this type of change but questioned if it was realistic. Interim Town Planner D'Amato felt the Corridor Study is more reflective of updated information.

A member of the audience requested to speak.



**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

9

**Christine Desroche, 40 Tromley Road:** Ms. Desroche questioned how this proposed change would affect the High School? Chairman Ouellette indicated the Commission isn't considering development plans at this time; the application under discussion is for a zone change, and what potential uses could go in that zone.

Ms. Desroche asked if the zone change would go to house 23 on Tromley Road? Mr. Ussery indicated the zone change would go just past 1<sup>st</sup> Street, to the third house on Tromley Road; Interim Town Planner D'Amato felt it would extend to lot 42. Ms. Desroche indicated she lives at 40 Tromley Road; 30 years ago they had horses in the fields. Mr. Ussery indicated the parcel extends just past the left rear corner of her property line. Chairman Ouellette noted this is an administrative request to change the zone; if the Commission approves the zone change the applicant would return with another application for a specific use. Ms. Desroche had no further questions.

Chairman Ouellette queried Mr. Ussery for additional comments; Mr. Ussery indicated he had nothing further to add.

Chairman Ouellette queried the Commission on their preference for action this evening. The consensus of the Commission was to close the Public Hearing tonight, consider the information presented, and vote at the next Commission Meeting.

**MOTION: To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING on Application #PZ-2020-18 for 87 South Main Street (Map 052, Block 20, Lots 029, 069) Zone Change Application, TZ6, R-3, and A-1 to TZ5 and A-1. Owner/Applicant: David Mason.**

**Gobin moved/Kowalski seconded/DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE by show of hands: In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Kowalski/Thurz/Gowdy (No one opposed/No Abstentions)**

**NEW PUBLIC HEARING/B. PZ-2020-20, SJK Properties, LLC** Text Amendment Application to East Windsor Zoning Regulations Section 802 Multi Family Development District (MFDD)

**AND**

**NEW PUBLIC HEARING/C. PZ-2020-21, SJK Properties, LLC** Zone Change Application, zone change from R-3 to MFDD:

Map 100, Block 77, Lots: 006-01, 006-02, 006-03, 006-04, 006-05, 006-06, 006-07, Map 100, Block 77, Lots: 006-01, 006-02, 006-03, 006-04, 006-05, 006-06, 006-07, 006-08, 006-09, 006-10, 006-36, 006-37, 006-38, 006-39, 006-40, 006-41, 006-42, 006-43, 006-44, 006-45, 006-46, 006-47, 009-02B, 009, 009-11, 009-12, 009-13

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

10

Map 110, Block 77, Lots, 009-14, 009-15, 009-16, 009-17, 009-18, 009-19, 009-20, 009-21, 009-22, 009-23, 009-24, 009-25, 006-26, 006-27, 006-28, 006-29, 006-30, 006-31, 006-32, 006-33, 006-34, 006-35, 006-34A

Map 090, Block 77, Lots: 006-48, 006, 006A, 006B

Chairman Ouellette read the description of these applications.

Appearing to present these applications was Attorney Christopher Smith, representing the applicant, SJK Properties, LLC. Also joining the discussion virtually was Marek Kement, the applicant.

Attorney Smith cited there are two applications before the Commission this evening, one for a Text Amendment and a second for a Zone Change. From a procedural standpoint, Attorney Smith requested the discussion on both applications be heard simultaneously, with a single Public Hearing.

Chairman Ouellette noted that historically the Commission has heard other applications concurrently; he felt it was an appropriate approach for these applications as well.

Attorney Smith noted that these applications don't include a proposed site development plan this evening. If the Text Amendment and Zone Change applications are approved then Mr. Kement would return with a site-specific application for a Special Use Permit, which would require a Public Hearing, with all the notice criteria requirements under the State Statutes.

Attorney Smith indicated he understood Mr. Kement appeared before the Commission for a pre-application informal discussion at which a conceptual plan was presented. No application was submitted for the conceptual plan.

Attorney Smith acknowledged that an article appeared in the Journal Inquirer this evening which indicated that a site application for Quarry Meadows was being heard this evening; he clarified that the site application would not be heard tonight.

Commissioner Gowdy noted he also saw the article, and a reference on Facebook that Commissioner Moore was involved in the Quarry Meadows development. Mr. Kement indicated that Mr. Moore was not in any way involved in any development for Quarry Meadows. During the establishment of quorum it had been noted that Mr. Moore was not present this evening.

Attorney Smith began his presentation with the Zone Text Amendment application. He cited it involves two components of the Multi-Family Development District (MFDD).

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

11

Under Section 802.4 of your regulations you have some preliminary requirements for qualifying for an MFDD, while Section 802.6(b)(1) addresses the proposed modification to the density requirements. Attorney Smith reviewed the following amendments:

- Section 802.4 addresses the minimum requirements necessary to apply for a zone change to an MFDD
- Section 802.4(c) references the 2016 POCD Growth Plan which requires a site to be 20 acres located in R-3 zones, be accessed by sewer, and water, but NOT be located in a non-designated residential area cited on the Non-Residential Growth Plan cited in the 2016 POCD, and must provide for increased residential density.
- Section 802.6(b)(1) addresses density. The current regulations specify a density of 2 units per acre, and no more than 4 units per acre. The applicant is proposing a modification to allow 4 dwelling units per acre of developable land of detached dwelling units only, with a cap of no more than 150 dwelling units within the parcel. Attorney Smith noted there are numerous parcels to which this modification could apply; they are not opposed to removing the cap on the number of units.

Attorney Smith noted the standards for review of a Text Amendment and Zone Change are: it must be consistent with the Zoning Map, the POCD, and does not pose an adverse impact to the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

Attorney Smith indicated this is a proposal to add an additional category of housing which may qualify for an MFDD, and could be subject to proposal for a project under a Special Use Permit which would require a Public Hearing.

Attorney Smith referenced pages 33 and 34 of the current POCD, regarding expansion of the sewer service area to include cluster housing rather than single unit per acre dwellings. The POCD recommends conducting a study of increased housing in key locations to increase residential density. Attorney Smith indicated one of those locations to be the Broad Brook area.

Attorney Smith suggested that conditions have changed since the POCD was written in 2016. He suggested recent market data indicates that 45% of households in East Windsor spend more than 30% of their income for housing. If approved, this Text Amendment would provide the opportunity to seek a zone change to MFDD which would provide greater housing opportunities for the community.

Attorney Smith indicated he feels this proposal for the ability to come to the Commission to ask for a zone change to MFDD with the expanded qualifying criteria is consistent with the POCD. Attorney Smith reference Interim Town Planner D'Amato's suggestion that additional qualifying criteria relative to amenities and access to open space should be

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

12

considered for Section 802.4(c). Attorney Smith indicated that if the Text Amendment were approved Mr. Kement has no objections to the addition of amenities, open space, or perhaps trail systems.

Regarding the request for a Zone Change to MFDD, Attorney Smith suggested the request is subject to the same standards regarding consistency with the POCD, and proposing no adverse impacts on the public's health, safety and welfare. Attorney Smith indicated the zone change is proposed for the parcel for which the Quarry Meadows Subdivision, containing 48 single family lots, received approval a number of years ago. The zone is proposed to be changed from an R-3 to an MFDD; approval of the zone change would enable Mr. Kement to return to the Commission with a site-specific Special Use Permit application. Attorney Smith indicated the original subdivision approval has expired; Mr. Kement would like to propose a plan for different housing options.

Attorney Smith indicated he believed the request for the Zone Change from R-3 to MFDD meets the same standards for review as the proposed Text Amendment.

Chairman Ouellette opened discussion to the Commission.

**Commissioner Gobin** suggested if the applicant doesn't receive approval for the Text Amendment then the application for Zone Change doesn't move forward. She indicated she strongly agrees with Interim Town Planner D'Amato that the new Section 802.4(c) should include requirements for open space and amenities, which could be something like tennis courts, or a pool.

With regard to the 20-acre size requirement, Commissioner Gobin questioned how that would apply to a parcel containing escarpment slopes or flood plains or wetlands impacts? If the 20-acre parcel actually contained 3 acres of developable land could this type of development be packed into the 3 developable acres? She questioned if the requirement should be for 20 developable acres. Commissioner Gobin noted this proposal opens the entire town to changing R-3 zoned properties to MFDD.

Commissioner Gobin also questioned if there is a reason the proposal applies only to detached dwelling units?

Attorney Smith indicated he hadn't meant to exclude amenities, such as a clubhouse or courts, to the open space requirement. He clarified the open space would not be available to the public.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

13

Regarding the 20-acre size as it relates to the developable land, Attorney Smith suggested Commissioner Gobin cited good examples. He indicated his client has no problem with the size requirement being 20 developable acres.

Attorney Smith suggested the Zone Change proposal doesn't open every 20-acre parcel to MFDD, but the parcel for the property under discussion is located within an R-3 Zone. If a parcel triggered all the criteria for an MFDD then an applicant could seek a zone change. Attorney Smith felt that just because a property is located within an R-3 Zone doesn't mean they could seek the MFDD unless all the other criteria requirements had been met.

**Commissioner Thurz** noted this parcel contains 44 acres. At 4 units per acre that could provide 176 units; he questioned if the applicant would consider going for more than the 150 units proposed?

Attorney Smith suggested he had just pointed out that if the 150 units was considered restrictive Mr. Kement had no objection to the cap being removed from the Text Amendment. Attorney Smith agreed with Commissioner Thurz's calculations. With regard to any proposal Mr. Kement may make in the future it would not be for the possible 176 units as the property couldn't provide that density due to the site conditions and regulation requirements.

**Commissioner Kowalski** referenced Section 802.1 – the purpose of the MFDD regulation - already requires that a property is, or can be, served by sewer and public water, and that the zones can't be located in a non-rural area; he questioned why reiterate that language in another part of the regulations?

Attorney Smith suggested if the Commission feels that's redundant they'll remove it.

Commissioner Kowalski requested clarification that the only change in Section 802.4 would then be a reduction of the current 25-acre requirement to 20 acres? Is that the applicant's intent? Interim Town Planner D'Amato suggested Section 801 only applies to PRDs – the Planned Residential Developments. He didn't feel the applicant planned to come back under the PRD. He agreed, Section 801 and 802 are incredibly complex in the way they relate to one another, but unless they come in under planned residential developments, cooperatives or community associations - it wouldn't apply. Attorney Smith indicated Interim Town Planner D'Amato and he had this conversation. It would be limited to a condominium, or a common interest form of ownership under Section 802(b) or (c). Mr. Kement confirmed the clarification.

Commissioner Kowalski also referenced Section 802.4(b) under the MFDD, noting it also required service by public water and sewer; he questioned the repetitive text

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

14

references? Attorney Smith indicated he had intended to include those provisions to clarify that it could be located in a rural area as long as it met those requirements. If the Commission felt the additional language was redundant it can be removed. Commissioner Kowalski felt in section (a) it was a restriction under the current language to have to be located on Route 5 or Route 191; he suggested that may be the section that requires the amendment. Referencing page 33 of the POCD Attorney Smith suggested it is Section (c) where it's not to be located in a rural area under the POCD Rural Growth Map – the intent was to provide that a property could be located in a rural area shown on that map, subject to and qualifying for the MFDD if it met the additional requirements. That was the reason he added some of the requirements that were already there for the MFDD regarding sewer and water. Attorney Smith suggested by his use of the word “however” the other restrictions apply.

Commissioner Gowdy indicated he didn't have a problem with including the additional language.

Commissioner Kowalski referenced Section (e), which currently specifies a density of 4 units per acre; he felt by making them detached units it would make it more restrictive. Is that your intent? Attorney Smith referenced Section (d), noting the regulations currently give a developer a bonus for doing this or that. The proposed language specifies you can do 4 detached units without considering density bonuses. Mr. Kement suggested the other reason for that was to prevent having duplexes, or multi-unit building structures on site; the intent was to keep them detached luxury house units. Commissioner Kowalski indicated he was thinking of any site being considered rather than Mr. Kement's property specifically.

**Commissioner Gowdy** indicated a lot of his concerns have been addressed; he has no further questions.

Chairman Ouellette questioned if Interim Town Planner D'Amato had any questions or comments? Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated he had no questions at this time.

Chairman Ouellette opened discussion to the public. He requested speakers identify themselves by name and give their address for the record.

**Roberta Hambach, 20 Overledge Drive, Derry, New Hampshire:** Ms. Hambach questioned how they planned to do the open space area and trailways which appear to have been laid out between her land and theirs. She has active farmland, which she doesn't want destroyed. How do they plan to protect the farmland from all of these houses and the people who will be using the trail system?

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

15

Attorney Smith indicated there is no site-specific application before the Commission this evening. He noted Mr. Kement had appeared before the Commission previously for an informal discussion of a conceptual plan, which he understood appeared in the newspaper (Journal Inquirer) today. Attorney Smith referenced Executive Order 7-I which requires that an applicant file with the Commission at least 24 hours prior to a hearing any material which may be discussed during a hearing. He noted he had suggested to Mr. Kement to submit that conceptual plan to the Planning Office so it would be available if it came up in discussion. Attorney Smith reiterated that's only a conceptual plan; that's not before the Commission tonight; we're not seeking any site-specific approvals tonight. Those would be issues that would be addressed if approval was received tonight for the Text Amendment and Zone Change.

Ms. Hambach reported the town line is between there; her property is on the Ellington side of the property line. It appeared that the trials will be extending over into Ellington. Attorney Smith indicated Mr. Kement is taking notes; her concern may be given consideration should any future development occur.

**Elizabeth Bragg, 17 Eastwood Drive:** Mrs. Bragg noted she lives adjacent to Sullivan Farms. Mrs. Bragg questioned why the whole neighborhood didn't get the notification letter advising them of this meeting, and describing the proposal? Attorney Smith noted there are State Statutes that require publication in the newspaper related to the Zone Change; he referred the logistics of the filing requirements to Interim Town Planner D'Amato. Mrs. Bragg questioned what the requirements are? Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated we're required to publish notice in the paper twice, which was done. Then the applicant mailed notification to abutting property owners but the entire neighborhood doesn't fall into the distance that would require everybody to get a notice. The people that did meet the distance requirement were notified directly. Mrs. Bragg questioned the specific number? Mr. Kement reported the distance requirement is 100 feet. Attorney Smith clarified the Ellington portion of the property is not subject to this Zone Change application before the Commission this evening.

Mrs. Bragg questioned that the road was referred to as an access road to Sullivan Farm Road? Attorney Smith suggested no one spoke of that; there isn't a site-specific application before the Commission this evening. Mrs. Bragg noted people moved into this town because it's rural, not to have multi-family homes here.

D'Amato cited the Certificate of Mailing was provided to the Planning Office; 16 letters were sent out to abutting property owners. Mrs. Bragg requested a copy of the 16 people the letter was sent to. D'Amato requested Mrs. Bragg reach out to the Planning Office for a copy of the letter. Chairman Ouellette also noted the letter is included on the meeting link noted on the Town webpage where you click on for the ZOOM meeting;

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

16

there's a One Drive folder. All that information is publicly available there. Mrs. Bragg indicated she didn't hear about the meeting until today.

**Nick Macsata, 14 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Macsata indicated his property is directly adjacent to the property being considered for this use change; the Harrington property is between us but it's open field. Mr. Macsata felt the area that's fallow needs to have use, over time. It's open now for people to go back there to shoot weapons, and having bonfires; it's a nuisance. He suggested it would be better served to have good use, but he didn't feel multi-dwelling use was an appropriate use of that property.

Regarding Planner D'Amato's point related to Section 802 Mr. Macsata noted that's an entire section; Section 802.1 is an introduction to that section. Mr. Macsata read the following excerpt from the regulations: "...the purpose of the section is to regulate development in construction of multi-family housing – comma – including but not limited to apartments, condominiums, cooperatives, whether new or existing structures and to permit planned residential developments for single family housing with open space conservation in accordance with Section 801." Mr. Macsata suggested the whole of Section 802.1 – purpose provisions – does not exempt anything that is not a PRD. It's a co-joiner that's an "and", not an exclusion, so 802.1 should apply to this specifically; it should not be exempted from it. He goes on the record saying he thinks it's false saying you would not include the exemptions from that and on the technicality he felt it must be included in the request for amendment.

**Craig Rutkowski, 36 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Rutkowski indicated he directly abuts this development. Because you're proposing to change the zone and you're going from 48 to possibly 150 houses he's concerned if there's an environmental or wetlands study that needs to be done to accommodate this huge increase in properties for this parcel.

Attorney Smith indicated the response to those types of issues would be addressed with a site-specific proposal which would be the next step if his client chose to make that application. If the Text Amendment and Zone Change applications are approved Mr. Kement would return to file a Special Use Permit application, which would be subject to a Public Hearing.

**Linda Kane, 28 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mrs. Kane reported she lives about 3 houses down from the area being discussed. Mrs. Kane indicated she agreed with Mr. Macsata; the property should be developed to some degree but didn't feel it was appropriate for multi-family housing or condos as it didn't fit the area. She indicated she and her husband moved here recently, to get away from a city. They moved to Broad Brook because of its rural character. Mrs. Kane also indicated she hadn't heard about this proposal; Elizabeth, her neighbor, is the one who told them about it. They received no notification about this, and we are literally 3 houses away from the area.



**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

17

**Michael Costa, 194 Depot Street:** Mr. Costa indicated he lives directly across the street from this property at 194 Depot Street. Mr. Costa indicated he had some concerns about the zone changing. He doesn't understand why if it was originally zoned for 48 houses they're increasing to multi-family. The impact it will put on Depot Street, if there's an entrance or exit, will be unbelievable. Also, what will it do to our taxes and everything else if we put that kind of housing here? I know I'm kind of getting ahead of things but once the door is open to a change then the rest will follow.

**Jason Bowsza, 121 East Road:** As someone who grew up in that neighborhood and now lives immediately adjacent to it Mr. Bowsza indicated he has some concerns what the proposed text amendment change and the associated zoning change will mean for the area. He felt that if you're going to apply the proposed MFDD to zoning, and then apply it to that particular parcel he disagrees with the comments in the application to CRCOG that it wouldn't have an adverse impact on the public health, safety and welfare of the community. If you're looking to effectively more than double, actually more than triple, the number of vehicles that will be going into that neighborhood on a regular basis he felt that would have an adverse impact on public safety and welfare. Mr. Bowsza felt that Depot Street already has some speeding issues that need to be considered when considering the potential change.

Mr. Bowsza felt the Commission should do a number of things. I think, first, you should think about how the potential text change would also affect other parcels in the community because a text change is going to be a universal. Anybody who wants to do MFDD zoning anywhere else in the community is going to be able to do a similar type of project.

Mr. Bowsza also wanted to associate himself with Elizabeth's comments about notification to property owners. You'll recall that back in September, with a similar proposal, he had suggested and urged that perhaps similar outreach for similar projects be done so we wouldn't find ourselves in a position where affected residents found themselves feeling disenfranchised. Mr. Bowsza felt some of the residents who are abutting property owners have made clear that that perception still persists.

And when you're making this change Mr. Bowsza felt the Commission should carefully consider what the impact would be from a public safety and quality of life perspective for existing homeowners. There's a lot of reason for the concerns that you're hearing tonight.

**Chris Mickey, 22 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Mickey indicated he's an abutting property to the Harrington farm within the 500-foot window relative to the proposed zone change. As Attorney Smith has brought up there's two things that have been put on the

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

18

table, one of which is the language change. The second one is the zone change. Regarding the language change, Mr. Mickey felt that was great. He suggested Attorney Smith is well versed in this type of stuff but as a resident of the town of East Windsor Mr. Mickey would suggest that Mr. Bowsza and the Commission review this proposed language with someone who doesn't necessarily have East Windsor's best interest at heart. Attorney Smith is representing Marek Kement, he's not representing the town of East Windsor.

The second thing, in regards to the zone change, Mr. Mickey felt the R-3 zone was characteristic for this area of town; he would strongly suggest you not consider changing to an MFDD in this particular area for all the reasons everyone else already said. Even as Mr. Smith has pointed out there's no project on the table right now, but if we kill the zone change and leave it R-3 we don't to worry about this.

**Gina Couture, 34 Sullivan Farms Road:** Ms. Couture indicated her concern was once you open the door anything can go there. If there's no proposal how do you make a decision on something there's no proposal for what you're deciding on? Ms. Couture suggested her concern was if you have no proposal then how do you know what you're agreeing to and once you open up the text change or the zone change then lots of thing can get put in there that maybe people wouldn't have agreed to if they knew what they were in the beginning. Ms. Couture indicated she believed it will affect quality of life for residents in the area.

**Leonard Dion, 13 Eastwood Drive:** Mr. Dion indicated he's lived on Eastwood Drive for 18 years, He indicated he probably would be opposed to that change. He suggested single family houses would probably be acceptable down there. He wasn't aware that the access to that property would go through Sullivan Farms Road but it appears that is the proposal shown on the map he saw. Mr. Dion reiterated he would be opposed to it coming through their neighborhood, and to the change itself.

**Mike Stiles, 7 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Stiles wanted to reiterate what his neighbors were saying. Mr. Stiles is concerned about quality of life; you don't have a plan to build. He felt it was too late once we agree to changing the zoning; we'll all come back and complain the next time. What happens? He understands you have your regulations but he felt there has to be a plan to speak about. With so many units going in there he has a concern about traffic, the use of Sullivan Farms Road to build, and whatever else might happen down at the end of the street. Mr. Stiles indicated it's a nice, quiet neighborhood; we like it like that.

**Nick Macsata, 24 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Macsata wanted to go on record that he agrees with Leonard; there does need to be some development there. The single family

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

19

design that's currently zoned is suitable there for this region and area. He understands Mr. Kement's desire to have the property maximized to see it used to the fullest.

Mr. Macsata suggested in line with (Section) 802 – the sewage use – the sewer line doesn't go all the way up there and it would go all the way down to the German Club. Would they have to rip up Depot Street and put a sewer line in, or would they be requesting an exemption to this? Mr. Macsata indicated he didn't quite understand that when they were talking earlier. No matter what happens there, is that under consideration as you're looking at a change to MFDD, or something other?

Attorney Smith suggested that would appear to him to be a site-specific question if a proposal were to be submitted. He queried Mr. Kement for comments. Mr. Macsata didn't feel it was site-specific because it's related to Section 802 requiring sewage, so if your request is a change to an MFDD and the Section 802 requires a sewer line there it's not site-specific; it's specific to your request.

Mr. Kement indicated that the original 48 lot subdivision that was approved, that was under sewer. That was a sewer project. Mr. Macsata questioned if there was sewer there currently? Mr. Kement indicated that is served by sewer, he then corrected his comment that it is to be served by sewer; that's the way it was originally approved. Mr. Macsata questioned that it's not currently served by sewer? Mr. Kement indicated it's not currently served by sewer but it was approved to be sewer.

**Karen Gaudreau, 167 Depot Street:** Mrs. Gaudreau indicated she was going to ask the questions Mr. Macsata just raised. She had been told that Depot Street was in a Sewer Avoidance Area. They are not allowed to connect to a sewer line, if there is a sewer line. She's curious why, if there is a zone change, why it would allow one particular location to have sewers and not the entire street. Attorney Smith indicated his understanding is that the sewer approval was obtained with the subdivision, so as it indicates in the provisions it served, or will be served, so why you can't tie into a sewer he doesn't know. He suggested Mrs. Gaudreau go to the WPCA and ask them.

**Joshua Pacheco, 228 East Road:** Mr. Pacheco wanted to reiterate what a lot of people had said about traffic. It's not just ordinary traffic; we have the tobacco with the tractors, we have horses, we have bikers that routinely go on rather narrow roads, so increasing what could be a couple hundred cars a day is a substantial danger to those people and their quality of life and safety.

Mr. Pacheco is also concerned with contrasting lifestyles of people who live in condominiums as opposed to people that are more rural or are farmers. We have a lot of smells out here, and stuff like that, and animals, and noises that they'd be more apt to

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

20

complain about and it will build animosity amongst people if it's zoned for any type of condo-multi-family building.

**Tom Bulgajewski, 26 Margaret Drive:** Mr. Bulgajewski indicated that currently that property is wide open, the roads have been cleared for years - possibly decades ago - for development, there are storm drains laid about. Why wasn't it developed initially, years or decades ago when everything was left? He questioned the status of that? Mr. Bulgajewski felt Mr. Kement owns the property. Why wasn't it developed as single family homes when it was supposed to be years ago when it was started? Mr. Bulgajewski indicated he's just curious; he lives in the area; he walks back there with his dog. It's wetlands and things like that. He questioned why it wasn't developed initially?

Attorney Smith suggested those questions as to why something that was approved wasn't developed aren't relevant to the applications before the Commission this evening. He suggested it may have been market issues, but the questions aren't relevant to the applications being discussed.

Mr. Bulgajewski suggested the (newspaper) article states a specific "Village at Quarry Meadows" -you're saying there isn't a plan but the article gives a specific map and name with roads and specific units but earlier you said there wasn't a plan; this is specifically for a zoning change? Are we not to believe the article in the paper where there's a specific plan?

Attorney Smith indicated that he said at the beginning of the Hearing that Mr. Kement appeared before this Commission for a pre-application informal presentation to show them if something along the lines of what's being proposed this evening with the Text Amendment were to be approved. Then it's a conceptual sketch or plan as to what could be developed on the property subject to a Special Use Permit review and approval. Attorney Smith suggested that was picked up by the newspaper, and from what he read quickly this afternoon it stated that there was an application for that development in front of the Commission this evening, and that's not what's before the Commission this evening. That (plan) would have to come with fully developed plans, tens of thousands of dollars of engineering to have a plan that would be submitted to the Commission. And there would be a Public Hearing. Attorney Smith noted that Mr. Kement did what the prior applicant did regarding his zone change proposal to get preliminary feedback. A site-specific proposal would have to come in as a separate application, which would be subject to a Public Hearing.

**Jennifer Abbe, 22 Rice Road:** Ms. Abbe questioned the status of the property taxes for all the lots in question – are they current? Attorney Smith suggested, respectfully, that's not relevant to anything before the Commission this evening. Ms. Abbe indicated she

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

21

was wondering, as its zoned now, current in our town? Attorney Smith respectfully deferred to answer.

**Tony and Katie (Tony Santacaterina & Katie Slivinsky), 16 Eastwood Drive:** Mr. Santacaterina suggested if this zone change is approved and it changes to multi-family homes, which gives us a possible 100 maximum units, it affects traffic and sewer. What's the impact as far as our school system and services? Attorney Smith responded, respectfully, there isn't a site-specific proposal that's involved with these 2 applications this evening. We don't have an application before the Commission for development.

**Doug Wyse, 21 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Wyse indicated he concurs with his neighbors, we're against any kind of zone change like that. We like the fields the way it is. If we had to have homes back there, single family homes would be something he would be agreeable to. Mr. Wyse indicated they have their grandkids over all the time; they come down; they like to get the mail. To have another hundred cars buzzing up and down the street, we would not appreciate it. Mr. Wyse indicated he stands with his neighbors.

**Mike Stiles, 7 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Stiles questioned why this is up for a zoning change if there's no plan to do anything? What are we talking about?

Chairman Ouellette indicated the applicant is following the requirements in the Town of East Windsor Zoning Regulations. That's what the process is. Right or wrong, that's what our process is. Chairman Ouellette didn't feel the process in East Windsor is any different from any town. Chairman Ouellette asked if Attorney Smith had any comments? Attorney Smith indicated he's been doing this for 30 years; he's here tonight and will be in another town tomorrow night, and another Thursday. This is the way you do it; you do a Text Amendment and a Zone Change. If they get approved you come back with a site-specific proposal. Mr. Stiles questioned the zone change approval is based on – what? Attorney Smith referenced the standards he gave at the beginning of the presentation.

**Alan Baker, Rye Street:** Mr. Baker indicated he lives on Rye Street; he's not an abutter. Mr. Baker suggested you're proposing an MFDD change, obviously you're looking for high density housing. To not answer questions that people are asking that are germane to the development because there's not a site-specific plan out there – he isn't sure that's the best strategy.

Number two, my question is how is this proposed Zone Change fit in with the Town's POCD for this area? Attorney Smith cited there's no strategy; there's no proposal. Attorney Smith suggested he's trying to respond in a vacuum to questions that are being

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

22

asked in a vacuum. Regarding compliance to the POCD, he did that as part of the presentation at the outset.

Mr. Baker suggested a change of this sort will have an effect on schools, You're looking for an MFDD, some applicant is going to try to do that. It makes sense for people to know how that affects the school, or the traffic, or the sewer, the infrastructure in the area, the quality of life. To say that we want to have this change but we don't want to address any of the issues that this change may cause is a little disingenuous.

**Joshua Pacheco, 228 East Road:** Mr. Pacheco thought the previous comments were really good. You're applying for a zoning change, which matters to the whole town and how it develops, so it doesn't have to deal with your site plan. It has to deal with the whole plan and how it effects precedent and our community and our schools and our fire department and our streets. Mr. Pacheco felt Attorney Smith was being evasive with his answers.

**Nick Macsata, 24 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Macsata suggested that without getting into site specifics or without getting into the actual nuts and bolts of what's going to occur on that property – the amendment before the Board requests to make it a multi-family development district. Mr. Macsata suggested there is more impact when you put more population density into a property space, and that impact will be felt in the uses in the adjoining areas as well and in the town as a whole. There's always pros and cons to everything; you might see an increase in the Grand List and a reduction overall in taxes, but that would have to be weighed in concert with the use of government services. Mr. Macsata indicated he's on the newly appointed and elected Fire Commission for the Broad Brook District, so the question about emergency services would have to be taken in context with a multi-family development district going in, and whether or not the services that we provide would be adequate to the development that's being proposed. So, without getting into site specifics, respectfully to address Mr. Smith and the applicant, there is some concern. There is a reason why there are zoning specific codes, and property use, and property use for that purpose's reason. Mr. Macsata felt there would be a change.

**Craig Rutkowski, 36 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Rutkowski indicated when he bought his house 12 years ago he looked up what the property was next to him, and he felt compelled to pursue the property because it was a residential area. To have it being changed after the fact really sits bad with him. Mr. Rutkowski indicated he bought his house knowing it was going to be on certain pretenses of it being residential, and now a change is being proposed that will negatively change things.

**Jason Bowsza, 121 East Road:** Mr. Bowsza questioned if he was correct in assuming if the text were amended and the zone were changed that any potential project that would

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

23

be introduced would still require a Special Use Permit? Chairman Ouellette replied, for this application – yes. Mr. Bowsza questioned that the Special Use Permit would have to consider special things like harmony with the area, adequate access and infrastructure, compatible design, public health, safety, and welfare, residential impacts, and a traffic impact? Chairman Ouellette indicated that's correct; that's all existing requirements in our Zoning Regulations. Mr. Bowsza cited he was thumbing through the zoning requirements presently, and if there was any validity to the story that was run in the Journal Inquirer regarding the project that was proposed it appears to him that a number of these conditions would be in question. Mr. Bowsza felt this is a "lift" to get to a Special Use Permit if there were a project before you. Chairman Ouellette suggested, that in summary, Mr. Bowsza respectfully disagreed with the applicant's position that it meets all the requirements for a zone change and a text amendment?

Mr. Bowsza felt that the text amendment change is a text amendment change. Mr. Bowsza felt the project that was reported in the newspaper, whether that was in process or not, does not seem to fit what would be required for a Special Use Permit from his reading.

Attorney Smith suggested Mr. Bowsza might be referring to criteria for a Special Use Permit for a specific proposal, whether it be for 100 dwellings, or 3 dwellings, or 3,000. If an application were to come in for a Special Use Permit for whatever number it is and for whatever property it's for Mr. Bowsza was right. Those issues would be considered by the Commission and would have to be addressed by the applicant during that time period. Attorney Smith suggested it was unfair to have someone say he's being disingenuous to say he can't respond to the adverse impact to the school system, the adjacent property, or the traffic. If his client were to come in with a proposal on that zone change property for 20 units it's going to be different for 20 units than for 50 units. Attorney Smith suggested he has no idea until the experts prepare that plan, if it is ever prepared and filed, to be able to respond to that.

Attorney Smith reported they have a Text Amendment before the Commission this evening, and a Zone Change. The newspaper made it pretty clear that the application that's being referred to was before the Commission this evening, and it's not. Attorney Smith indicated they don't have a traffic study, we haven't prepared any experts or engineers or anybody else, or wetlands or whatever else is involved if there were to be a site-specific application. Attorney Smith suggested the newspaper article was unintentionally misleading in reporting there was this proposal before the Commission tonight; there isn't. There's a proposal for a Text Amendment and a Zone Change. Attorney Smith referred to the similarities of the previous application for a Zone Change, not a used car dealership. Attorney Smith reiterated he isn't trying to be evasive; he can't respond to the impacts until there's a proposal; you can't evaluate anything.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

24

**Marsha Andzans, 15 Sullivan Farms Road:** Ms. Andzans felt it had been clear that everyone of the neighbors who have spoken are adamantly speaking out against the project.

Ms. Andzans felt that obviously, there is a plan for a multi-family units, and to increase that number from the 48 originally to something significantly higher, which would affect the properties and likely the property values of the neighbors in the area. Mrs. Andzans also felt they have a proposal tonight from a private citizen asking for a zoning change and we don't have clear answers in regard to the fiscal responsibility towards the Town that this particular citizen has had in the past. Although the Attorney had said that wasn't relevant to the proposal, she felt that it was. Mrs. Andzans reported she's opposed to this change.

**Chris Mickey, 22 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Mickey suggested there's been a lot of discussion tonight relative to the conversion to a zone change to a MFDD. He questioned if he would be wrong in saying it's all a moot point if we just leave it as an R-3? We wouldn't have to worry about Special Use Permits or anything else.

Chairman Ouellette asked Attorney Smith to respond; Attorney Smith indicated he didn't have a response to Mr. Mickey's question.

Chairman Ouellette advised Mr. Mickey that isn't what's being proposed. Mr. Mickey suggested the zone change is proposed. Chairman Ouellette clarified that a request to make a zone change is before the Commission, not to do nothing with the property. Mr. Mickey reiterated it all becomes a moot point if we do nothing and leave it an R-3; life goes on good, and himself and his neighbors are happy. Chairman Ouellette cited what you're kind of getting at is if the request were denied that's what you'd end up with. Mr. Mickey replied exactly, and Mr. Kement would be free to continue with the original development plan as approved. Chairman Ouellette noted that plan has expired. Mr. Mickey suggested maybe we could look at renewing that. Chairman Ouellette indicated that wasn't his decision. Mr. Mickey indicated he understood that; he's just offering constructive criticism.

**Marie DeSousa, 10 Rice Road:** Mrs. DeSousa indicated it was alluded to during earlier discussion that the Commission is looking to make some adjustments to the Plan of Conservation and Development that was created in November, 2016. Mrs. DeSousa cited the reasons for the changes in the POCD were twofold. One of the reasons is the mandatory requirement that the plan be revised periodically, and the was because it was recognized that there was a lot of spotty zoning in town. It was put forth to try to deal with some of that. Mrs. DeSousa indicated she would hope that the Board would take a look at those recommendations. If you're going to change it from 25 to 20, even though they haven't asked they alluded that it would be fine by them. Mrs. DeSousa suggested



**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

25

that we make sure that whatever we decide it's not for a potential property as has appeared in the paper tonight, but that what's being done is in the best interest of the town and not what's in the best interest of a particular developer. She would hate to go back to what it was 10 or 15 years ago with spotty zoning all over when we identified that the corridor was going to be Route 140 and Route 5.

Mrs. DeSousa indicated she feels totally differently from what the Attorney said about the Main Street property, for the auto shop/car dealership. It's completely different because that area is that way. We're talking about farmland, land that's adjacent to another town and issues that could be developed. Mrs. DeSousa urged the Commission to do your due diligence and take a look at what's in the overall best interest of the town for zoning purposes alone.

Chairman Ouellette continued to query the public for comments; no one requested to speak at this time.

Chairman Ouellette noted there's been a lot of great dialogue from the general public this evening, as well as a lot of information from the development team. Chairman Ouellette indicated he wasn't prepared to take action tonight. He had heard a lot of information, which he needed to absorb; he'd like to consider keeping the Public Hearing open but wanted feedback from his fellow Commissioners. He noted the Commission is not under any obligation to vote tonight. Chairman Ouellette noted the Commission has 90 days after closing the Public Hearing to make a decision. He noted when the Public Hearing is closed there is no more voice of the public, or the applicant team; all you can do is consider approval or disapproval based on the facts already presented or publicly shared. You can't consider anything new. Chairman Ouellette queried the Commissioners for their preference.

**Commissioner Gobin** indicated she'd like to continue the Public Hearing. The thought behind that was that the Commission heard that people picked this up from the Journal Inquirer today, and the Journal Inquirer staff person has been on the phone listening, and people felt that the only way they heard about this was the newspaper article. Others may not have time to absorb it if they were not abutters that got the notice. Because it seems to impact a lot of people who are concerned, and there may be more out there, she hoped the reporter would clarify it better in a follow-up article, and get the word out to abutters or others who may be concerned, and let them weigh in, too. Chairman Ouellette suggested this dialogue will also appear in the Minutes.

**Commissioner Gowdy** agreed with Commissioner Gobin 100%. If there is additional information, or comments, the Commission should listen to them. He felt the issue may have gotten confused about this being a Site Plan approval; if we leave the Public Hearing open maybe we can get it straight at a future meeting.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

26

**Commissioner Kowalski** would like more time to consider how the Text Amendment would affect other properties in town, not just this one that's before the Commission. Chairman Ouellette questioned if Commissioner Kowalski was asking the applicant to advise the Commission what other properties in town this Text Amendment could apply to? Commissioner Kowalski indicated he'd like it from the applicant, or Town Staff; Commissioner Gobin indicated she would like the information to be provided by Town Staff. Chairman Ouellette questioned if Interim Town Planner D'Amato could provide that information via GIS layering? Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated assuming the data related to various qualifiers are available it should be a simple analysis. He noted he's not personally aware of how accessible the information related to sewer and water will be. He questioned that that mapping was available; he indicated he'd also reach out to the applicant to see if he's already done some of that due diligence. Commissioner Gobin suggested if the sewer and water information wasn't readily available she questioned if that mattered, as the developer could extend the sewer and water lines until it becomes cost prohibitive. Commissioner Kowalski suggested it's basically taking the 25-acre requirement down to 20 so now what automatically pops up that might not have previously been available might now be available dropping it to a 20-acre requirement. Interim Planner D'Amato indicated he'll try to have that information available for the next meeting.

Chairman Ouellette indicated the Commission will keep this Public Hearing open. He queried the audience for any comments the Commission hasn't heard this evening.

**Nick Macsata, 24 Sullivan Farms Road:** Mr. Macsata questioned what happens next? He and his neighbors need to understand the process. Mr. Macsata indicated it's clear to him that you have an applicant looking to change things generally, not site specifically, there's no site-specific plan. Mr. Macsata suggested if this were to go forward after the public participation the Public Hearing closes, there's a period of time for the Commission to consider it, and then the Commission would vote on it. Mr. Macsata asked for the path forward if the Commission votes no or yes? What would be likely to follow?

Chairman Ouellette requested Interim Town Planner D'Amato, or Attorney Smith, to respond. Attorney Smith deferred to Interim Town Planner D'Amato. Interim Town Planner D'Amato cited the Connecticut General Statutes outlines the timeframes the Commission needs to follow for the various actions. From the date the application is submitted they have to open the Public Hearing within a certain amount of time, which they did tonight. Once they open it, they have to close the Public Hearing within a certain amount of time, and once they close the Public Hearing they have another block time in which they need to render a decision. The Statutes provide for up to 65 days of extension that the applicant can grant to the Commission, and due to the Governor's Executive Orders there's an additional 90 days that the Commission can take in

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

27

considering how to deal with each application. Each application, even though they were heard together, will track separately; they'll be separate decisions; we then post that decision in the paper, which triggers an appeal timeframe. After all that has taken place the next step for the applicant, if he so chooses, would be to return and submit an application which complies with the revised regulations for permit consideration, by which we would have to advertise the Public Hearing, and notice the application, just as we did, and to hold another Public Hearing as we are now for the specific application which is where the layout, number of units, density, and all the specific site design criteria would be addressed. Attorney Smith concurred with Interim Town Planner D'Amato's summary of the timeframes. Mr. Macsata indicated that answered his question.

Chairman Ouellette queried the public again for new comments; no one requested to speak.

Chairman Ouellette offered Attorney Smith an opportunity to make final comments. Attorney Smith indicated he had nothing additional to present, and questioned the date of the next meeting. Chairman Ouellette indicated the Commission would meet again in two weeks; the date of continuance will be noted in the motion.

Chairman Ouellette called for a motion.

**MOTION: To CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARINGS on Application # PZ-2020-20, SJK Properties, LLC Text Amendment Application to East Windsor Zoning Regulations Section 802 Multi Family Development District (MFDD) AND Application #PZ-2020-21, SJK Properties, LLC Zone Change Application, zone change from R-3 to MFDD for Map 100, Block 77, Lots: 006-01, 006-02, 006-03, 006-04, 006-05, 006-06, 006-07, Map 100, Block 77, Lots: 006-01, 006-02, 006-03, 006-04, 006-05, 006-06, 006-07, 006-08, 006-09, 006-10, 006-36, 006-37, 006-38, 006-39, 006-40, 006-41, 006-42, 006-43, 006-44, 006-45, 006-46, 006-47, 009-02B, 009, 009-11, 009-12, 009-13, *and* Map 110, Block 77, Lots, 009-14, 009-15, 009-16, 009-17, 009-18, 009-19, 009-20, 009-21, 009-22, 009-23, 009-24, 009-25, 006-26, 006-27, 006-28, 006-29, 006-30, 006-31, 006-32, 006-33, 006-34, 006-35, 006-34A, *and* Map 090, Block 77, Lots: 006-48, 006, 006A, 006B. Applications are continued to the Commission's regularly scheduled meeting to be held January 26, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via ZOOM.**

**Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION: None.**

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

28

**VOTE by show of hands: In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Kowalski/Thurz/Gowdy  
(No one opposed/No Abstentions)**

**NEW BUSINESS/A. PZ-2020-19, 198 South Main Street** (Map 022, Block 05, Lot 079) Site Plan Application for the demolition of an existing house and construction of a 9,600 SF building and parking lot for an automobile workshop. Zone B-2:

Chairman Ouellette continued the meeting by reading the description of this agenda item.

Also signed into the meeting was Tim Coon, of J. R. Russo & Associates, and Bill Ezedine, owner of the property.

Mr. Coon noted this parcel, which contains approximately 2.61 acres, is presently located on the west side of Route 5, across the street from King's Wines & Liquors. The property is north of Car City; Windsor Wheels is located to the south. The property is presently zoned B-2.

Mr. Coon noted there is an existing dwelling and garage on the property which will be demolished. The property contains steep slopes, which drop off to the rear of the property; an intermittent stream is located within the flood plain. The applicant received approval for a Wetlands Permit at the January meeting. After demolition of the existing structures the applicant is proposing to construct a 9,600 square foot building which will provide 8 rental spaces for auto related uses. Access to the new building will be located at the existing access; parking to the new building will be located to the east and west, with additional parking to the north and south. Mr. Coon indicated 14 parking spaces are required under existing regulations. They are proposing 55 parking spaces in total to provide parking for storage and display spaces if one of the tenants is a dealership; parking will be provided up front for employees and visitors. A vinyl fence will be installed along the north parking lot.

Mr. Coon indicated that run off from the paved area will be collected in an off-site detention basin, and directed to a stormwater treatment structure which is sized to handle a 100-year storm. The only clearing that will be done will be in the vicinity of the outfall of the treatment structure. The property is served by public water, gas, and sewer. They will provide landscaping in the islands within the parking lots, and adding street trees in front of existing trees on the south end of the property.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

29

Mr. Coon indicated that the plans have been reviewed by Town Engineer Norton. His memo dated 12/17/2020 indicates his comments have been addressed.

Mr. Coon indicated he received the following comments from Interim Town Planner D'Amato regarding application revisions:

- **Section 601.5 – Auto Uses – Parking:** Location of parking spaces are to be shown on the plan; Mr. Coon is adding labels to show employee and display parking.
- **Section 601.1(c) – Parking Spaces:** 14 spaces required vs. 55 proposed. Interim Town Planner D'Amato suggested reducing the number of spaces to reduce the amount of impervious coverage, and associated run-off. Mr. Coon indicated the applicant prefers to keep the 55 spaces for the flexibility of future development and the potential for a dealership use; stormwater management has been designed to handle the 55 spaces.
- **Section 601.6(c): Loading requirements:** 8-inch concrete pad required for supports for storage trailers. Mr. Coon indicated the applicant doesn't anticipate deliveries via tractor trailers, deliveries would be via box trucks. Mr. Coon felt the concrete pads are unnecessary.
- **Section 600.1 – Landscaping:** Mr. Coon indicated there are existing large trees on the north and south boundaries of the site, which will remain. Additional trees will be added in front. Mr. Coon cited he has not added trees on the south because it's a common boundary with the adjacent use. Mr. Coon suggested he'll add additional trees if the Commission prefers.
- **Section 900.3(d) – CT DOT – confirmation of work within the State's right-of-way:** Mr. Coon indicated the DOT doesn't want to see the plans until after local approval is received.
- **Section 900.3(f)(5) – Illumination:** Mr. Coon indicated there are no plans to install pole lights. They will be installing building mounted lights with LED wall packs mounted at 15 feet high. Mr. Coon will provide information regarding the cut-offs to Town Staff.
- **Section 900.3(f)(5) – Building/Site Character:** Mr. Coon indicated the applicant is waiting for PZC approval before deciding on an Architectural Plan. He felt the intent was to construct something similar to adjacent properties, which are metal buildings with metal roofs and vinyl siding. Commissioner Gowdy indicated he would like to see an Architectural Plan or rendering during the presentation as this is a commercial proposal on Route 5. Mr. Coon indicated he'll provide an Architectural Plan for the next meeting.

**Commissioner Thurz:**

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

30

- **Dumpster location/screening:** Mr. Coon indicated the dumpster will be located to the rear; screening will be provided by a privacy enclosure.
- **Location of employee parking:** Why is employee parking proposed in the front rather than display parking? Mr. Coon indicated the applicant doesn't know who the tenants will be; the use may be all repair work.

**Commissioner Gowdy** had no additional comments.

**Commissioner Kowalski:**

- **Delineation of amenities for tenants:** Will each tenant be assigned separate parking; will there be 8 separate dumpsters vs. one shared dumpster? Mr. Coon suggested the building could provide 8 rental spaces, or one tenant may want the entire building. The lease agreements would specify the parking areas. There would be one shared dumpster.
- **Pylon sign:** Will the size of the sign change based on the number of tenants; will it be illuminated? Mr. Coon indicated they will have to meet the current sign regulations; they have no plans for the sign presently and have not considered illumination. The applicant would make a separate application for the sign through the Planning Department after approval of the use.

**Commissioner Gobin:**

- **Architectural renderings:** Commissioner Gobin would also like to see an Architectural Plan.
- **Definition of automobile workshop:** Will it include painting cars? Mr. Coon suggested it wouldn't include auto body work, which would require a tenant to return to the Commission for a separate application. The use would be limited to auto repairs or a dealership. Commissioner Gobin indicated if auto body work is anticipated they need to consider emissions.

**Chairman Ouellette:**

- **Driveway access:** How does it align with access on the east side of Route 5? Mr. Coon offered to show the site location on the GIS. Chairman Ouellette indicated he wanted to see the location on the Site Plan. He suggested curb cuts should be lined up when the opportunity occurs.
- **Drainage associated with Route 5:** Mr. Coon indicated a drainage pipe comes across from drainage systems across the road at the Southern Auction lot and the location of the former Railroad Salvage location and

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

31

- the lot to the south. Chairman Ouellette questioned if the State owned that pipe? Mr. Coon replied affirmatively.
- **Overflow emergency drainage system:** Is there a need for easements to drain to other properties? Mr. Coon indicated they will be discharging into an intermittent stream on the applicant's property.

Interim Town Planner D'Amato noted:

- Comments have been received from Town Engineer Norton.
- He's pushing for landscaping improvements for this area of Route 5, especially related to auto dealerships.
- Mr. Coon will need to submit revised plans reflecting the curb cuts and location access.
- He concurs with Commissioner Gobin regarding emissions related to auto body work.
- Wetlands approval has been received.

Chairman Ouellette recommended continuing the Public Hearing until the next meeting to give Mr. Coon the opportunity to revise the plans and provide an architectural rendering. He would also like a copy of the Wetlands approval. The consensus of the Commission was to continue the Public Hearing.

**MOTION:** To CONTINUE the Site Plan review for Application #. PZ-2020-19, 198 South Main Street (Map 022, Block 05, Lot 079) Site Plan Application for the demolition of an existing house and construction of a 9,600 SF building and parking lot for an automobile workshop. Zone B-2. Application is continued the Commission's regularly scheduled meeting to be held January 26, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via ZOOM.

Gobin moved/Kowalcki seconded/**DISCUSSION:** None.

**VOTE** by show of hands: In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Kowalski/Thurz/Gowdy  
(No one opposed/No Abstentions)

**NEW BUSINESS/B. PZ-2020-22, 89 Bridge Street** (Map 111, Block 12, Lot 002) Site Plan Application for a 5,400 SF addition to the existing firehouse and parking lot. Zone B-1. Owner/Applicant: Warehouse Point Fire District:

Chairman Ouellette read the description of this item of business.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

32

Tim Coon, of J. R. Russo & Associates, LLC joined the Commission virtually to discuss this application. Also signed into the meeting was Warehouse Point Fire District Chief James Barton.

Mr. Coon reported the applicant is seeking Site Plan approval for an addition to the existing fire station located on Bridge Street, across from Geissler's Plaza. He noted the station is bounded by the parking lot of St. John's Episcopal Church, Bank of America to the west, and the Blue Ditch and Benson's undeveloped parcel to the east. The entire parcel contains 1.6 acres, which are located in a B-1 Zone. There's a concrete pad to the rear of the station, to the southeast there's some existing parking and a small shed.

Mr. Coon indicated the proposal is to construct a 5,400 square foot addition in the location of the concrete pad at the southeast corner of the existing fire station. They will be relocating the shed (to a location referenced on the Site Plan by Mr. Coon), and expanding the pavement to accommodate the doors associated with the addition. Some of the parking is being relocated to accommodate the addition. Impervious coverage on the site will be increased, but is less than the maximum amount allowed.

Mr. Coon referenced the architectural drawing, noting it will be updated to show the potential for 4 false windows on the southside and 2 false windows on the east side. The addition will have a pitched roof; the height will be 18 ½ feet to the eaves. The addition will include floor drains with an oil/water separate before connecting to the existing sanitary sewer. The existing monument sign will be relocated to a location Mr. Coon referenced on the Site Plan.

Mr. Coon advised the Commission the following approvals or comments have been received:

- A variance for the rear lot set back was granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals on 11/22/2020.
- Wetlands approval was granted on 12/2/2020.
- Town Engineer Norton's comments have been received and were addressed prior to the Wetlands approval.

Regarding Interim Town Planner D'Amato's comments, the following issues will be addressed:

- **Section 600.1 – Landscaping:** Areas not considered impervious coverage should be landscaped. Mr. Coon indicated the non-impervious area, including the area in the rear, will be lawn. Two existing trees will be removed. Mr. Coon suggested they may be able to add a couple new trees in the northeast corner.
- **Section 900.3(d) – CT DOT – confirmation DOT – confirmation of work within the State's right-of-way:** Mr. Coon indicated the DOT



**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

33

doesn't want to see the plans until after local approval is received. They will be dealing with encroachment issues during the DOT review.

- **Section 900.3(f)(5) – Illumination:** They are proposing to add 4 or 5 16-foot pool mounted lights. Mr. Coon indicated he will provide information regarding building cut off lighting to Staff.
- **Section 900.3(f)(5) – Building/Site Character:** Mr. Coon noted his earlier comments regarding updating the Architectural Plan to show the addition of 6 false/faux windows in the addition.

Chairman Ouellette queried the Commissioners for comments.

**Commissioner Gobin:**

- **Coordination of construction with recommendations of the Warehouse Point Village Study:** Commissioner Gobin noted the time spent by the Commission and others reviewing the study being conducted by Mrs. Hahn regarding future development in the Warehouse Point Village area. Commissioner Gobin noted her assumption that the station is a Town building; she questioned if Mrs. Hahn had been included in any of the discussions regarding this proposal?

Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated he had not spoken to Mrs. Hahn regarding this proposed addition. Mrs. Hahn concurred, noting this presentation is the first she's heard of the proposal but would be happy to communicate with Interim Town Planner D'Amato offline. *(See additional comments below made by Chief Barton regarding facility ownership).*

**Commissioner Kowalski:**

- **Anti-tracing pad:** Is it just for the construction area; will it be removed after completion of construction? Mr. Coon replied affirmatively to both questions.
- **Dumpster location:** Mr. Coon indicated the dumpster will be located to the rear, and will be enclosed with screening.
- **Connectivity of construction:** Commissioner Kowalski questioned if the addition will be connected to the existing structure? Mr. Coon replied affirmatively, noting the common wall on the Site Plan.
- Will the addition be sprinklered? Chief Barton replied affirmatively.

**Chief Barton** offered the following additional comments:

- **Building ownership:** Chief Barton clarified that this station is **NOT** a Town owned building, but is owned by the Warehouse Point Fire District. The Warehouse Point Fire District levies their own taxes to cover costs associated with the district.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR**  
**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021**  
**ZOOM Teleconference**  
**Meeting ID: 332 683 3563**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

34

- **Landscaping – additional trees:** Chief Barton felt the requirement for planting additional trees will be a problem as they lack sufficient room. He indicated they only have 13 feet of potential planting area; the area also abuts a bank.
- **Building connectivity:** Chief Barton concurred regarding the common wall between each structure.
- **Architectural recommendations:** Chief Barton concurred regarding the proposal for adding the 6 false windows.

Commissioner Thurz and Commissioner Gowdy indicated they were willing to sacrifice the additional trees to move this project forward.

**Chairman Ouellette**

- **Parking lot circulation:** What the proposed circulation pattern would be; are any new curb cuts being proposed? Mr. Coon indicated they will be widening the existing curb cut to provide access for the overhead doors in the addition. Chief Barton indicated they don't have a problem currently; the access needs to be widened to be able to get out of the driveway. Chairman Ouellette questioned if someone would be assisting at the street to help the vehicle drivers back into the station? Chief Barton indicated they don't back in now; he advised the Commission of the process to return vehicles to the station after a call.
- **Meeting space:** Chairman Ouellette questioned if the department anticipates interior meeting space, either within the addition or the existing building? Chief Barton indicated they currently have a large meeting room in the existing building. The thought was to get the apparatus out of the smaller space. He indicated the nature of fire services is changing; they are considering modifying the smaller space for bunker rooms and offices.
- **Parking adequacy:** Chairman Ouellette questioned if there's enough parking to accommodate training sessions, etc.? He cited his concern that people will park across the street. Chief Barton indicated this proposal will give them 6 more parking spaces. They often use the parking at the church, if necessary, to accommodate staff.
- **Relocation of digital identification sign:** Chairman Ouellette questioned if the proposal site for relocation of this sign structure is the best from a sightline perspective? Mr. Coon indicated the State right-of-way is 50 feet, the sign will be set back 10 feet from the property line. He felt the sightline wouldn't be limited based on the visibility from the trucks. Chief Barton suggested the proposed sign location is the most logical based on the location of the utilities. Discussion following regarding an alternate location.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

35

Chairman Ouellette asked if Interim Planner D'Amato had any comments or questions? Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated his only comment, other than those noted in his memo, was to confirm that the applicant has received the variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Chairman Ouellette suggested continuing the Public Hearing to give the applicant the opportunity to submit revised Site Plans and Architectural Drawings. Chairman Ouellette requested Interim Town Planner D'Amato and Mrs. Hahn confer regarding the proposal relative to the intent for future development within the village of Warehouse Point.

**MOTION:** To CONTINUE the Site Plan review for Application # PZ-2020-22, 89 Bridge Street (Map 111, Block 12, Lot 002) Site Plan Application for a 5,400 SF addition to the existing firehouse and parking lot. Zone B-1. Owner/Applicant: Warehouse Point Fire District. Application is continued the Commission's regularly scheduled meeting to be held January 26, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via ZOOM.

Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

**VOTE by show of hands:** In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Kowalski/Thurz/Gowdy  
(No one opposed/No Abstentions)

**OLD BUSINESS/A. Warehouse Point Planning Study to include Terri Hahn of LADA P.C. Land Planners:**

Discussion followed regarding the schedule for submission of the final report to the Planning and Zoning Commission for approval, and for referral to the Board of Selectmen. Mrs. Hahn indicated that Commissioner's previous comments have been included in the latest version of the report. The Commission requested an e-mail advisement of the availability of the next/last revision for review. Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated staff can provide printed copies if requested as the material becomes available.

**OLD BUSINESS/B. ZEO Report:**

Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated ZEO Calabrese has submitted an updated report for the Commission's review. She continues to work with the Fire Marshal regarding compliance for automotive uses, particularly along Route 5 locations.

**OTHER BUSINESS:** None.

**TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting #1794 – January 12, 2021  
ZOOM Teleconference  
Meeting ID: 332 683 3563  
MEETING MINUTES**

36

**CORRESPONDENCE:**     None.

**BUSINESS MEETING:**     No discussion this evening.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

**MOTION:**     To ADJOURN this Meeting at 10:15 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

---

Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission