1		TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR
2		PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
3		
4		<b>REGULAR Meeting #1795</b>
5		January 26, 2021
6		
7		Meeting held via ZOOM Teleconference
8		Meeting ID: 332 683 3563
9		Town Hall closed to the Public by
10	Executive Order of First Selectman Bowsza	
11	due to Coronavirus pandemic	
12		due to coronavirus pundenne
12		MEETING MINUTES
13	MEETING MINUTES *****Minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting*****	
15	14	linaies are not official and approved at a subsequent meeting
16		
17	Chairman Ou	ellette called Regular Meeting#1795 of the East Windsor Planning and
18	Zoning Commission dated December 8, 2020 to Order at 6:30 p.m. The Meeting is	
19	being held via teleconference due to closure of the Town Hall to the public as the result	
20	of the corona	virus epidemic.
21		
22	<b>PRESENT:</b>	<b><u>Regular Members:</u></b> Joe Ouellette (Chairman), Anne Gobin, Michael
23		Kowalski, and Jim Thurz.
24		Alternate Members: Frank Gowdy.
25		
26	<b>ABSENT:</b>	All current members were present. There are vacancies for one Regular
27		Member and two Alternate Members.
28		use Clark Charin Town Diamon/Director of Diaming and Development
29 30	-	was Clark Chapin, Town Planner/Director of Planning and Development, own Planner Michael D'Amato.
31		own Flaimer Michael D'Amato.
32	CUESTS/SP	<b>EAKERS:</b> First Selectman Bowsza hosted the meeting. Also present
33	<b>UCES IS/SI</b>	were: Alan Baker, Board of Selectman Liaison to the Planning and Zoning
34		Commission; Attorney Christopher Smith, of Alter & Pearson, LLC. and
35		Marek Kement, representing SJK Properties, LLC.; Tim Coon, of J. R.
36		Russo & Associates, LLC; and James Barton, Chief, Warehouse Point Fire
37		Department; Terri Hahn, LADA, P.C., Land Planners; Carla Dawson; Jim
38		Platt; Amie Olschafskie.
39		
40		Public (as identified in the Meeting participation list): Heidi Alexander,
41		Roberta Hambach, Austin Holden, Robert Leach, Anna Mangiafico, Bob
42		Winot, and others identified only as follows: Alexis, Antoinetta, Barbara's
43		Galaxy, Burger, Carlamac, Chris' i-pad, Debra's i-phone, Elizabeth's i-
44		pad, Marie's i-phone, 16 Eastwood Drive, obiedoc, CCARD, Ruth, Walt,
45		Wendy's i-pad, ZoomUser.

46 47

## **ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:**

48

54

57

60

- 49 A quorum was established as four Regular Members were present at the Call to Order. 50 Chairman Ouellette requested Alternate Member Gowdy to join the Board regarding 51 continued discussion and action on all Items of Business this evening as well. 52
- 53 **ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:**

55 Interim Town Planner D'Amato requested the additional of an informal discussion of 56 correspondence from J. R. Russo & associates under the BUSINESS MEETING.

- 58 **MOTION:** To ADD under the **<u>BUSINESS MEETING</u>**, Correspondence from J. 59 R. Russo & Associates.
- Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION: 61 None.
- Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz 62 **VOTE** (by show of hands): In Favor: 63 (No one opposed/No abstentions) 64
- 65 **LEGAL NOTICE:**
- 67 The following Legal Notices were read by Chairman Ouellette:
- 68

66

69

75

76 77

78

88

### **EAST WINDSOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION**

70 71 The East Windsor Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a regular meeting on 72 Tuesday, January 26, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via the remote video conferencing platform, 73 Zoom. 74

- Join meeting: https://zoom.us/j/3326833563 Meeting ID: 332 683 3563
- 79 Dial by your location 80 +1 646 558 8656 US (New York) 81 +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago) 82 +1 301 715 8592 US 83 +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston) 84 +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose) 85 +1 253 215 8782 US
- 86 87 The following public hearing will be held:

#### 89

90 PZ-2021-01 Zone Change Application, 111 South Main Street (Map 052, Block 20,

- Lot 061) requesting a zone change from R-3 to TZ-5. Applicant: United Ag & Turf
  Northeast, Owner: Lawrence Farm, LLC.
- 93

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 attendthe online meeting and public hearing to be heard on this topic.

97

98 Dated January 13, 2021, East Windsor, CT

99

100 This Appeared in the Journal Inquirer on 1/15/2021 and 1/21/2021. 101

### 102 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:**

103

104 Chairman Ouellette queried the audience for comments regarding items/issues not posted105 on the Agenda. No one requested to speak.

106

107 First Selectman Bowsza requested to introduce the Commission to our new permanent 108 Town Planner. Clark Chapin comes to us most recently from the U.S.D.A. Farm 109 Agency, he has experience in Federal, State, and local government, and he has a Masters Degree in Community Planning from the University of Iowa. First Selectman 110 111 Bowsza indicated Mr. Chapin joined us on Thursday of last week; they'll be a certain 112 amount of time that Interim Town Planner Mike D'Amato is helping to onboard Clark 113 into that new role, and as projects fall off that Mike has been working on there will be a 114 transition, so Clark is fully installed. First Selectman Bowsza indicated he's very 115 excited to welcome Clark to our team; with the addition of Clark and Ruthanne that we 116 have some real firepower in that department. He indicated he wanted to take the 117 opportunity to introduce Clark to the Commission, and give him an opportunity to say a 118 few words. 119 Town Planner Chapin thanked First Selectman Bowsza for the kind words. He noted 120 121 this is day four on the job. He's been traveling around town and it's amazing how

many projects that he's already familiar with. Town Planner Chapin indicated he looks
 forward to continuing to get his feet wet – hopefully not in the deep end of the pool –

and he looks forward to working with Interim Town Planner D'Amato as we try to

125 provide some continuity to Planning and Zoning as well as the other agencies that we

126 staff. As far as he's concerned, they'll take the transition nice and slow so no balls get

127 dropped and business will be conducted in a professional manner and continue forward.

128

129 Chairman Ouellette thanked Town Planner Chapin for his comments; he noted he

- 130 looked forward to working with him and staff.
- 131

132

- 133 Chairman Ouellette called for additional comments for something not already on the agenda. Chairman Ouellette requested people wave their hand to indicate their 134
- 135 preference to speak as he noted many people were signed in to the meeting. No one
- 136 requested to speak at this time.
- 137

#### 138 **APPROVAL OF MINUTES/January 12, 2021 Regular Meeting:** 139

- 140 Chairman Ouellette asked the Commissioners for comments regarding approval of the 141 Meeting Minutes for January 12, 2021 Regular Meeting. Commissioner Gobin suggested 142 they were a good job, and completely and adequately described the meeting. She had no 143 suggested edits. Chairman Ouellette called for additional comments. Hearing none, he 144 called for motion for approval.
- 145

#### 146 **MOTION:** To APPROVE the Meeting Minutes as presented of Regular Meeting 147 #1794 dated January 12, 2021. 148

- 149 Gobin moved/Gowdy seconded/DISCUSSION: None.
- 150 VOTE (by show of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz 151 (No one opposed/No Abstentions)
- 153 **RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS:**
- 154

156 157

158

159

152

155 Chairman Ouellette acknowledged the receipt of the following new application:

#### 1. **PZ-2021-02, 53 Prospect Hill Road** (Map 092, Block 14, Lot 012) General Development Plan modification. Zone HIFZ. Applicant: Tracy Becker for Sign Pro. Owner: Crossroads Community Cathedral.

160 161 Chairman Ouellette noted this item will be discussed at a meeting in February.

#### 162 163 PERFORMANCE BONDS – ACTIONS; PERMIT EXTENSIONS; ROAD ACCEPTANCE 164

- 165
- 166 No requests presented under this Item of Business this evening.
- 167
- CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS: A. PZ-2020-20, SJK Properties, LLC Text 168 169 Amendment Application to East Windsor Zoning Regulations Section 802 Multi Family
- 170 Development District (MFDD).
- 171
- AND B. PZ-2020-21, SJK Properties, LLC Zone Change Application, zone change from R-3 172 173 to MFDD.
- 174

175

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, 006-179
41, 006-42, 006-43, 006-44, 006-45, 006-46, 006-47, 009-02B, 009, 009-11, 009-12, 009-13

181

182Map 110, Block 77, Lots, 009-14, 009-15, 009-16, 009-17, 009-18, 009-19, 009-18320, 009-21, 009-22, 009-23, 009-24, 009-25, 006-26, 006-27, 006-28,006-29,

- 184 006-30, 006-31, 006-32, 006-33, 006-34, 006-35, 006-34A
- 185

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

187
188 Chairman Ouellette read the description of the captioned items of business which
189 are the subject of the continued Public Hearings. At the opening of the Public
190 Hearing Attorney Christopher Smith requested that the Public Hearings for these
191 two items would be heard simultaneously; the Commission will continue that
192 process tonight.

193

Attorney Smith opened discussion by introducing himself as a land use attorney
with the law firm of Alter & Pearson, who is representing the Applicant, SJK
Properties, LLC. Attorney Smith respectfully requested to turn the presentation
over to Marek Kement, who would like to make a statement to the Commission.

198

# 199 <u>Marek Kement, representing SJK Properties, LLC:</u> (Mr. Kement's statement 200 follows):

201

I wanted to take some time to address concerns raised by the general public at the last Planning and Zoning Meeting. The Kement family has been part of this community for over 75 years and we're very sensitive to the Broad Brook area. Our family developed the Sullivan Farm Subdivision where I lived for several years, and as you know, my sister still lives in the neighborhood directly abutting the site.

208

I have a personal attachment and obligation to develop our property in
consideration of the public health, safety, and welfare, as well as my own family,
who lives right there.

212

It has been brought to his attention that the neighborhood might be feeling left in the dark, or something inappropriate is occurring. That can not be furthest from the truth. In fact, I have been very transparent with this proposal. The community is now protesting based on false information and making predetermined conclusions without having all of the facts. Prior to this application

218

we met with Town officials and informally with this Commission on a preapplication basis as provided by law to discuss this proposal. We put all of our cards on the table and left all of the meetings with a favorable consensus. We would not have proceeded with this application if we did not get a green light feeling, or if this proposal did not make sense.

224

I want the community to know that we notified all abutters as required in accordance with the East Windsor Planning and Zoning Regulations. Public Notice was also advertised in the newspaper. These are all statutory and regulatory requirements which we complied with; I did everything by the book.

I do understand the public's reaction, and I now understand I should have
approached the community first. I apologize for not doing so. Regrettably, I can
not go back in time. So, let me take this time to explain my family's vision for
the property.

In order to determine if the site was capable of supporting this type of development we prepared a conceptual plan to support the feasibility. The plan that was published in the Journal Inquirer is only conceptual, but it does represent our intent and vision for developing the property. At this time there is no final design, but I would like to share some design element concepts that will be incorporated into the proposal.

241

242 The proposal is intended to be for a private, luxury, common-interest ownership 243 community; it is not intended to be developed for low-income or affordable 244 housing. With the current and upcoming trend we are looking to provide a 245 private community for all persons, not age-restricted, and be geared for the work-246 at-home working family. We want to provide a community that is maintenance-247 free in regard to lawn care and snow removal, and to provide recreational-use 248 amenities for the families living there. All buildings are to be detached homes; 249 these houses are to be separate residences to fit better with the rural setting and 250 the surrounding neighborhood. We want to provide for a village-type 251 community. Each house will be two to three bedrooms, single family dwellings 252 with attached garages, and with an expected value of north of \$300,000 per 253 house. There will not be any duplex-type or multi-family buildings like the 254 Mansions at Canyon Ridge. No one will be sharing a common wall. Houses will 255 be offered with home office concepts to facilitate with the new ongoing trend of 256 working from home. Landscape buffers and additional screening will be 257 implemented into the design to better screen or conceal the development, which 258 is already secluded.

259

260 And regarding access and traffic on Sullivan Farms Road and Eastwood Drive,

261

262 please know that as part of the Special Use Process a traffic analysis will be 263 required to address any potential impacts. The entrance will be located off of 264 Depot Street, in the exact location as the previously approved Quarry Meadows 265 Subdivision. And a secondary means of egress will be provided off the cul-de-266 sac for a gated emergency access only. I would like to emphasis that through 267 traffic on Sullivan Farm Road will not be allowed. And, again, for the record, 268 the intent is to limit traffic on Sullivan Farm Road and therefore provide no 269 traffic impact to that neighborhood by this development.

270

271 Adversely, if we were to continue development of the previously approved 272 Quarry Meadows Subdivision there then would be 48 more properties 273 contributing to the traffic flow through Sullivan Farm Road. Not to mention 274 opening the door to a cut-through to Depot Street and possible future 275 development of properties sitting north and east, which also connect to Hemlock 276 Court. This proposal eliminates these traffic and connectivity issues altogether, 277 and by removing the traffic as previously approved from going through an 278 established residential neighborhood, thus promoting the general objective of 279 public health, safety, and welfare.

280

During the design stage I'll be reaching out to the abutters and work with you to understand any concerns you may have and implement any design strategies to hopefully resolve those concerns. I am hopeful that we can work together.

284

285 In my opinion, the previously approved Quarry Meadows Subdivision should 286 also be considered a multi-family residential development that consisted of 48 287 units on the one piece of property. The term multi-family is misleading for this 288 application. Taken from Wikipedia, the definition for a multi-family residential 289 development is, in part, "a classification of housing where multiple housing units 290 are contained within one building, or, multiple housing units are contained within 291 one complex." This proposal is not an apartment complex scenario with multiple 292 units in one building like the Mansions, or Mill Pond. It is the complete 293 opposite. We are proposing multiple houses on one property which are all 294 single-family residences.

295

This proposal could also be characterized as a PRD, which is a Planned Residential Development for single family housing with open space conservation. But as you are aware this PRD falls under this Multi-Family Development Regulation. A Zone Change for the MFDD for this path would also be needed.

301

302 To the Commission, in your decision, please also consider the following:

• That we would have complete control over the income classification of

304 305

the housing, which would not impact the neighboring property values.

- That this proposal reduces Town maintenance acceptance for the roadway and storm drainage systems. This will be a private, common-ownership development and the Town will not be required to provide services for snow removal, or storm drainage maintenance; this will not be a Town road.
- That this proposal will provide families opportunities to reside in a community that will be maintenance-free in regards to snow removal and lawn care upkeep, as well as allow for the use of numerous amenities for recreational uses.
- That due to its location this development is remote, practically isolated and concealed from the rest of the community and keeps the rural character of the existing areas.
- That this property will be developed maintaining a rural atmosphere.
   This is the reason for the single-family residential home model and village-type concept.
  - That this proposal is consistent with the POCD, which urges village-type developments.
- That this proposal is also consistent with the POCD, which comments
   that increased residential density should be considered in the Broad
   Brook area.
- That this development will provide housing diversity for the town, as also outlined in the POCD.
  - And finally, that this proposal minimizes any traffic impact on Sullivan Farm Road by eliminating the cut-through to Depot Street and by eliminating future development possibilities to the north and the east.
- 330331

328

329

321

322

332 Again, we are eliminating the traffic on Sullivan Farm Road altogether. This, 333 sensibly, should be considered vs. the alternative. We could construct the 48 334 additional homes as previously approved. This would provide additional public 335 roads which would increase the Town's responsibility for maintenance of the 336 roadway and drainage systems, which could also increase taxes. This would 337 certainly eliminate the cul-de-sac that's out there. This would open connectivity 338 for Depot Street and Hemlock Court to the Sullivan Farm roads, and most likely, 339 there would be an impact to traffic for Sullivan Farm Road for the community. 340 Motor vehicles will be traveling through that neighborhood.

341

Looking back at the public's remarks at the last PZC Meeting I surmise that this is not what the community actually wants. As stated earlier, I have a personal attachment to the Sullivan Farm community, and I want to develop the property in a way that will least impact that neighborhood. I believe that I am providing this. Weighing everything out, this proposal makes the most sense. Following

347

348 the last Public Hearing I met with a few residents of the neighborhood to better 349 understand the issues. The two concerns that repeatedly came up were: 1) We 350 don't want more traffic, and 2) We don't want a Mill Pond in our back yard. Let 351 me say, I don't either. That is not what we are proposing. I do understand the 352 "not in my backyard" attitude, but this property has always been slated for 353 development, as everyone knows. This proposal will not be a Mill Pond, or even 354 considered for any type of apartment complex. These houses will all be 355 individual, single family residences, and what we are proposing is an 356 improvement to what was previously approved.

357

358 This proposal is nothing new to Broad Brook. We already have Millbrook 359 Condominiums off of Church Street, which is located within a residential area 360 and directly abuts a single-family residential subdivision. We have Hillside 361 Farms off of Depot Street, housing located adjacent to and across from several homes. Meadows Farms community, also off of Depot Street, which directly 362 363 abuts a rural subdivision known as Farms Road. Meadows Farms contains all 364 detached houses similar to what we are proposing. The Mansions at Canyon 365 Ridge – there are 220 luxury units built within a rural designated area. Scantic 366 Glen Condominiums, off of Old Ellington Road, there are 220 units that were 367 built within a rural designated area. And Norton Glen Condominiums, off of 368 Norton Road, also built within a rural designated area.

369

370 If you recall, I met with this Commission last October on a preliminary basis to 371 discuss the need to increase density to move forward with the development due 372 to the high construction costs. The initial concept you saw was received well. 373 Please keep in mind the rendering shown was only conceptual and was only to be 374 used as a talking point, nothing more. After speaking with several residents, and 375 seeing the public's voice, and who continued to voice their concerns my family 376 would like to revisit the design and see if we can develop the land in a way that 377 can accommodate our needs as well as address the community's concerns and 378 reservations. Maybe we can reach a compromise.

379

380 At this time, we are withdrawing the request to increase the density portion of the 381 text amendment. So instead of having four (4) units per acre as shown, we will be following the existing density limits outlined in the Zoning Regulations, 382 383 which is only two (2) units per acre. Doing the math, this drops the density 384 permitted by half. I want to produce an updated conceptual plan reflecting the 385 decrease in housing and show the community what Quarry Meadows could be. 386 But, I did not have time to do that for tonight's meeting. Therefore, I 387 respectfully request that this Public Hearing remain open, and be continued to 388 your next scheduled meeting so I can have the opportunity to provide this 389 additional information to you and the community.

390

- 391 I want to end this by saying this is not a multi-family development; it is a single-392 family development that unfortunately falls under the MFDD Regulation.
- 393
- Thank you for your time and consideration, and I look forward to working with everyone as we proceed on this proposal.
- 396
- 397 Thank you.
- 398
- 399 (Mr. Kement concluded his statement).
- 400

401 Attorney Smith indicated he will formalize, in writing, Mr. Kement's request to 402 withdraw that portion of the Text Amendment that provides for an increase in the 403 density within the MFDD, as we proposed specifically Section 802.6(b)(1). 404 Attorney Smith indicated they were also proposing a new sub-section "e", where the existing "e" would then become "f". Attorney Smith indicated they are 405 406 withdrawing their proposal for the new sub-section "e" of the regulations. He'll 407 modify the proposed regulation amendment, redline it, and send it to the 408 Commission, and provide a clean copy which can be posted on the website, 409 which anybody will be able to review.

410

411 Attorney Smith indicated the applicant is also respectfully requesting a 412 continuance of the Public Hearing. although, as the Chair pointed out at the 413 beginning of the hearing two weeks ago that a site-specific proposal is not before 414 the commission regarding this location, Mr. Kement would like to prepare a new 415 conceptual plan which would show a potential development proposal of the 416 property, with the Text Amendment and the Zone Change to the citizens and the 417 Commission. Attorney Smith indicated the new conceptual plan would be 418 different than what was shown to the Commission on a preliminary basis back in 419 October, 2020 and appeared in the Journal Inquirer. There is time for the 420 continuance so this additional information can be provided; if we do get that 421 conceptual drawing submitted it can be posted on the website, as well as the 422 modified Text Amendment.

- 423
- 424 Attorney Smith indicated he understood a protest petition had been filed, which 425 is being reviewed.
- 426

427 Attorney Smith indicated Mr. Kement and his family look forward to working
428 with the Commission and the community to hopefully come up with something
429 that works for everybody.

430

431 Chairman Ouellette noted this request is a game changer regarding the432 application the Commission has before them to consider. He noted there have

433

been numerous public comments, petitions have been submitted as part of the
public record, letters have been submitted which the Commissioners have
received. Chairman Ouellette indicated he would keep the Public Hearing open;
that's not debatable. Chairman Ouellette questioned the Commissioners if there
was any value to continue public comments tonight on something that might be
vastly different as we move forward?

440

Chairman Ouellette indicated his personal opinion would be to not take public
comments tonight, realizing that members of the community would have ample
opportunity to voice their opinions on something that will be vastly different than
something they've already looked at. Chairman Ouellette requested comments
from his fellow Commissioners.

- 446
- 447 <u>Commissioner Thurz</u> agreed with Chairman Ouellette.
- 448

449 Commissioner Gobin indicated she felt like the Commission has received a lot 450 of comments from the public; they were good questions. The applicant is 451 changing direction, but from what's been raised and from what she's been 452 thinking about she had a few questions she'd like to ask. She acknowledged 453 they might not get answered tonight, but they would be raised for part of the 454 record, and maybe for the Town Planner to think about in formulating where we 455 go from here. Commissioner Gobin indicated she'd like to raise her questions 456 on the record if that would be acceptable.

457

458 Commissioner Gowdy indicated that in his mind, first and foremost, it's a Zone 459 Change from R-3 to multi-family; he felt that's the primary consideration. He 460 cited Mr. Kement came up with great suggestions, which the Commission should 461 look at in detail, but for him, the Commission are members of the Planning and 462 Zoning. He wonders if the Commission does enough planning. Commissioner 463 Gowdy questioned if the Commission wants to have an R-3 Zone change so that 464 other districts in the community can be multi-family. His concern is the Zone 465 Change.

466

467 Chairman Ouellette suggested the question on the table is should the 468 Commission entertain additional public comments tonight; he didn't want to 469 rehash everything that's already on the public record; his preference was to hear 470 anything new – if the Commission chose to go down that road. He suggested 471 there would be even more questions before the Commission in two weeks. 472 Commissioner Gowdy concurred, but suggested the Commission was spending a 473 great deal of time on something that might not even be done if the Zone Change 474 doesn't go through. He felt the focus should be more on if the Zone Change is appropriate, not specifically to the Sullivan Farm area, just anywhere in the town. 475

476

477 <u>**Commissioner Kowalski**</u> concurred with Commissioner Gowdy, but felt the 478 area of consideration was the Text Amendment, which can be applied anywhere 479 in town. Commissioner Gowdy concurred with Commissioner Kowalski's 480 clarification; the Text Amendment would apply to the whole town. 481 Commissioner Kowalski questioned, procedurally, can we modify the 482 application, or do they need to reapply because they're asking for something 483 different than they originally proposed?

484

Regarding Chairman Ouellette's original question regarding public comments,
Commissioner Kowalski felt there was no sense in taking public comments on
something that we've been told will change. He cited no one on the Commission
now knows what the new change will be and can comment appropriately.

489

490 Chairman Ouellette referred to Interim Town Planner D'Amato to discuss the 491 procedural process going forward. He questioned if Interim Town Planner 492 D'Amato was in agreement with the Commission not entertaining any additional 493 public comments, keeping the Public Hearing open and moving forward with the 494 submission of new material within the next two weeks which is the 495 Commission's February 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

496

Interim Town Planner D'Amato felt keeping the Public Hearing open and doing nothing tonight is the cleanest. His concern is having any discussion amongst Commissioners or the applicant could potentially leave some comments or questions in purgatory because they may apply to the old application but not the modification. Because I want everyone to understand where we are, I'd rather wait to see what the modifications reflect, particularly because Mr. Kement has indicated he's going to try to be responsive to the concerns he's heard.

504

Regarding Commissioner Kowalski's comment, Interim Town Planner D'Amato noted that because the applicant's modification is more restrictive it can be modified while we're in progress; he can do that while the Public Hearing is open. If it were a modification less restrictive then we'd be back to square one.

509

510 Interim Town Planner D'Amato noted we also received a request from the 511 Ellington Planning and Zoning Commission, who met last night. They 512 respectfully requested that the Commission keep the Public Hearing open to 513 submit a memo reflecting their comments.

514

515 Interim Town Planner D'Amato also noted we did receive a petition from 516 residents in the area and, per Statutes, once we verify the numbers and the 517 percentages are correct, it likely will trigger a super-majority vote. Staff will 518 have more information regarding the petition for the next meeting.

519

520 Interim Town Planner D'Amato reported the next meeting is the last date the 521 Commission can have the Public Hearing open without an extension from the 522 applicant. He would like a good faith confirmation from the applicant that if the 523 Commission holds this Public Hearing open to hear their requests that they/the 524 applicant would be willing to grant those extensions going forward so the 525 Commission has time to consider the new information being proposed.

526

Attorney Smith, for the record, consents to whatever extensions are necessary. Attorney Smith indicated they will offer an extension until February 24<sup>th</sup>, which would be the day following the Commission's next meeting, in a written correspondence with Interim Town Planner D'Amato tomorrow. Attorney Smith clarified the extension was not necessary until after February 9<sup>th</sup>.

532

533 Chairman Ouellette reiterated the Commission's plan for proceeding with these 534 Public Hearings. He noted the Commission has not taken a vote on either application. We will continue the Public Hearing until February 9<sup>th</sup>, at which 535 536 time the applicant will be making another application similar to that which has 537 already been heard. He understands it will be a revised design which is intended 538 to address community concerns. They have withdrawn the Text Amendment 539 because the density isn't changing. Even though the Hearing is being moved to 540 February there will still be the full amount of time to talk about this. The Public 541 Hearing is still open, but we won't take public comment tonight; if you want to 542 submit a letter to the Planning and Development Office for the public record, 543 please do so.

544

545 Chairman Ouellette requested a motion to continue both Public Hearings until
 546 February 9<sup>th</sup>.

547

548 Understanding that the requirement to close the Public Hearing is February 9<sup>th</sup> 549 with an extension to the 23<sup>rd</sup> Jason Bowza questioned if the residents who have 550 concerns will have sufficient time to review the revised plans even prior to the 551 closing of the extended hearing? Chairman Ouellette indicated it was his 552 understanding that they will, but if the Commission is forced to make a decision 553 based on what we have now he doesn't see the Commission members approving 554 this request because we won't have ample time to appropriately react to this.

555

556 Chairman Ouellette reiterated his request for a motion to continue the Public 557 Hearings until February 9<sup>th</sup>.

558

559 <u>**Commissioner Gobin**</u> agreed to moving the motion, but questioned if she could 560 put some questions on the record for the Town Planner? Chairman Ouellette 561 cited Commissioner Gobin was allowed to have discussions administratively

562

568

573

575

581

with Staff; it's your prerogative. Commissioner Gobin agreed to that suggestion.
Interim Town Planner D'Amato suggested if Commissioner Gobin discussed her
questions with he and Town Planner Chapin then they'll respond in writing for
the record so the information will be available for everyone. Commissioner
Gobin agreed.

569 Chairman Ouellette clarified he wasn't trying to be difficult, but he was trying to 570 be consistent in giving everyone an opportunity to comment at the appropriate 571 time. Commissioner Gobin indicated she had some questions that needed to be 572 answered and she wanted to give Town staff time to do that.

- 574 Commissioner Gobin offered the following motion:
- 576MOTION:To CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING on Application PZ 2020-20577SJK Properties, LLC Text Amendment Application to East Windsor578Zoning Regulations Section 802 Multi Family Development District579(MFDD) <u>AND</u> PZ-2020-21, SJK Properties, LLC Zone Change580Application, zone change from R-3 to MFDD.
- 582Map 100, Block 77, Lots: 006-01, 006-02, 006-03, 006-04, 006-58305, 006-06, 006-07, Map 100, Block 77, Lots: 006-01, 006-02,584006-03, 006-04, 006-05, 006-06, 006-07, 006-08, 006-09, 006-10,585006-36, 006-37, 006-38, 006-39, 006-40, 006-41, 006-42, 006-43,586006-44, 006-45, 006-46, 006-47, 009-02B, 009, 009-11, 009-12,587009-13
- 588589Map 110, Block 77, Lots, 009-14, 009-15, 009-16, 009-17, 009-59018, 009-19, 009-20, 009-21, 009-22, 009-23, 009-24, 009-25,591006-26, 006-27, 006-28,006-29, 006-30, 006-31, 006-32, 006-33,592006-34, 006-35, 006-34A
- 594Map 090, Block 77, Lots: 006-48, 006, 006A, 006B.Public595Hearing continued until the Commission's regularly scheduled596meeting on February 9, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. via ZOOM.597
- 598 Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION: None.
- 599 VOTE (by show of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz
   600 (No one opposed/No Abstentions)
- 601

593

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

605

607

606 Chairman Ouellette read the description of this item of business.

- Tim Coon, of J. R. Russo & Associates, LLC, representing the applicant, United Ag &
   Turf Northeast, joined the meeting virtually.
- 610

Mr. Coon indicated the subject of the application is a 7-acre portion of the 88-acre parcel located at 111 South Main Street. The parcel is located on the east side of Route 5, across the street from Winton Road, and north of Phelps Road. Mr. Coon indicated the 7acre portion of the parcel contains three zones, 250' at Route 5 is zoned TZ-5, to the rear of that the zone changes to R-3, and changes to A-1 beyond that. Mr. Coon indicated the TZ-5 Zone is a transitional zone, which currently allows for commercial and business uses, while the R-3 allows for high density residential development.

618

Mr. Coon noted that United Ag & Turf Northeast currently operates as Stanton Equipment at 105 South Main Street to the north of the subject parcel. They want to rezone a portion of 111 South Main Street to be able to relocate their current business to the new location; their intent is to build a new facility and expand the business at the 111 South Main Street location. The requested Zone Change would abut the remaining vacant land of the current owner, and the parking lot owned by Southern Auto Auction.

625

Mr. Coon indicated that the parcel at 111 South Main Street is currently served by publicwater, sewer, electric, and gas.

628

629 Mr. Coon suggested the requested Zone Change is in harmony with the surrounding area, and is also in harmony with the POCD, which speaks to transitioning the residential 630 631 parcels to business uses along the Route 5 Corridor, while seeking to minimize impact to 632 residential properties. Mr. Coon indicated the only real residential property nearby is the 633 property to the rear, which is owned by Lawrence Farm, who also owns the subject 634 parcel; they are aware of the proposal and support it. He noted the POCD suggests that 635 area should be assessed in conjunction with the CRCOG Route 5 Corridor Study, which 636 recommends more commercial and less residential development be proposed. Mr. Coon 637 noted that at the previous PZC Meeting Mr. Ussery presented a similar Zone Change 638 application for 87 South Main Street. During that presentation Mr. Ussery had also 639 suggested more commercial development than the POCD recommended, and noted the 640 CRCOG study referenced a conceptual development map (Site 5, Industrial Park) 641 reflecting commercial development for the site of this parcel at 111 South Main Street. 642 Mr. Coon suggested the current Zone Change proposal is consistent with that 643 recommendation as it begins the commercial use at the front of the parcel.

644

645 Mr. Coon cited one of the concerns pointed out by Interim Town Planner D'Amato was 646 development of the front of the parcel as a commercial use could limit access, and 647 therefore development, to the rear. There is contiguous land of Lawrence Farms to this

648

649 parcel, so they would have frontage to Phelps Road, and the way they've configured the 650 Zone Change it allows for access, and an access road, to Route 5 across from Winton 651 Road. They believe opportunities for future development of the rear of the parcel, 652 whether it's residential under the current zoning, or commercial resulting from the Route 653 5 Corridor study, still exist; they don't believe it will impede the potential for 654 development of the land to the rear.

655

Mr. Coon suggested they feel this proposed Zone Change is in harmony with the POCD, as well as the Route 5 Corridor Study, and is in harmony with the surrounding neighborhood. He reiterated the infrastructure is there, and that this can be developed as TZ-5 with minimal impact to surrounding residential properties.

- 661 Chairman Ouellette opened discussion to the Commission.
- 662 663

680

660

#### <u>Commissioner Gobin:</u>

• Location clarification/abutter transparency: 664 Commissioner Gobin questioned if the parcel she believes is Lot #63 residential? 665 Mr. Coon indicated he believed there are two houses located to the rear of the current 666 Stanton Equipment location. Commissioner Gobin questioned if the cul-de-667 668 sac shown on the map was South Road; Mr. Coon replied affirmatively, noting there are residential properties within 500 feet of the proposed Zone 669 Change. Commissioner Gobin questioned if the residents at Lot #63, Lot #64, 670 671 and the residents on South Road are aware of this proposal? Mr. Coon indicated notifications were sent out to abutters within 500 feet in accordance 672 673 with the Town's requirements; proof of same was submitted to the Planning 674 Office. Commissioner Gobin questioned if the red circle would be subject to the 500 feet? Mr. Coon replied affirmatively; he noted South Road fell 675 676 outside the 500-foot notification area so those residents did not receive 677 specific notification. Commissioner Gobin questioned if the residents in the condominium complex on Winton Road were notified? 678 Mr. Coon replied affirmatively. 679

#### 681 Commissioner Thurz:

682 • Access to Phelps Road: Commissioner Thurz requested Mr. Coon show the 683 access from Phelps Road to get to the back of the larger parcel. Mr. Coon 684 indicated as you continue down Phelps Road past South Road there's an open field that fronts on Phelps Road where an old tobacco barn used to be located; 685 there was a farm road that went to the tobacco barn that provided access off of 686 687 Phelps Road. Mr. Coon also suggested the rear of the parcel is subject to wetlands. He recalled an application made through the Wetlands Commission 688 689 in 2012 which proposed residential development/apartments for the entire 690 parcel. Access was provided via a through road from South Main Street out

- 691
- 692to Phelps Road. The Wetlands Application was approved; the application693never proceeded to the Planning and Zoning Commission level. There is the694ability to provide access out to Phelps Road if necessary.
- 695

697

696 **<u>Commissioner Gowdy</u>** is fine with the proposal as submitted.

#### 698 Commissioner Kowalski:

- 699 • Southern Parking lot clarification/buffer Auto requirement: 700 Commissioner Kowalski questioned if the Southern Auto Parking lot would Commissioner 701 remain an R-3 Zone? Mr. Coon replied affirmatively. 702 Kowalski questioned if that would then require a 150-foot buffer from the TZ-703 5 Zone? Mr. Coon suggested the TZ-5 buffer is 100 feet, which can be 704 reduced to up to 50 feet. Mr. Coon suggested they would likely request the 705 reduction as the parcel is abutting a parking lot.
- Location of commercial operations: Commissioner Kowalski questioned if
   they plan to operate out of the existing building, or just the new building?
   Mr. Coon felt the operations would be concentrated at the new location.
   Commissioner Kowalski questioned if we anticipate equipment traffic
   between the two locations? Mr. Coon indicated he didn't know the intent of
   the use of the existing building. He apologized that the applicant was unable
   to attend this meeting to answer questions.
- 713714 Chairman Ouellette:
- 715 • Clarification of zone line designation: Chairman Ouellette referenced the 716 map with the red circle, which indicates "proposed zone line"; he questioned 717 what's the strategy for drawing the zone line as you have in the R-3 Zone rather than keeping it going due north to bisect, or terminate somewhere 718 719 between Lots #63 and #64 at the top of the page? Mr. Coon indicated the applicant/United Ag & Turf is looking to purchase 7 acres, and this 720 721 configuration provides that amount of area. It would leave the remaining land 722 as it is under the current/Lawrence Farms ownership. The current owner 723 could decide to propose a similar Zone Change to commercial in the future, or 724 purse residential development as well.
- Potential future development options: Chairman Ouellette noted if this Zone
   Change were to be approved there's nothing restricting the owner actually
   pursuing a residential development out back? Mr. Coon concurred with
   Chairman Ouellette's assessment.
- 729
- 730 Chairman Ouellette requested comments from Interim Town Planner D'Amato.
- 731
- 732 Interim Town Planner D'Amato suggested the reason why the access to Phelps Road isn't

733

jumping out to people is because it's contiguous acreage, but it's another parcel. So,when you select the parcel it's not all one piece but it's contiguous.

736

737 Interim Town Planner D'Amato also noted that although this has come through as a Zone 738 Change application it's not really a zone change; TZ-5 already exists on the property. He 739 suggested you have this weird discrepancy in what the POCD says, what the Route 5 740 Study says, what the existing zoning already has, and it doesn't all match. He also noted 741 that the pre-existing zone line, which was pre-set on this parcel, when you take out the 742 State right-of-way and the setbacks you probably couldn't construct a building there; it's 743 not wide enough. While the applicant is increasing the TZ-5 Zone Interim Town Planner 744 D'Amato questioned an applicant's ability to develop the area under the current bulk 745 requirements for the zone. Mr. Coon concurred, noting the TZ-5 line goes back 250 feet 746 so after taking out the front and rear setbacks you're limited as to what you can do with 747 the piece. Chairman Ouellette suggested that gets back to his earlier question of the 748 location of the TZ-5/R-3 zone line on Lot #61; if it makes sense or makes the property 749 more marketable to move the line due north? Mr. Coon noted the TZ-5 opens up parcels 750 for commercial development, but he questioned if it puts more limitations on residential 751 development.

752

Chairman Ouellette noted this application is a Public Hearing; he opened discussion tothe public.

755

Jim Platt (?) and Amie Olschafskie, Lot #64/107A South Main Street: Mr. Platt
questioned where are they proposing the road? He got to the part where he was talking
about the old barns, which are gone. Will they come in far from there, or will they be
coming in next to the cul-de-sac area?

760

761 Mr. Coon indicated they aren't proposing to bring in a road at this time. The issue they 762 were discussing would be a potential access road to provide future development in the 763 back, and potentially the area that abuts your property. Mr. Coon indicated that's all 764 future speculation; we don't know how that land will be developed. Mr. Coon referenced 765 the area of the proposed Zone Change. Mr. Platt felt that wouldn't affect them; he 766 requested clarification that they would still be coming in from the front on South Main 767 Street? Mr. Coon replied affirmatively. Mr. Platt referenced Lot #62 and the TZ-5 Zone, 768 noting that's actually the entrance in for Lot #64 and Lot #63; he requested clarification 769 that nothing is going to change that? Mr. Coon indicated they aren't proposing any 770 changes on Lot #62.

771

772 **Carla Dawson, (lives in the condominiums off of Winton Road)**: Ms. Dawson cited 773 the traffic in the area has always been a concern; will there be an increase in traffic due to 774 this proposal? Will there be large trucks going in and out? Ms. Dawson noted trying to

- 775
- 776 get in and out from Winton Road onto Route 5 without a traffic light has always been a 777 big concern.
- 778

779 Mr. Coon noted this isn't a Site Plan application; they're just doing a Zone Change 780 application. The area out front is currently zoned TZ-5; they're looking to expand it a 781 little to accommodate the relocation of United Ag & Turf. Mr. Coon assumed the traffic 782 at Stanton Equipment would be comparable to what you could expect for United Ag & 783 Turf, Ms. Dawson questioned if they would be expanding the number of employees? 784 Mr. Coon indicated he wouldn't know that until they get into the Site Plan approval 785 process, which would come back before the Commission under a Special Use Permit 786 application

- 787 788 Chairman Ouellette queried the public again; no one requested to speak.
- 789

790 Chairman Ouellette questioned the Commission if they have enough information to 791 consider closing the Public Hearing this evening. The consensus of the Commission was 792 they had the information they needed, and were ok with closing the Public Hearing. 793

- 794 **MOTION:** To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING on Application PZ-2021-01, 111 795 South Main Street (Map 052, Block 20, Lot 061) Zone Change 796 Application, United Ag & Turf Northeast for a zone change from R-3 797 to TZ5.
- 798

799 Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

#### 800 VOTE (by show of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz 801 (No one opposed/No Abstentions)

- 802
- 803 No action taken by the Commission this evening; motion for consideration to be 804 prepared for the next meeting.
- 805

806 **NEW BUSINESS:** None.

807

808 OLD BUSINESS/A. PZ-2020-22, 89 Bridge Street (Map 111, Block 12, Lot 002) Site 809 Plan Application for a 5,400 SF addition to the existing firehouse and parking lot. Zone 810 B-1. Owner/Applicant: Warehouse Point Fire District.

811

812 Chairman Ouellette read the description of this item of business.

813

814 Joining the Commission virtually to discuss this application was Tim Coon, of J. R.

815 Russo & Associates, LLC, representing the applicant, the Warehouse Point Fire District.

- Also joining the Commission was James Barton, Chief of the Warehouse Point Fire 816
- Department. 817

818

819 Mr. Coon indicated he made his main presentation at the previous Commission meeting. 820 He has made the following revisions to the Site Plan proposal: 821 • Added lighting locations for the building mounted fixtures; cuts of the fixtures 822 have been provided to Interim Town Planner D'Amato. 823 • Updated the Architectural renderings to show the false window locations on the 824 south and east side; a cupola has been added to the roof of the addition as well. 825 • A note has been added to the plan stating the existing landscape island around the 826 sign, which includes shrubs and flowers, will be relocated along with the sign; the location of the sign and island is now shown on the plan. There will be low 827 828 landscaping along the sign frontage to address the concerns for visibility of fire 829 trucks exiting the station and vehicles approaching on Route 140. 830 831 Regarding the additional trees, which Town Planner D'Amato proposed as a condition of 832 approval, Mr. Coon referenced Chief Barton's comment at the previous meeting; due to 833 limited space and the concern for visibility for trucks along the frontage, they would 834 prefer not to have to put those trees in. Mr. Coon recalled a couple of the 835 Commissioners being ok with that; their preference would be to NOT install the 836 additional trees. 837 838 Chairman Ouellette noted the Commission hasn't the flexibility to waive regulation 839 requirements; he questioned how the Commission might address that request regarding 840 the landscaping requirement moving forward? 841 842 Mr. Coon suggested this is a redevelopment project. The requirement is for trees every 843 50 feet around the parcel; they can't comply with that requirement. He noted there are 844 currently a few trees existing along the eastern property line but there are none to the 845 north or south or up against the bank; he questioned that they had the room to plant any 846 additional trees. Mr. Coon suggested there may be an opportunity to plant a couple of 847 trees along the frontage on the northeast corner but noted there are a couple there already. 848 He questioned if those existing trees could be considered to meet the requirements of the 849 regulations if this were to be considered a redevelopment project? 850 851 For the record, Chairman Ouellette suggested if the applicant were anyone different he 852 felt Mr. Coon's argument would be a non-starter; it doesn't fly. Chairman Ouellette 853 opened discussion to his colleagues. 854 855 **Commissioner Thurz** felt Mr. Coon didn't answer the question about the landscaping; 856 he side-stepped it. For public safety Commissioner Thurz loves the expansion of the fire 857 house but he questioned how the Commission could make that happen. He noted in the 858 past the Commission could waive the landscaping requirements, and he would be fine 859 with that, but he questioned how the Commission could make that happen legally. 860

861

862 Commissioner Thurz indicated he's good with the expansion of the building and moving 863 the sign.

864

Commissioner Gowdy felt it's a no-brainer. This is for the health, safety, and welfare of 865 866 the community. Commissioner Gowdy reluctantly disagreed with Chairman Ouellette.

867

Commissioner Gobin indicated she likes the cupola on the roof, as it offers architectural 868 869 details. Commissioner Gobin also liked the landscaping around the sign, but didn't see 870 why two small, decorative trees which aren't tall couldn't be included in the landscaping. 871 Commissioner Gobin felt the regulations require the trees; they should put them in.

872 Commissioner Gobin indicated she had no other comments regarding the Site Plan

- 873 design.
- 874

875 **Commissioner Kowalski** questioned how specific the regulations are regarding the size 876 and diameter of the street trees? Chairman Ouellette deferred to Interim Town Planner 877 D'Amato, who indicated he's pushing for the landscaping because he felt this is a really 878 important site component. He recalled that with every site Mr. Coon has come in with 879 he's pushed for landscaping. Interim Town Planner D'Amato suggested he didn't feel it 880 needed to be street trees; that was his suggestion based on the fact that they're removing 881 2 trees from the property line. He's fine with them putting them in a spot where they 882 feel they won't create a sightline hazard and sizing them so the type of tree won't become 883 an issue. Commissioner Kowalski questioned if a pair of miniature Japanese Maples 884 would satisfy the regulations; Interim Town Planner D'Amato concurred by shaking his 885 head in agreement. He felt that would be an acceptable compromise as it would satisfy 886 the regulations and maintain the public safety regarding the sightlines.

887

888 Chairman Ouellette asked Mr. Coon if there was any place to add the two trees, which the 889 Commission doesn't have the ability to waive. Mr. Coon deferred to Chief Barton, 890 noting they appreciate the offer of the ornamental trees which would be smaller and less intrusive.

- 891
- 892

893 Chief Barton questioned how many people have walked the site? He recalled the need to 894 comply with the Wetlands regulations, and the installation of the retention basin; he felt 895 there was no place to put in the additional trees every 50 feet at a 3-inch caliper. Chief 896 Barton suggested perhaps they could add a little tree out by the sign, as long as its not 897 above 6 feet. Chairman Ouellette felt there was some flexibility in the regulations to 898 interpret the type and height and size of the landscaping; he suggested the Commission would never create an obstacle for the fire department, or create another hazard, just to 899 900 satisfy a regulation. Chief Barton noted they would be doing the island around the relocated sign; that's intended to have annual flowers and trees and shrubbery around it. 901 902 He noted putting anything along the Blue Ditch creates a problem because the State

903

comes along to clean that out periodically; location is also a problem with the snowplowing. He noted they had to obtain variances to construct this addition.

906

907 Chairman Ouellette questioned Interim Town Planner D'Amato if the trees around the sign would constitute the landscaping requirement under Section 600? Interim Town 908 909 Planner D'Amato indicated the language says it requires "properties developed in this 910 zone to provide landscaping on the portions of the site that are not covered by impervious 911 surfaces", it also requires "trees 3 inches in caliper be provided for each 50 feet. Interim 912 Town Planner D'Amato felt the regulations require much more than is being requested. 913 He noted in his suggested motion it says "the plan shall be revised to include two street 914 trees"; he suggested that condition could be adjusted to say "the plans shall be revised to 915 include additional landscaping as determined to be appropriate in consultation with Town 916 staff." Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated his intent was to establish a baseline 917 that all sites should have to provide landscaping of some kind. If trees are going to be too 918 high and maintenance is going to be a problem then they can provide landscaping of 919 some other kind in between the proposed parking lot and the roadway. He felt that 920 particularly in conjunction with the Warehouse Point Planning Study we need to be 921 consistent with the regulations.

922

923 Chief Barton suggested if it would help he'd take the island from around the sign and he
924 would continue the landscaping all along those parking spots, and put low landscaping in
925 there – make it almost like the islands with the short bushes along the road at Geissler's.
926 Mr. Coon suggested extending a bark mulch island between the parking and the street
927 frontage; Commissioner Gobin suggested planting something like hydrangeas which stay
928 low.

929

930 Chairman Ouellette noted condition #5 currently references street trees; he requested a 931 revised condition. Interim Town Planner D'Amato felt the proposal was fine, realizing 932 the regulations don't have a caveat for fire apparatus leaving a site; this is a unique 933 circumstance. His revision for condition #5 should be something along the lines that "the 934 plans shall be revised to expand the landscape island along the sign along the parking 935 area adjacent to Bridge Street to the satisfaction of Town staff."

936

Interim Town Planner D'Amato also noted the Commission talked about reviewing the
proposal with Terri Hahn. She has provided 10 recommendations for the Commission's
consideration. Interim Town Planner D'Amato noted this is a Site Plan modification,
which limits what the Commission can ask for, but Mrs. Hahn's recommendations show
us what we should consider when developing Warehouse Point under the finalized
Planning Study. Interim Town Planner D'Amato shared Mrs. Hahn's comments:

943
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
949
949
940
940
940
940
941
941
941
942
942
943
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944
944

945

946	2. Provide a sidewalk along the Bridge Street Frontage.		
947	3. CONNDOT application should include definition of sidewalk across open drive		
948	pavement (typically flush concrete with truck loading psi)		
949	4. New parking area should be pervious pavement.		
950	5. Suggest a berm along the southeast corner and along the church property to rear		
951	of new building so that overflow of basin during highwater conditions of the Blue		
952	Ditch can not contribute to flooding on Church property.		
953	6. Highly recommend Access and Maintenance Easement along Blue Ditch (eastern		
954	property line) in favor of Town.		
955	7. Provide sidewalk from street to front door		
956	8. Recommend providing better definition of front door( plaza, etc.) on ground plane		
957	and as visible form street.		
958	9. Existing accessible parking does not meet 2010 ADA Requirements with respect		
959	to access aisle/accessible path. there is no van accessible space defined which is		
960	required.		
961	10. Suggest planting along the back of the building to define property line.		
962	Chief Barton noted their handicapped access is on the west side of the building near the		
963	Bank building.		
964	~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
965	Commissioner Thurz suggested the comments are good, but he noted the limited space		
966	for this addition. Commissioner Gobin concurred that the comments are good, but this		
967	application came in prior to the adoption of the Warehouse Point Planning Study. She		
968	agreed with Interim Town Planner D'Amato that for future development we need to		
969	make it clear up front. Chairman Ouellette suggested it would have been helpful to have		
970 071	a pre-application discussion prior to submission of this proposal. He noted he had no		
971 072	idea this project was in the works prior to the application appearing under the receipt of		
972 072	applications. He cited the benefit of discussing some of the opportunities for the site with the Commission recognizing its limitations. The consensus of the Commission		
973 974	the Commission, recognizing its limitations. The consensus of the Commission concurred with Chairman Ouellette.		
	concurred with Chanman Oueneue.		
975 076	Chairman Quallette quaried the Commission for additional comments. Commission		
976 077	Chairman Ouellette queried the Commission for additional comments. Commissioner		
977 078	Kowalski requested Interim Town Planner D'Amato repeat his revision for condition #5.		
978 979	Interim Town Planner D'Amato read the following: "The plans shall be revised to include the landscape island along the sign clong the parking area adjacent to Bridge		
979 980	include the landscape island along the sign along the parking area adjacent to Bridge Street to the satisfaction of Town staff."		
980 981			
981 982	Chairman Ouellette called for a motion.		
982 983			
983 984	MOTION TO APPROVE:		
984 985			
705			

MEETING MINUTES		
	oplication #PZ 2020-22 for Site Plan Approval. Map 111, Block 12, Lot 5, n as 89 Bridge St. Applicant/Owner: Warehouse Point Fire Department. B-1	
This a	pproval is granted subject to the conformance with referenced plans (as may be	
modified by the Commission and this approval) and the following		
condit	ions/modifications.	
Refere	enced Plans	
	<ol> <li>"Warehouse Point Fire Department Building Addition" 89 Bridge St. Prepared by J.R. Russo &amp; Assoc. Sheets 1-5. Dated:11-2-20.</li> </ol>	
	Rev: 12-3-20 B-1 Zone	
	<ol> <li>"Addition to Warehouse Point Fire Department" Exterior Elevations, Jager Associates LLC, Dated 12-10-20.</li> </ol>	
Condi	itions which must be met prior to signing mylars:	
	1. A copy of this approval motion has been incorporated into the	
	plans	
	2. A copy of the final approved plans with any necessary revisions shall be submitted to the Planning & Development Office for review and comment.	
	3. All final plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and	
	live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.	
	4. The conditions of this approval shall be binding upon the	
	applicant, landowners, and their successors and assigns.	
	<b>5.</b> The plans shall be revised to include an expanded landscaping island along the front parking lot to the satisfaction of Town Staff.	
Condi	itions which must be met prior to the issuance of any permits:	
	1. One set of final mylars, with all necessary revisions shall be	
	provided to the Planning and Development Office. A copy of this	
	approval motion shall be incorporated.	
	2. A single, PDF copy of the final plans, with all necessary revisions	
	shall be provided to the Planning and Development Office.	
	<b>3.</b> A zoning permit has been obtained from the Planning and Development Office for the project.	
	<ol> <li>An Erosion Control Bond has been provided, such estimate shall</li> </ol>	
	be reviewed and approved by the Town Engineer.	
	itions which must be met prior to the issuance of a Certificate of	
Comp	liance:	

1032		
1032	1	Final grading, stabilization and seeding shall be in place or
1035	1.	adequate bond filed with the Town for the unfinished work.
1034		dequate bond filed with the rown for the unfillished work.
1035	2	One electronic PDF and paper copy of the final as-built survey
1030	2.	showing structures, pins, driveways, final floor elevations and spot
1037		grades shall be submitted.
1030		grades shan be submitted.
1040	General Condi	tions:
1041 1042	1	In accordance with Section 000 2(h) of the Zoning Deculations
1042	1.	In accordance with Section 900.3(h) of the Zoning Regulations, the construction of any buildings associated with this approval
1043		shall commence within one year of this approval date and all
1044		improvements shall be completed within five years. Such approval
1046		shall otherwise be null and void unless an extension has been
1047		granted by the Commission.
1048	2.	This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance
1049		with the final plans. Minor modifications to the approved plans
1050		that result in lesser impacts may be allowed subject to staff review
1051		and approval.
1052	3.	Any modifications to the proposed drainage or grading as depicted
1053		on the site plan are subject to review and approval by the Town
1054		Engineer.
1055	4.	Additional erosion control measures may be required by Town
1056		staff if field conditions necessitate.
1057	5.	By acceptance of this approval and its conditions, the applicant,
1058		owner and/or their successors and assigns acknowledge the right
1059		of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for
1060		the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this
1061		approval.
1062	6.	The approval granted by the East Windsor Inland Wetland and
1063		Watercourses Agency is hereby incorporated into this approval.
1064		Any deviations from plans approved by the IWWA shall be
1065		subject to the requirements of the Inland Wetlands and
1066		Watercourses Agency Regulations.
1067		
1068		Thurz seconded/ <u>DISCUSSION:</u> None.
1069	VOTE (by show	w of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz
1070		(No one opposed/No Abstentions)
1071		
1072		SS/B. <u>PZ-2020-19, 198 South Main Street</u> (Map 022, Block 05, Lot
1073		Application for the demolition of an existing house and construction of a
1074	9,600 SF buildin	ng and parking lot for an automobile workshop. Zone B-2. (continued to
1075	February 9):	
1076	•	
1077		

#### 1078

1084

1091

1079 Chairman Ouellette read the description of this item of business. He noted that although
1080 this item has appeared on the agenda this evening the applicant has requested discussion
1081 be continued to the next meeting. Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated the applicant
1082 has requested the additional time to address the questions raised by the Commission at
1083 the previous meeting.

- 1085MOTION:To CONTINUE Application PZ 2020-19 198 South Main Street (Map1086022, Block 05, Lot 079) Site Plan Application for the demolition of an1087existing house and construction of a 9,600 SF building and parking lot1088for an automobile workshop. Zone B-2.1089the Commission's next regularly scheduled meeting on February 9,10902021 at 6:30 p.m. via ZOOM.
- 1092 Gobin moved/Gowdy seconded/*DISCUSSION:* None.

1093 VOTE (by show of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz
 1094 (No one opposed/No Abstentions)
 1095

- 1096 <u>OLD BUSINESS/C. PZ-2020-18, 87 South Main Street</u> (Map 052, Block 20, Lots 029, 1097
  1097 069) Zone Change Application, TZ6, R-3, and A-1 to TZ5 and A-1. Owner/Applicant:
  1098 David Mason:
- 1099

Chairman Ouellette read the description of this item of business, noting the reference tozone TZ6 in the agenda was a topo.

1102

1107

1103 Chairman Ouellette recalled that the Commission had closed the Public Hearing at the 1104 previous meeting. They continued the application as they wanted time to consider 1105 the comments and information presented, and to give Interim Town Planner D'Amato 1106 time to prepare a Staff memo.

Chairman Ouellette queried the Commissioners for comments or questions to beaddressed by Staff? No one requested an opportunity to speak.

# 1111 MOTION TO APPROVE:

- Application #PZ 2020-18 Zone Change Application, A-1 and R-3 to TZ5. 87
- 1113 South Main St. Applicant, Dave Mason.
- 1114
- 1115 This approval is granted subject to the conformance with referenced plans (as may be
- 1116 modified by the Commission and this approval) and the following
- 1117 conditions/modifications.

1118

# 1119 **Referenced Plans:**

1120	
1121	1. Zone Change Map, 87 South Main Street: Prepared by J.R. Russo &
1122	Associates for Dave Mason. sheet 1 of
1123	1. Dated November 23, 2020.
1124	Conditions:
1125	1. This approval does not constitute approval of a site development plan
1126	or permit for any construction on the property. No future use or
1127	occupancy is expressed or implied by the granting of this application.
1128	
1129	2. A copy of this approval shall be incorporated into the plan and a PDF
1130	copy shall be provided to the Planning and Development Office for
1131	review and comment.
1132	3. Following a review by the Planning and Development Office, a
1133	single mylar plan shall be prepared for endorsement by the
1134	Chairman and Secretary of the Planning and Zoning Commission.
1135	Following endorsement of the plans, the mylar shall be filed in
1136	the Town Clerk's Office.
1137	
1138	Gobin moved/Kowalski seconded/DISCUSSION: Chairman Ouellette noted the Zone
1139	Change is consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development.
1140	VOTE (by show of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz
1141	(No one opposed/No Abstentions)
1142	
1143	OLD BUSINESS/D. Warehouse Point Planning Study to include Terri Hahn of
1144	LADA P.C. Land Planners:
1145	
1146	Terri Hahn, of LADA P.C. Land Planners, joined the Board virtually. She noted the final
1147	report has been completed; paper copies and digital copies have been provided to the
1148	Planning Office.
1149	
1150	Mrs. Hahn reported that as a result of the discussions at the last meeting, she has added a
1151	couple of items to the final report that she'd like to review with the Commissioners.
1152	
1153	> <b>Discussion checklist</b> : Mrs. Hahn suggested this checklist will facilitate
1154	discussions with an applicant regarding their proposed project. The focus is that
1155	anything that can be done during an application process to facilitate components
1156	of the Warehouse Point Study should be considered. The checklist briefly raises
1157	questions about proximity to the Blue Ditch, is it located on Main Street or Bridge
1157	Street (the commercial district), consideration for sidewalks or street trees, is
1150	there room for a bike lane, and other discussion items. Mrs. Hahn suggested the
1160	idea of creating a village center is you will have more people walking around the
1160 1161	idea of creating a village center is you will have more people walking around the area than you might think – people walking to work, to services, from one
1160	idea of creating a village center is you will have more people walking around the

1164

1167

1179

1191

- plantings. She noted she chose 50 feet of frontage because most of theWarehouse Point properties only have 50 feet of frontage.
- 1168 Commissioner Kowalski questioned if, when considering the placement of the 1169 street trees, should the Commission consider which side of the street the power lines are located on? He foresaw problems in the future if the street trees 1170 1171 interfered with the power lines. Mrs. Hahn clarified that the intent wasn't to 1172 require street/lawn/sidewalk tree; in some cases your street tree might be back 1173 towards the building. The location doesn't have to be within the road right-of-1174 way. The intent isn't to provide quantity, but rather to provide enough green to 1175 provide differentiation. Commissioner Kowalski questioned if the term "street tree" was a misnomer? Mrs. Hahn indicated that in her vocabulary street tree is a 1176 kind of tree, not necessarily the location. It's a tree designed to have a canopy, or 1177 be a flowering tree, or be smaller, or be a shrub. 1178
- 1180 Discussion continued regarding location vs. function. Mrs. Hahn indicated she 1181 wasn't wedded to the trees being planted next to the sidewalk, her intention is that they be planted in the front yard. Commissioner Kowalski questioned if 1182 1183 rephrasing the language to "deciduous trees" would be better; Mrs. Hahn replied affirmatively. Chairman Ouellette cited that distinction is excellent information; 1184 1185 he suggested that evergreen trees wouldn't meet the requirement. Mrs. Hahn 1186 reported that evergreen trees aren't deciduous but were used historically during 1187 the Civil War and beyond. She noted she doesn't have a problem with using 1188 evergreens, but street trees are usually salt-tolerant, evergreens are not. Chairman 1189 Ouellette clarified that in Mrs. Hahn's mind street trees are another way of saying 1190 front yard trees; Mrs. Hahn agreed.
- **Build-to line Map:** Mrs. Hahn suggested she began to think what the 1192 1193 Commission would need to implement these regulations. Another point of 1194 clarification is the "build-to" line is the historic placement of the buildings relative to the street. The new regulations will specify that there will be no 1195 1196 parking in front of the buildings. For ease of identification, Mrs. Hahn has 1197 created a map reflecting the build-to line within the village area. Mrs. Hahn 1198 referenced the Fire District application. If the Fire District application come 1199 through after adoption of the new regulations, the Commission would have 1200 considered that additions are generally set back from the original build-to line. 1201
- 1202 > Streetscape examples: Mrs. Hahn has provided examples of various streetscape designs, showing the placement of street lights, front yard trees, and other components, such as benches, street flags, etc. Mrs. Hahn indicated she prepared seven sheets of potential streetscapes showing the relationship of potential bike lanes to pedestrian access, potential sidewalk locations, and other street features.

1207

1208 Commissioner Gobin questioned if locating the street trees too close to the 1209 sidewalk sometimes causes buckling of the sidewalk as the trees mature and 1210 become a hazard? Mrs. Hahn suggested that wouldn't occur if you picked the 1211 right type of tree and if you had enough room to place the trees; she also noted the 1212 need to replace street trees every 3 generations. Commissioner Gobin questioned 1213 who would be responsible for the replacement? Mrs. Hahn indicated often 1214 replacement of street trees are part of a DOT funded project working with the 1215 Town; such projects occur on a repetitive basis. The responsibility could fall to 1216 the property owner if there was a site plan on file indicating the location of street 1217 trees. Mrs. Hahn noted some towns require the services of a landscape architect 1218 to assist with some of the design components. 1219

1220 Chairman Ouellette clarified that the documents presented this evening are already part of 1221 the final plan that was available to the public; these are just additional tools to understand 1222 what the plan says? Mrs. Hahn replied affirmatively, noting she was looking for a 1223 mechanism to facilitate the use of the information contained in the study. She noted the 1224 Commission must still consider the proposed regulations and approve the zone maps, all 1225 of which will require additional public input.

1226

1227 Discussion continued regarding funding opportunities to complete the remaining tasks.1228

1229 Chairman Ouellette questioned if Mrs. Hahn has satisfied the State's requirement for 1230 publishing the report? Mrs. Hahn indicated she revised the report by assigning 1231 implementation tasks to the Planning and Zoning Commission, or the Board of 1232 Selectmen, or the Town Engineer after appearing before the Board of Selectmen last 1233 week. Mrs. Hahn suggested the Commission should accept the report officially; the State 1234 wants to know that the report has been received and the study is over. Commissioner 1235 Gobin questioned if the Commission's acceptance of the report commits the Board of 1236 Selectman take on a work plan? Mrs. Hahn replied negatively, noting the tasks are a 1237 recommendation. Chairman Ouellette suggested this is no different than accepting the 1238 POCD. Interim Town Planner D'Amato concurred with Mrs. Hahn's suggestion to 1239 formally accept the report.

1240

1241 Chairman Ouellette called for additional questions from the Commission.

1242

1243 Commissioner Gobin thanked Mrs. Hahn for doing an exceptional job on this report; she 1244 cited how much she's learned working with Mrs. Hahn. Chairman Ouellette concurred

1245 with Commissioner Gobin, noting Mrs. Hahn has been a pleasure to work with. Mrs.

1246 Hahn indicated it's been her pleasure as well.

1247

1248

#### 1249

# 1250MOTION:To DEEM the Warehouse Point Planning Study presented by Terri1251Hahn of LADA P.C. Land Planners as complete and to ACCEPT the1252report received by the Commission.

1253

1257

1259

1254 Gobin moved/Thurz seconded/*DISCUSSION:* None.

1255VOTE (by show of hands): In Favor: Ouellette/Gobin/Gowdy/Kowalski/Thurz1256(No one opposed/No Abstentions)

1258 **OTHER BUSINESS;** 

Interim Town Planner D'Amato advised the Connecticut Bar Association has scheduled
their annual training via ZOOM; the training will be held in March. He requested
Commission members advise him within the next two weeks if they would like to register
for the training.

1264 1265

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None.

1266 1267

1268

**BUSINESS MEETING/A.** Correspondence from J. R. Russo & Associates:

Tim Coon, of J. R. Russo & Associate, LLC., rejoined the Commission. Mr. Coon noted
the Charbonneau gravel pit is run by Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC. Their oneyear permit for excavation expired November 28, 2020. Due to COVID, and one of
Governor Lamont's Executive Orders, the permit was automatically extended to February
9, 2021.

Mr. Coon reported this property is subject to a solar project which is currently before the
Connecticut Siting Council. A Public Hearing was held in December, 2020; a decision is
due either this month or next month.

1278

1279 Mr. Coon indicated the questions for Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC is if the 1280 Connecticut Siting Council will make a decision before the Executive Order expires on February 9<sup>th</sup>, or will the Executive Order be extended to April. If the Siting Council 1281 1282 doesn't approve the solar request and the Executive Order isn't extended then 1283 Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC would like to continue the gravel operation for 1284 another year. That would require submission of a full application for a Special Use 1285 Permit to the Commission. Mr. Coon indicated he is submitting a letter on behalf of Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC asking if the Commission would consider approving 1286 1287 an abbreviated permit for a limited amount of time which would allow them to continue 1288 to do business until the issue is resolved with the Siting Council, or a decision is made 1289 regarding an extension of the Executive Order. The limited permit would relieve them of 1290 the expense of fulfilling the requirements of a full application. If Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC submits the full permit application for February 9<sup>th</sup> they could receive a 1291

1292

favorable ruling from the Siting Council on February 10<sup>th</sup>, and the expense and work
would have been unnecessary.

- 1295
- 1296 Chairman Ouellette took comments from the Commissioners.
- 1297 1298 Commissioner Thurz felt it was a legal question; Commissioner Gobin concurred, as she 1299 felt it opens the Commission to how they do business, and how they treat everyone. Mr. 1300 Coon felt the question to be considered was is the full-blown application necessary, or 1301 can they file and abbreviated application? Chairman Ouellette noted even if the solar 1302 project is approved the property won't change hands overnight; Apothecaries Hall 1303 Enterprises, LLC would still be subject to ceasing the current operation and closing out 1304 the existing operation and restoring the property to specified conditions. There will be a 1305 period of time that activity will be occurring on the site; it can't be left in its current 1306 condition.
- 1307

1308 Interim Town Planner D'Amato offered the Commission the option of considering if 1309 there is some option that doesn't provide for the full extension of the permit with a full 1310 plan set and Public Hearing, or does the Commission feel the appropriate action is to 1311 renew? If you consider there is some merit to not granting a full-blown gravel permit an option might be if he submitted an application on February 9<sup>th</sup> the Commission would 1312 1313 have 65 days to open the Public Hearing, you also have 65 days worth of extensions, and 1314 90 days because of COVID, which would get you to about the middle of June. Interim 1315 Town Planner D'Amato wants to focus on compliance and closure if these folks are 1316 thinking about leaving at some point; he felt getting rid of a gravel operation and getting 1317 a green energy source is moving the property in the right direction and is something the 1318 POCD supports.

1319

1320 Commissioner Thurz suggested he has 65 days with the application and another 90 days 1321 with COVID; if he gets approved tomorrow then he can work on reclaiming the land. 1322 Chairman Ouellette noted he must submit the application with the documents required 1323 under the current regulations, and what he's asking for is relief from what those 1324 documents look like. Commissioner Gobin indicated she agrees with Interim Town 1325 Planner D'Amato regarding getting to compliance. She noted the Commission knows 1326 there are a lot of open phases, there's big piles of waste back there, and he may continue 1327 operating; we don't know that the Siting Council will approve the solar project. 1328 Commissioner Gobin felt giving him an extension without solving the problem doesn't 1329 send the right signal to the public.

1330

1331 Interim Town Planner D'Amato indicated he's had these discussions with land use1332 attorneys as to what constitutes an application; the attorney's comments were if you have

1333 a document that says what they want to do and where and they've paid you you ought to

1334 put it on the agenda. If the Commission decides they don't have enough information,

1335

1336 then that's on the applicant to provide that. To decide an application is not complete and 1337 not put it on the agenda is probably not a good idea. Interim Town Planner D'Amato 1338 suggested he envisions an application submitted with any and every piece of material that 1339 the applicant has to date and he's requesting a permit as he would any other year. If the 1340 application doesn't have the information that the Commission needs then he'll have to 1341 provide it, and if that takes him 65 days or 125 days, he has to provide it by the 1342 timeframes outlined in the Statutes, or the application has to be denied. And if he waits 1343 to submit that application to you until the very last day and the Siting Council denies the 1344 solar project then he has a fire drill on his hands. Interim Town Planner D'Amato 1345 indicated he agrees with the Commission, we can't give him a permit without the 1346 documents for compliance; the only we can do is push out your date to make that 1347 decision.

1348

1349 Commissioner Kowalski noted the Commission has used the permit period as an1350 enforcement tool and that's what we've told the public. At time of renewal is when we

judge if an applicant is in compliance and if they follow the rules. We've rewarded good

applicants with longer periods, and we've tried to help bad applicants seek compliance.

1353 Commissioner Kowalski felt anything we do to skirt that process, or the Public Hearing

1354 process is wrong. He didn't feel the Commission should go down that road.

1355 Commissioner Thurz suggested it's bad timing for this applicant. Commissioner Gowdy1356 agreed with Commissioner Kowalski.

1357

1358 Chairman Ouellette questioned Mr. Coon if he had enough information to take back to 1359 his client to assist him to make a decision? Mr. Coon clarified that at a minimum we 1360 need to submit an application on February 9th to be received, if the as-built is completed 1361 by then that's a positive thing, if not then we'd have to wait for a decision from the Siting 1362 Council. Chairman Ouellette questioned if the as-built is the critical item; would an 1363 aerial photograph provide the same information? Mr. Coon indicated the as-built is 1364 expensive; they don't have time to do the aerial photo and that's costly as well.

1365

1366 Interim Town Planner D'Amato requested clarification of the Commission's perspective on one issue. Let's assume the Siting Council approves the solar project and 1367 1368 Charbonneau/Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC doesn't need the excavation permit; 1369 what's the Commission's perspective on closing out the site? Interim Town Planner 1370 D'Amato suggested he doesn't feel a permit is necessary to close out the pit; an 1371 application shouldn't be required to complete close out activities. Discussion continued 1372 regarding the intent of the permit as it relates to closure activity, the significance of the 1373 final grading plan as it relates to the closure, discussion of closure vs. restoration, and the 1374 significance grading plan to the closure operation. The Commission felt the permit sets 1375 the requirements for the closure and once the permit has expired the Commission no 1376 longer has any leverage over the applicant. Interim Town Planner D'Amato cited the

1377

1378

Town is holding a bond. Commissioner Kowalski sees the permit as the contract under
which the applicant is operating ; if there's no longer a permit then there's nothing to
hold the applicant to the agreement. Mr. Coon felt the expectation is that the applicant
will restore the site, and the bond makes sure he does that.

1383

1384 Chairman Ouellette suggested Interim Town Planner D'Amato has outlined some 1385 options. He suggested Apothecaries Hall Enterprises, LLC needs to submit something by February 9<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Coon questioned if they need to submit a permit to close out the site if 1386 1387 the Siting Council approves the solar project tomorrow? Commissioner Thurz felt a 1388 permit is necessary; he noted the permit also covers restoration as well as the gravel 1389 operation. Commissioner Kowalski felt allowing activity without a permit sets a bad 1390 precedent; he noted the Town has several other gravel excavation projects who would 1391 expect the same treatment. Commissioners Thurz and Gowdy agreed with Commission 1392 Kowalski. Discussion continued regarding the permitted closing plan vs. the grading 1393 plan applicable to the solar project.

1394

Interim Town Planner D'Amato offered as an option that prior to the expiration of the existing permit Mr. Coon submit a modification using the proposed grading plan for the solar project. That would buy you some time and keep the permit valid, and if the solar project plan dies then you come back and modify that plan to continue moving forward with another phase.

1400

1402

1401 Mr. Coon thanked the Commission, and Interim Town Planner D'Amato for their time.

### 1403 ADJOURNMENT:

- 14041405MOTION:To ADJOURN this Meeting at 9:10 p.m.
- 1406

1407 Gowdy moved/Kowalski seconded/VOTE: In Favor: Unanimous

- 14081409 Respectfully submitted,
- 1410
- 1411 Peg Hoffman, Recording Secretary, East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission
- 1412