TOWN OF EAST WINDSOR PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR Meeting #1827
May 24, 2022
6:30 P.M.

John Daly Jr. Meeting Room (Town Hall)
11 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. 06016
In-person

AND

via ZOOM Teleconference Meeting ID: 714 897 1799

MEETING MINUTES *****Minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting*****

I. TIME AND PLACE OF MEETING:

Chairman Gobin called Regular Meeting #1827 of the East Windsor Planning and Zoning Commission dated Tuesday, May 24, 2022 to Order at 6:30 p.m. The Meeting is being held in-person in the John Daly, Jr. Meeting Room, Town Hall, 11 Rye Sreet, Broad Brook, CT., and via telconference as well..

PRESENT: Regular Members: Anne Gobin (Chairman), Frank Gowdy, Joseph Sauerhoefer, and Jim Thurz (Secretary).

<u>Alternate Members:</u> David Leason. There are presently two vacancies for Alternate members.

ABSENT: Regular Member Michael Kowalski is absent.

GUESTS/SPEAKERS present in person: Director of Planning and
Development/Town Planner Calabrese hosted the meeting. Also
present in person was Planning Consultant Michael D'Amato, Paul
Guarino, Jr., Paul Guarino, Sr., Jay Ussery, of J. R. Russo &
Associates, LLC., representing Don's Auto Care Center, and Don
Walker, owner of Don's Auto Care Center; and an unidentified
resident.

GUESTS/SPEAKERS present remotely identified as they sign in: Jason Ouimet, Beta Group, Chris Lewis, Cube Storage, John

Guszkowski, Tyche Planning and Policy Group, Tom Fahey, Peg (Margaret) Hoffman, Recording Secretary.

II. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUORUM:

A quorum was established as four Regular Members and one Alternate Member were present at the Call to Order. Chairman Gobin requested Alternate Member Leason to join the Board regarding discussion and action on all Items of Business this evening.

- III. ADDED AGENDA ITEMS: None.
- IV. LEGAL NOTICE:
 - a. PZ 2022-06 26 & 28 Rye Street. Zone Change to a 2 Family Residence, Applicant: Paul Guarino:

The following Legal Notices were read by Chairman Gobin:

LEGAL NOTICE

EAST WINDSOR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

The East Windsor Planning & Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 24, 2022 at 6:30 p.m. Details regarding how to attend will be published on the Commission's Agenda which will be made available on the Town's website.

PZ-2022-6 Zone Change/Map Change – Applicant: Guarino Homes wishes to change the zoning district for 26 & 28 Rye Street, Broad Brook, CT. Map 077, Block 40, Lot 001, and Lot 001-1. Zone R-2 – from R-2 to R-1.

A full copy of the application is available on the Planning and Zoning Commission's webpage of the Town website. All interested persons may attend this meeting and provide verbal or written comments to the Board regarding this application.

Appeared in the Journal Inquirer editions: May 13 and May 17, 2022

V. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:

Chairman Gobin queried the in-person audience for comments regarding items/issues not posted on the Agenda. No one requested to speak. Chairman Gobin then queried the remote audience; no one requested to be acknowledged.

VI. <u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES:</u>

a. May 10, 2022 - Regular Meeting of PZC:

The document provided for the Commissioner's approval was the Schedule of Motions for the May 10, 2022 Meeting rather than the Minutes. Chairman Gobin suggested approval of Minutes be postponed until the Commission's next meeting.

VII. RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS:

a. PZ-2022-07 10 Prospect Terrace – Site Plan Review – Change of Use from Burlington Coat Factory (Retail) to a True Storage Facility (Warehouse/Storage). Applicant: Josh Sullivan:

Chairman Gobin acknowledged the receipt of the following new application:

PZ 2022-7 10 Prospect Hill Terrace. Site Plan review for a change in use from Burlington Coat Factory (Retail) to a True Storage Facility (Warehouse/Storage). Applicant: Josh Sullivan.

VIII. <u>PERFORMANCE BONDS – ACTIONS; PERMIT EXTENSIONS; ROAD ACCEPTANCE</u>

No requests presented under this Item of Business this evening.

IX. <u>CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:</u> None.

X. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a. <u>PZ-2022-06 26 & 28 Rye Street - Zone Change to a 2 Family</u> Residential. Applicant: Paul Guarino:

Chairman Gobin read the description of this Agenda item.

Joining the Commission in person were Paul Guarino, Jr., and Paul Guarino, Sr. Paul Guarino, Jr. spoke on behalf of himself and his father.

Mr. Guarino, Jr. advised the Commission that 26 Rye Street actually touches the zone for 2-family homes. It is already a 2-family dwelling, and the property it touches is a 2-family home as well. Mr. Guarino, Jr. provided the Commission with a location plan, noting each of the homes he described. Mr. Guarino, Jr. noted there are separate services and separate driveways to each of the properties he referenced. They are requesting that the 2-family zone be extended to include 26 and 28 Rye Street.

Chairman Gobin began discussion by noting she recognizes the homes are 2-family dwellings today, but she questioned if they were 2-family homes when they were constructed? Mr. Guarino felt 26 Rye Street was when it was constructed, and the property card lists the home as a 2-family. Chairman Gobin cited her concern is was the home created legally originally, or was it just made a 2-family at some point in time.

Commissioner Gowdy suggested the proposal would reduce the non-conformity, and provide a contiguous zone. Commissioner Thurz suggested the property was grandfathered. Planning Director Calabrese suggested the property card for 26 Rye Street indicates it was built in 1950, if that's the case it would be legal non-conforming and this would make it conforming. Chairman Gobin reiterated her concern that the change had been made legally. Commissioner Gowdy suggested the proposed change is for the betterment of the zone. Planning Director Calabrese noted the applicant must come through for a Special Use Permit for the vacant lot (28 Rye Street). Chairman_Gobin questioned if that would be a separate transaction, and if so would the Commission see an architectural rending for that proposal? Planning Director Calabrese replied affirmatively to both questions.

Chairman Gobin asked if anyone in the in-person audience wanted to comment on the proposal; no one requested to speak. Chairman Gobin then queried the remote participants for comments; no one requested to be acknowledged.

Chairman Gobin offered the Commissioners an opportunity to comment again. Commissioner Gowdy questioned if the lots were served by septic systems? Commissioner Sauerhoefer indicated both lots/properties are

served by the sewer line. Chairman Gobin suggested the lots are within the Aquifer Protection Area.

Commissioner Sauerhoefer questioned what would prevent the people on the other side of the street from doing the same thing if they had enough land, or is the Commission just changing this one lot? Planning Director Calabrese suggested the proposal is for the vacant lot (28 Rye Street). Commissioner Sauerhoefer also questioned if that would be spot zoning? Commissioner Sauerhoefer suggested that technically it's been subdivided, the original application for 28 Rye Street was to build one house.

Mr. Guarino, Jr. rejoined the discussion. He suggested that lot isn't touching the zone but it is touching the 2-family home (at 26 Rye Street). Mr. Guarino, Jr. felt the other people couldn't do it because their properties don't touch the 2-family home. Commissioner Sauerhoefer reiterated that the lot had been subdivided so technically it's not touching that zone. Mr. Guarino, Jr. concurred. Commissioner Sauerhoefer noted the Commission is moving the zone a lot over now, your original application was to build a house on lot 28. That's not touching the contiguous zone. Mr. Guarino, Jr. agreed, but noted the other owner of the other property, signed in on this proposal; Mr. Guarino felt that made that property conforming.

Chairman Gobin reiterated her struggle is whether it became a 2-family legally or was grandfathered. She suggested it feels like you get this zone creep of people making a house a duplex without going through the process, and the next house becomes a duplex, and then the next one. Chairman Gobin indicated if it was originally built that way she has no issues, but she felt like the Commission is rewarding and encouraging people to go underground and make 2-family houses and then the zone has to be changed. Commissioner Gowdy felt situations like that would be caught by the Building Inspector. Commissioner Sauerhoefer recalled the next house had a dental office, which was a business, in it for years. Chairman Gobin suggested the Plan (of Conservation and Development) calls for a mix of residential and business so she can live with that.

Discussion continued with Mr. Guarino, Jr. noting other homes in the extended area which have become multi-family. Commissioner Sauerhoefer noted no one in the neighborhood has come forward for the Public Hearing.

Chairman Gobin questioned if the Commissioners felt they had enough information to close the Public Hearing, no one requested to continue discussion. Chairman Gobin requested a motion to the close the Public Hearing on this application.

MOTION: To CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING on Application

PZ-2022-06 26 & 28 Rye Street- Zone Change to a 2 Family Residential. Applicant: Paul Guarino.

Thurz moved/Gowdy seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: In Favor: Gobin/Gowdy/Leason/Sauerhoefer/Thurz

(No one opposed/No abstentions)

Decision on application made under <u>NEW BUSINESS</u>, <u>Agenda item b.</u>

XI. OLD BUSINESS: None.

XII. <u>NEW BUSINESS:</u>

a. PZ-2022-07 - 10 Prospect Hill Terrace. Site Plan Review - Change of Use from Burlington Coat Factory (Retail) to a True Storage Facility (Warehouse/Storage). Applicant: John Sullivan:

Chairman Gobin read the description of this item of business. Joining the Commission remotely was Jason Quimet, of the Beta Group, and Chris Lewis, of Cube Storage. Mr. Quimet introduced himself and Mr. Lewis, noting they are making the presentation this evening as Mr. Sullivan and his wife have just had a baby over the weekend and he is not available this evening.

Mr. Quimet noted he's the civil engineer for the project located at 10 Prospect Hill Terrace. Mr. Quimet reported the parcel contains 10 total acres which are split between Enfield and East Windsor. His discussion this evening will involve 5.6 acres located in East Windsor which are zoned B-1. The parcel is owned by the Burlington Coat Factory. Planning Director Calabrese reported in reviewing the application this morning she found our Zoning Map identifies this property as a Zone M-1, which would allow the use as a warehouse. Mr. Quimet thanked Planning Director Calabrese for her clarification/correction.

Mr. Quimet reiterated his contention is that this zone allowed for storage use on the property. The property has been vacant for some time, True Storage wants to convert the building to a climate-controlled facility. There is no outside storage proposed. The project includes minor site improvements, including striping of the parking area, and signage.

Chairman Gobin:

• Extent of project: Chairman Gobin noted that in the past the property had included other stores as well as the Burlington Coat Factory. Would the project include the entire parcel, or just the building to the right on the Site Plan? Mr. Quimet felt the entire parcel was owned by the Burlington Coat Factory, True Storage plans to convert the entire building with climate-controlled internal storage.

Referencing the Site Plan, Mr. Quimet suggested the existing building footprint is not changing. The only changes to the exterior of the building are the façade and signage. Some of the entrances will be upgraded/renovated, none of the building exits or entrances will be modified or changed which includes the loading docks and emergency access. All 3 main entrances and the parking will be maintained. Mr. Quimet reported that due to the lack of use of the building the parking lot has cracks and weeds growing up through the pavement, for that reason they plan to make some superficial improvements to the parking area.

Mr. Quimet indicated the current traffic in and out of the building is currently much less than the previous use. He understands there will now be only 2 employees at the facility. Mr. Quimet reported a traffic study was done which indicated less than 100 vehicles coming in or out of the facility at peak times. Their intent is to upgrade the entrances (main entrance drive and access drive) and maintain adequate parking adjacent to the building for people using the facility, and improve the areas of the parking lot required for the operations of the building. The improvements include a 2-inch milling of existing pavement and an addition of a 2-inch overlay, as well as replacement of existing curbing which has been damaged. Mr. Quimet suggested this is not a reclamation or full excavation of the parking areas. The majority of the existing parking will remain to be available, although it won't be improved as noted for the areas described previously.

Mr. Quimet reported none of the drainage on site will be changed. They will be adding silt socks within the catch basins and silt fence for erosion

controls adjacent to Boweyns Brook on the Enfield side of the parcel adjacent to the entrance drive. Parking spaces, including handicapped spaces, will be restriped.

No changes are proposed for existing utilities (electricity), signage will be upgraded. They are not proposing any new overhead or security lighting. The site is currently served by sewer.

Mr. Quimet opened discussion to the Commission.

Commissioner Thurz:

- Clarification of building height: Commissioner Thurz noted the plans provided for the Commission says it's a 2-story building. Mr. Quimet clarified it's a 2-story height building but he wouldn't categorize it as a 2-story building. He noted they will be using mini roll up overhead doors for each storage unit but the area above the units are open; it's not stacked units. Mr. Quimet shared a floor plan of the potential units.
- *Roof replacement:* Commissioner Thurz questioned that they weren't replacing the roof? Mr. Lewis, of Cube Storage, replied negatively.
- *Hours of operation*: Commissioner Thurz questioned if the facility would be open 24/7? Mr. Lewis indicated operating hours would be 9:00 to 6:00, in some cases they may let someone in until 8 o'clock; they don't allow people to come into the property at night.

Chairman Gobin:

• *Dumpster locations:* Chairman Gobin noted from the layout it looks like a lot of units and tenants, when people end their lease and want to dump the items, where are the dumpster locations? Mr. Lewis reported they don't allow anyone to dump items when ending their lease, it's the responsibility of the person renting the unit to remove the items. If that doesn't occur then there is a process for auctioning off the items, people are allowed a short period of time to collect the items.

Commissioner Gowdy:

• *Fire Marshal approval*: Commissioner Gowdy questioned if the Fire Marshal had reviewed the plans? Mr. Lewis felt the Fire Marshal would review the plans at the point of acquisition of the Building Permits.

Chairman Gobin:

• Storage of hazardous or flammable materials: Chairman Gobin questions if storage of such materials is allowed? Mr. Lewis replied negatively. He indicated they hire a third party, like Cube Smart or Extra Space, which are companies that manage these facilities; they have legal requirements regarding these activities.

Commissioner Gowdy:

• *Review of materials being stored:* Commissioner Gowdy questioned that when a tenant comes in someone is there to make sure what they're unloading is ok? Mr. Lewis replied affirmatively, noting there are 70 to 80 video cameras recording at all times, entrances and hallways are covered. Any suspicious activity is recorded.

Chairman Gobin noted the lack of a Staff motion this evening as Staff continues to review the proposal, she suggested the Commission continue this discussion until the Commission's next meeting

Planning Consultant D'Amato:

• Exterior lighting: Planning Consultant D'Amato requested the applicant to confirm that there won't be any changes to the exterior lighting. He noted references on the plans that existing lights are to remain but there was no reference to exterior wall-mounted lights. Mr. Lewis indicated in this project all existing entrances will remain and be reused, if they find there are conditions where lights need to be replaced they'll do that.

Commissioner Gowdy:

• *Unit lighting:* Commissioner Gowdy questioned if all the units have a light? Mr. Lewis replied negatively, noting because the tops of the units are open they have a wire mesh over the top of the unit. Lights are operated on motion sensors, if there's no one in the building the majority of the lights will be off. As people enter the building the motion will turn on lights in the area where people have entered. He noted they're also sensitive to energy conservation when no one is there. Mr. Lewis also noted the property management people have requirements regarding how often they circulate through the building.

Commissioner Sauerhoefer:

• Availability of sewer service: Commissioner Sauerhoefer questioned if the property is served by sewer, and is it owned by the property

owner or the Town? Mr. Quimet indicated there is sewer availability in the back of the building. He felt it was a privately owned system which had an easement on the Enfield side of the property.

Director of Planning Calabrese:

• *Pending approvals/Enfield:* Director of Planning Calabrese questioned what approvals were necessary through the Town of Enfield? Mr. Quimet indicated he would be presenting a Site Plan, and a request for a Zone Change will be heard on May 26th in Enfield.

Chairman Gobin reiterated the Staff memo remains pending additional review. She suggested a motion to continue the application until the Commission's next meeting.

MOTION: To CONTINUE Application PZ-2022-07 10 Prospect

Hill Terrace. Site Plan Review – Change of Use from Burlington Coat Factory (Retail) to a True Storage Facility (Warehouse/Storage). Applicant: John Sullivan to the Planning and Zoning Commission's next

meeting to be held on June 14, 2022.

Thurz moved/Gowdy seconded/DISCUSSION: None.

VOTE: In Favor: Gobin/Gowdy/Leason/Sauerhoefer/Thurz (No one opposed/No abstentions)

b. <u>PZ-2022-06 – 26 & 28 Rye Street. Zone Change to a 2 Family</u> Residence. Applicant: Paul Guarino:

Chairman Gobin read the description of this Agenda item. She asked if the Commission was ready to take action on this application?

MOTION: Motion to Approve: Application #PZ-2022-06 for a Zone change from R-2 Single Family Residential District to R-1 Single-Multi Family Residential District.

This approval is granted subject to conformance with the submitted application, supporting materials, and public hearing presentation (as may be modified by the Commission and this approval) and the following conditions/modifications.

Findings:

- The Commission finds that the proposed zone change is appropriate in reducing present non-conformities, provides contiguous zoning, and meets the sewer/septic needs as regulated by the Town and approved by the NCDHD.
- 2. The proposed amendment is in agreement with the East Windsor Plan of Conservation & Development.

Thurz moved/Gowdy seconded/<u>DISCUSSION:</u> None.

VOTE: In Favor: Gobin/Gowdy/Leason/Sauerhoefer/Thurz
(No one opposed/No abstentions)

XIII. OTHER BUSINESS:

a. <u>Informal Discussion: 14 North Road – Don's Auto Care Center:</u>

Chairman Gobin read the description of this item of business. Joining the Commission in-person to discuss this application was Jay Ussery, of J. R. Russo & Associates, and Don Walker, owner of Don's Auto Care Center.

Mr. Ussery initiated discussion by noting that about a month ago he and Mr. Walker had approached Director of Planning Calabrese regarding modifications and upgrades to the car wash at Don's Auto Care Center. Mr. Ussery shared a Site Plan, Regulation excerpts, and a flyer on EV (electric vehicle) charging stations, with the Commission.

Mr. Ussery indicated Mr. Walker is considering adding vacuum islands and EV charging stations at the left side in the front of the building at 14 North Road. Mr. Ussery suggested this business is located in an M-1 Zone rather than the B-3 Zone created further down the road. When reviewing the allowable uses under the Zoning Regulations they found the use table includes automotive filling and re-energizing stations in a B-2 and B-3 Zone but not in the M-1 Zone. Mr. Ussery noted the auto repair business is allowed but charging stations are not. He suggested the Commission began considering re-charging stations in 2014. Mr. Ussery noted there are currently a lot of incentives available to businesses for installing charging stations.

When discussing options with Director of Planning Calabrese Mr. Ussery suggested they are presently considering a Text Amendment – perhaps as an accessory use to an automotive use - rather than proposing a Zone Change. Mr. Walker advised the Commission super- charging stations

fully charge a vehicle in 25 minutes, he cited his location right off the highway and noted he's been accepted by Eversource to provide the service. Mr. Ussery noted Mr. Walker is also considering installing vacuum stations, perhaps in 6 existing parking spaces next to the proposed location of the charging stations. Mr. Ussery recalled the Commission approved vacuum islands in the rear of the building some time ago but they're often unused, and because they accepted cash they were often vandalized. Because of the location of the property adjacent to the merging of the lanes on Route 140 many people are unaware the facility includes a car wash. Mr. Walker no longer accepts cash for the car wash due to vandalism of the change machine.

Mr. Ussery and Mr. Walker advised the Commission that 4 parking spaces in front of the building would provide 4 super-charging stations, and 2 vacuum islands.

Mr. Ussery noted the proposed location of the charging stations is bisected by the set-back line, he cited the front yard set back is 60 feet but a footnote says "canopies for automotive filling or re-energizing stations can be a minimum of 35 feet from the front property line". Mr. Ussery noted the 35-foot minimum set back line cuts the location of the parking spaces in half. Mr. Ussery then cited under Section 601 – off street parking regulations (h.1) – "all residential parking spaces, loading spaces, driveways, access roadways, traffic aisles, shall be located at least 25 feet from the front property line except that pavement associated with auto filling or re-energizing station canopies can be 10 feet from the property line." Discussion continued regarding the implementation of this amendment. Mr. Ussery indicated Mr. Walker would like to install a canopy over the vacuum islands and the charging stations and install solar panels as well.

Mr. Ussery noted an additional ambiguity is the "structure" set back, he questioned if a charging station would be considered a structure? Mr. Ussery referenced the definition — "anything constructed or erected which requires location on the front"... "structures do not include pavement or concrete pads". Mr. Ussery questioned if the arm of the vacuum or the charger would be considered part of the structure?

Discussion continued regarding the proliferation of the use of electric vehicles vs regulation options. Chairman Gobin suggested there needs to be multiple charging locations within a municipality, and East Windsor is

ideally located between Springfield and Hartford regarding the charging range for the vehicles. She also noted Mr. Walker's location is walkable, while people are charging their vehicles they can walk to Dunkin Donuts or the restaurants and coffee shops during the charge time. Mr. Walker noted they are estimating that in 10 years statistically 50% of all vehicles will be electric. Discussion turned to the installation of home chargers, the service capacity required, and the cost.

Commissioner Sauerhoefer:

• *Tree removal vs. replacement:* Commissioner Sauerhoefer noted the potential removal of trees to accommodate the improvements. He requested Mr. Walker plant additional trees to replace those removed. Mr. Ussery agreed.

Planning Consultant D'Amato advised the Commission there's a program called Solar Smart, which is the solar version of Sustainable CT. certification, they may have model regulations to consider for the Text Amendment. They'll actually review your draft regulations and tell you where they're lacking.

Chairman Gobin:

- *Proximity to State right-of-way:* Chairman Gobin questioned if any of these proposed improvements would fall within the State right-of-way? JU the edge of the pavement is about 12 feet from the right-of-way, he wasn't sure about the canopy.
- Charging vendors: Chairman Gobin questioned if Mr. Walker contacted any other companies besides Chargepoint? Mr. Walker reported another company, American Energy Sources, approached him a couple of months ago because of the availability of the Federal incentives. Chargepoint is supposed to be one of the leading companies for super-chargers. He will own the equipment and believes the fees are dictated by himself. Discussion continued regarding driving range vs. battery capacity vs. time and cost of charge to the consumer. Mr. Walker advised the Commission his 8,100 square foot building is solar, his carbon footprint is almost zero.

Commissioner Gowdy:

• *Battery disposal:* Commissioner Gowdy questioned what Mr. Walker will do with the batteries? Mr. Walker indicated he'll recycle them.

Mr. Ussery and Mr. Walker indicated they'll continue to work with Staff regarding this proposal.

Chairman Gobin acknowledged an unidentified resident who entered the in-person meeting. The resident advised Chairman Gobin he had joined the meeting to hear the result of the application request for 26 and 28 Rye Street. Chairman Gobin noted the meeting had begun at 6:30 and the Commission had already made a decision on that application. The resident asked what the Commission had approved, he noted he lived next door and wondered what the applicant can now do? Chairman Gobin advised the resident the Commission approved the Zone Change for 28 Rye Street; Director of Planning Calabrese advised the resident the lot was zoned residential before, the applicant must now appear before the Commission to build a duplex home on the vacant lot, and the adjacent homeowners will be notified when that occurs.

b. Informal Discussion: Warehouse Point Village Zoning:

Planning Consultant D'Amato recalled that previously he had given the Commission a brief overview of Form Based Zoning vs standard Zoning Regulations which involve a use table, set backs, parking requirements, etc. One of the issues for Warehouse Point is they don't have the energy right now that would make someone come in and incorporate some of the large scale elements that Form Based Zoning would have. Planning Consultant D'Amato felt a good middle ground would be to create Zoning Regulations based on the criteria in the Warehouse Point Study regarding the goals for uses and streetscapes and incentivize through deregulation some of those some required improvements without creating the need for someone to hire a design team to do something on a property because they have to meet the criteria of traditional Form Based Zoning. Planning Consultant D'Amato suggested the area doesn't have properties that would sell for millions of dollars so the design budget will be lower for the developer. He suggested we're looking for small scale improvements over time.

Chairman Gobin cited the Lowe's property was the one everyone thought had the potential for a large scale development project. Planning Director Calabrese advised the Commission there have been some discussions with property owners in that area regarding what the regulations currently allow. Planning Consultant D'Amato reviewed the success or challenges of various communities working on Form Based Zoning projects. He

noted some communities offer a developer a structured abatement where the developer is given a tax abatement based on the value of the improvements to give them time to recoup the money invested. Planning Consultant D'Amato noted the activity occurring in Windsor Locks, it's not that far for people living in the apartments to walk over the bridge to Warehouse Point.

Discussion turned to a timeframe for development of regulations. Mr. Ussery, of J. R. Russo & Associates joined the conversation, noting Paul Benson received approval for a project in the Warehouse Point area based on a modification of the Pasco's Commons mixed-use development concept. When Mr. Benson sought financing the banks didn't like the mixed use aspect while they were comfortable with a residential development. Mr. Ussery suggested Mr. Benson is still interested in developing in the area and feels there's a market for accessible residential units in Warehouse Point. Mr. Ussery concurred that the distance across the bridge from Windsor Locks isn't that far to access groceries, restaurants, and other amenities. He also noted the proximity of the train station and the Canal Park in Windsor Locks.

Commissioner Gowdy;

• *Project timeframe:* Commissioner Gowdy questioned the timeframe for developing the regulations? Mr. Ussery suggested Mr. Benson is anxious to get a project started, he felt the regulations could be developed within the next year.

Commissioner Sauerhoefer:

• Flooding conditions: Commissioner Sauerhoefer questioned where the water would be going? Mr. Ussery noted the water would go into the Blue Ditch. Commissioner Sauerhoefer suggested the water goes into the Blue Ditch now. Mr. Ussery suggested the culverts on Holcomb Terrace and Spring Street aren't large enough to take the upstream flow from storm events. Mr. Ussery felt the storm events can be fixed but you can't fix the river flooding where the river backs up; that will never go away. Commissioner Sauerhoefer felt the Blue Ditch needs to be defined/identified from Bridge Street to Holcomb Terrace. Mr. Ussery suggested the ditch needs to be cleaned as it hasn't been touched in decades.

Planning Consultant D'Amato suggested the proposal would be to cut the Land Use Map put together by LADA from 9 or 10 zones to maybe 3 – a

> core zone, a transitional zone, and a peripheral zone, and not include all of the properties in this small area. He felt there is an opportunity to partner with Windsor Locks as well.

c. <u>Affordable Housing Plan Update:</u>

Planning Consultant D'Amato introduced John Guszkowski, his partner at Tyche Planning and Policy Group. He noted Mr. Guszkowski works on Affordable Housing Plans for various communities. Planning Consultant D'Amato noted the Commission has been provided a document titled "The Front End" which summarizes the statistics on which East Windsor's Affordable Housing Plan (AFP) is predicated.

Mr. Guszkowski noted that Tyche has been retained by the Town of East Windsor to write its Affordable Housing Plan (AHP). In 2017 the Connecticut General Assembly passed Public Act 17-170 which created a new State Statute 8-30g which requires that every town update or create a plan to increase the number of affordable housing units. There is no numerical threshold, no percentage threshold, and the type of housing is not defined or dictated regarding rental vs owned units or single vs multifamily units. The first plan is due in June, 2022. As East Windsor has not yet adopted a AHP the Town will need to send a letter to the Office of Policy and Management to explain the delay, and the anticipated timeframe for completion. Mr. Guszkowski felt First Selectman Bowsza will be sending that letter shortly.

Mr. Guszkowski offered the following demographic information which accompanied a PowerPoint presentation; please refer to YouTube Meeting video for PowerPoint documentation.

- ➤ The State defines Affordable Housing as housing for a household spending 30% of its annual income on housing. If you're renting it includes the cost of the rent and utilities, if the property is owned it includes the cost of the mortgage, property taxes and utilities. If you're spending more than 30% of your income on those costs you're considered "cost burdened" and may be eligible for affordable housing.
- A low-income household is considered to be people making less than 80% of the area or State median income, whichever one is less.

- Regarding development of an AHP, communities use either the State's definition for Affordable units which are deed restricted or income limited units, or houses assisted by a CHFA or USA loan/mortgage or Government assisted which is Senior or Disabled Housing.
- ➤ If a community exceeds 10% of its housing stock the Town is exempt from the Affordable Housing Appeals Act (8-30g). East Windsor has approximately 13% of its housing stock considered Affordable.
- ➤ When considering a community's AHP they also look at "naturally occurring affordable housing" an accessory apartment, a cottage in the backyard, smaller apartment complexes, studio/one bedroom apartments, and starter homes which are available to people at the lower end of the income spectrum.
- ➤ The population of East Windsor is approximately 11,000 people.
- The median age is 48.3 which is slightly higher than the State's median. East Windsor also has a large number of younger people aged 25 to 34.
- ➤ The population is 83% White, 9% Asian, and 8% African Americans.
- ➤ The median income is just over \$76,000.
- ➤ The current population has been fairly steady between 2011 and 2018, with a slight uptick of a couple of hundred people over a couple of years.
- ➤ The housing size is slightly smaller than in other parts of the Hartford region, over 2/3rds of East Windsor's households are 1 and 2 person households. Mr. Guszkowski felt that matched with the younger population demographic.
- ➤ Looking forward East Windsor is projected to grow over 25% over the next 2 decades. The older populations 65 and over are anticipated to grow the most, while the rest of the population is anticipated to shrink somewhat.
- Regarding the cost of housing in East Windsor, with a median income of approximately \$76,000 that breaks down to slightly over \$6,000 a

month. When taking 80% of the total median income (80% of the \$76,000) you get approximately \$6,400 which translates to \$5,000 a month. With the rental thresholds set at 30% of the monthly income that translates to \$1,600 per month (including heat, hot water, utilities) as a fair market rate for a 2-bedroom apartment.

- East Windsor's current housing stock is a little over 5200 units, with half being single family detached while the remainder are attached and multi-family units. About 2/3 are 2 and 3 bedroom and approximately 1/4 having 4 bedrooms.
- Regarding ownership approximately 2/3 or 68% are owner-occupied, while the remaining 31-32% are renter occupied.
- Approximately 40% of the housing stock was built in 1980 and is 40 years old.
- ➤ Since the crash of 2009-2010 housing growth has been relatively quiet, with an unusual spike in 2018.
- Regarding affordable housing goals East Windsor is just under 14% or 800 units, which exceeds the State goal of 10%. Almost all of the units are Government assisted Senior or Disabled Housing (Park Hill). You also have over 100 mortgaged single family owned, and approximately 10% receiving Section 8 assistance.
- ➤ With the threshold for being cost burdened or paying more than 30% of their income for housing 30% of East Windsor's population is cost burdened, which breaks down to 28% homeowners and 38% renters. More than 1900 households in East Windsor are cost burdened and are struggling to meet housing costs.

Mr. Guszkowski suggested the next steps for East Windsor is to:

- Public survey/community outreach to assist the public understand the intent of the AHP, the types of potential housing, and locations.
- Draft a narrative
- Analysis of Affordable Housing Plan, Regulations, and Plan of Conservation and Development relative to housing development.
- Recommendations for actions for regulatory changes, and potential policies and investments for the Town.

Mr. Guszkowski then took questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Gowdy:

- Cost of education vs. low income: Commissioner Gowdy questioned if anyone had done an analysis of the cost per pupil for low-income families? He suggested the cost per pupil in East Windsor is much higher than surrounding towns; some of that cost is because some of the low-income families have children with special needs. Commissioner Gowdy noted we are required by law to provide that education; sometimes students with special needs are sent out of state at a cost of \$80,000 to \$90,000 to provide them their education.
- Considerations when people contemplate residing in East Windsor:
 Commissioner Gowdy suggested when people look at a town to reside in they look at the school system, are the schools in good shape, are they reputable, what's the graduation and college admission rates?
 Chairman Gobin suggested if the cost of education is high then the property tax rate in town is higher as well.

Mr. Guszkowski suggested there are a lot of related issues in Commissioner Gowdy's questions. He noted his firm doesn't do a home by home breakdown of how many children are part of a household, how many are in East Windsor's schools, and how many kids are special needs. He noted the 1 to 3 bedroom apartments tend to generate a smaller student/child population than traditional single family subdivision homes. He suggested that a one bedroom apartment complex tended to generate 1 child per 20 to 25 units while a 2 bedroom unit generates 2 kids per 8 to 12 units. You could add a significant number of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments without affecting the school numbers. Commissioner Gowdy noted when the Scantic Glen complex was constructed only 3 kids attended East Windsor schools.

Planning Consultant D'Amato suggested the goal of the Plan is to make housing more affordable. He suggested there are multiple ways to accomplish that. Planning Consultant D'Amato gave examples of paths taken by some other communities; Old Saybrook is limiting the size of starter homes to keep them affordable. Commissioner Gowdy recalled that in the past in Enfield many people purchased starter homes at \$10,000 to \$12,000, which resulted in the construction of school after school. Those starter homes are no longer available. Chairman Gobin questioned the ability to require energy efficient units as utilities is a large percentage of housing costs. Mr. Guszkowski cited the Planning and Zoning

Commission doesn't set the State Building Codes, but the regulations could include regulatory incentives or tax abatements to encourage energy efficiency. Mr. Guszkowski noted that many Towns run this process through the Board of Selectmen rather than the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Guszkowski noted that a large percentage of East Windsor's affordable housing units are Senior and/or Disabled Government Assisted, yet not many households have taken advantage of CHFA or USDA mortgages. Promoting those programs could significantly increase the affordability numbers in East Windsor.

Hearing no further requests from the Commissioners for discussion Chairman Gobin thanked Mr. Guszkowski for the update. Mr. Guszkowski indicated Tyche would conduct the survey, and return with the results, as well as a review of regulations, within the next month or two.

d. **Zoning Enforcement and Citation Procedure Revision:**

Director of Planning Calabrese advised the Commission Staff has begun to prioritize the items listed on the Zoning Enforcement Report. She noted Staff is also drafting a Blight Ordinance to send to the Board of Selectmen for consideration. Director of Planning Calabrese cited that many of the properties on the ZEO Report are messy yards, without a Blight Ordinance Staff is hampered regarding enforcement. Chairman Gobin suggested many of the messy properties are related to poor property maintenance. Planning Consultant D'Amato suggested the condition of the properties are based on community standards. Commissioner Sauerhoefer questioned what if someone can't afford to paint a house, or they're on Social Security and have limited income? Discussion continued regarding enforcement options.

Commissioner Thurz questioned the status of enforcement of car dealerships improperly displaying vehicles within the road rights-of-way? Director of Planning Calabrese indicated Staff continues to work on that issue.

XIV. CORRESPONDENCE: None

XV. BUSINESS MEETING:

No item of discussion presented this evening.

XVI. <u>EXECUTIVE SESSION:</u>

No **EXECUTIVE SESSION** this evening.

XVII. ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: To ADJOURN this Meeting at 8:43 p.m.

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

Respectfully submitted,

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