

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
September 14, 2009 Meeting

Commission Members Present: Alan Gannuscio, Marshall Brown, Vincent Zimnoch,
Janet Ramsay, and Anthony Scarfo

Town Staff Present: Town Planning Coordinator and Assistant Zoning and Wetlands
Officer Jennifer Rodriguez, Town Engineer Dana Steele, and
Town Planning Consultant Michael O'Leary

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm.

Commission roll call was taken.

Chairman Gannuscio seated Mr. Scarfo for Commissioner Tatro for all of the evening's proceedings.

MINUTES:

Chairman Gannuscio referred to the July 13, 2009 meeting minutes and noted that he, Mr. Zimnoch, Mr. Brown, Ms. Ramsay, Mr. Tatro and Mr. Scarfo were present at that meeting. He then asked the Commission members and staff for any comments or corrections. They had none. Mr. Gannuscio moved to approve the July 13, 2009 meeting minutes, as published. Mr. Brown seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

There were none.

REVIEWS:

There were none.

ACTION ON CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

There were none.

OLD BUSINESS:

Chairman Gannuscio stated that they would skip over Item 7a on the evening's agenda for the time being and move on to Item 7b.

b. Review of the extension for 177 Old County Road.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if there was anyone present that evening for the review. There was no one present. Mr. Gannuscio then asked the Recording Secretary to drop the review of the extension for 177 Old County Road from any future agendas since it had been on the agenda for the past several months and no one had ever shown up for the discussion.

c. Discussion of street trees at Windsor Locks Farms.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that she had spoken with T & M, Beaudry and the Town Attorney regarding getting the street trees planted. She went on to say that a letter had gone out and that some of the residents had responded saying that stakes had been put in indicating where the trees would be planted. Ms. Rodriguez noted that they would discuss the street tree issue further later that evening when they received the application from Northgroup, LLC.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. Public Input

There was none.

b. Receive New Applications

i. Site plan application of Allen Precision for the property located at 1 Northgate Drive.

Tom Pouliot, owner of Allen Precision, addressed the Commission and stated that his business was a manufacturing job shop. He explained that he was looking to relocate his business from Rocky Hill to Windsor Locks because he needed a larger space. Mr. Pouliot stated that he was proposing to put up a Morton building which would be very modern and attractive.

Mr. Pouliot stated that Carl Haim was also present that evening and that he currently rented space from Mr. Haim in Rocky Hill. He went on to say that Mr. Haim had also put up Morton buildings on his property.

Mr. Pouliot explained that his business was a one-man company where he ran very modern, automated equipment. He went on to say that he had been in business for ten years. Mr. Pouliot noted that he might expand in the future by having his son come on board

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. O'Leary and Mr. Steele if they had had a chance to review the site plan. Both Mr. Steele and Mr. O'Leary replied that they had.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received comments from Water Pollution Control and Public Works. He then asked Ms. Rodriguez if she had received comments from Police and Fire. Ms. Rodriguez replied that she had received comments from Fire stating "no issues", but that she had not received any written comments from Police. She went on to say that she had spoken with the Police Chief and that he had had no issues with the site plan.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to accept the site plan application of Thomas Pouliot of Allen Precision for the property located at 1 Northgate Drive and to conduct the review of the site plan that evening. Mr. Pouliot stated that his manufacturing company was Allen Precision, but that the applicant was DKP Properties, LLC, the company that would actually be putting up the building. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

Mr. Pouliot stated that he had a new set of plans as of that day. He then displayed those new plans and distributed copies to the Commission members and staff. He stated that he wanted to put a manufacturing building up at 1 Northgate. He then explained that the building would be 5,400 square feet, with 1,000 square feet of office space. Mr. Pouliot noted that he wanted to move his business, Allen Precision, from Rocky Hill to the proposed building in Windsor Locks.

Mr. Pouliot referred to Mr. O'Leary's memorandum dated September 11, 2009 and read Item 1 from that memo as follows:

"1. The Plans should indicate the specific use proposed to occupy the building, rather than a broad land use category from the list of permitted uses in the Zoning Regulations."

Mr. Pouliot then asked Mr. O'Leary what he was looking for. Mr. O'Leary stated that on the plan it had looked like general manufacturing processing, the broad category, but that he wanted to see something more specific on the plans such as the explanation that Mr. Pouliot had given earlier that evening. Mr. Pouliot stated that he was a job shop that manufactured parts. He then showed the Commission

members and staff some of the types of small parts that he manufactured. He went on to say that the lot sizes ran from 100 pieces to 1,000 pieces. He then noted that he had a core group of customers that were very diverse; he did not rely on any one type of business.

Mr. Brown clarified that Mr. Pouliot programmed machines to make the parts. Mr. Pouliot stated that that was correct. He then reiterated that he was a job shop that did light manufacturing.

Mr. O'Leary clarified that it would be a machine shop with some office space. Mr. Pouliot stated that that was correct.

Mr. Pouliot stated that all of his materials came in as 1 inch diameter bars that were 12 feet long. Mr. O'Leary asked if everything would be stored inside the building. Mr. Pouliot replied that everything would be stored inside the building.

Mr. Steele asked if it was noisy. Mr. Pouliot replied that it was not overly noisy, but that it could be a little noisy at times. He then commented that he did not have to wear ear muffs; the noise level was 80 or 90 decibels.

Mr. Scarfo clarified that it would just be Mr. Pouliot working in the building by himself; no one else would be working there with him. Mr. Pouliot stated that that was correct. Mr. Scarfo then asked if he operated at night at any time. Mr. Pouliot replied that he typically did not work at night, although he might work late once in a while.

Mr. O'Leary asked Chairman Gannuscio if he wanted him to go through his comments. Mr. Gannuscio replied that he did.

Mr. O'Leary referred to his memorandum dated September 11, 2009 and summarized his comments as follows.

2. Dealt with the parking calculations and the necessary additional parking spaces.

Mr. O'Leary stated that the new revised site plan now showed six parking spaces. He went on to say that, if Mr. Pouliot felt that he did not need all of the spaces, he could request that half of them be waived. Mr. Pouliot stated that he would go with the proposed six spaces as they were shown on the plan; it would be easier to do them all at once. Mr. O'Leary then asked if there was a reason why the fifth parking space outside was put alongside the building. Mr. Pouliot replied that engineer had to kind of shoe-horn it in to get that last

space in. He then explained that the original Morton plans for the building showed the office area offset 10 feet inside, but that they had to push that office area back over 10 feet in order to keep the porch. He noted that the porch was originally going to be 22 feet, but that they had had to reduce that to 16 feet in order to get the required 10 foot buffer between the building and the parking. A brief discussion followed regarding the required 10 foot buffer and whether or not the porch/overhang was actually considered the building.

3. Dealt with the width of the drive aisle.
Mr. O'Leary asked Mr. Pouliot if he had adjusted the drive aisle width to 24 feet. Mr. Pouliot replied that he had adjusted it.
4. Dealt with the lighting.
Mr. O'Leary explained that they typically had a lighting plan. Mr. Pouliot stated that he had a lighting plan and then proceeded to submit it to Mr. O'Leary. Mr. O'Leary stated that the lighting plan would need to be reviewed by staff. He then suggested the condition, if the Commission members were agreeable, that the lighting be full cut-off and that the lighting details be approved by staff.
5. Dealt with the signs.
Mr. O'Leary asked if any signs were being proposed. Mr. Pouliot replied that he was not proposing any signs. He then asked about putting the business name on the building. Mr. O'Leary stated that it would be allowed, but that Mr. Pouliot would have to apply for it.
6. Dealt with the outside dumpster and screening.
Mr. O'Leary noted that the dumpster and screening had been added to the revised plan. Mr. Pouliot pointed out that they had added screening on two sides of the dumpster. Mr. O'Leary stated that dumpsters typically should be screened where they face the street.
7. Dealt with the landscaping plan and, specifically, the required size of the street trees and the parking lot landscaping requirement.
Mr. Pouliot stated that the plan had been revised to show 2 ½ inch caliper street trees. Mr. O'Leary noted that since there were less than 10 parking spaces only one street tree was required in the parking area and that it had been shown on the plan.

8. Dealt with the conservation easement.

Mr. O'Leary asked Mr. Pouliot what he was planning to do in the conservation easement that had been required with the original subdivision approval. Mr. Pouliot explained that the 25 foot conservation easement was on the deed. He went on to say that the berm within that conservation easement was actually 40 to 45 feet wide and not 25 feet. He then stated that the oversized berm infringed on his plans. Mr. Pouliot stated that he needed to take the existing berm and trees down and would reconstruct it at the correct 25 foot width. He then noted that he would also plant new plantings on the berm.

Mr. O'Leary asked if the original landscaping berm and trees had been planted by the developer. Mr. Pouliot replied that he assumed that that was who had done it. He went on to say that the "conservation easement" language was deceiving because it was not a natural feature that was being protected; it was a berm that had been built as a buffer between the residential area and the commercial development. He then reiterated that the berm had been built wider than the required 25 feet. Mr. Pouliot also noted that the trees that had been planted on the berm did not offer screening down low; you could see right through the trees. He went on to say that he had taken some photographs of the berm and trees earlier that day from the residential neighbor's property. He then submitted the photographs to the Commission members and staff for their review.

Mr. Pouliot reiterated that white pines had been planted on the berm and that as they grew taller they would lose their bottom branches, therefore over time offering less and less screening. He went on to say that he wanted to reduce the width of the berm because it was impeding on the size of the building and parking area that he could build. Mr. Pouliot commented that he would also plant some better trees for screening.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if the conservation easement prohibited any disturbance to the area. Mr. O'Leary replied that typically a conservation easement did prohibit any disturbance. Mr. Pouliot stated that he had spoken with the people who had prepared his plans and that they had questioned the "conservation easement" terminology because it was not a natural feature that was being protected. He then reiterated that it was a manmade feature that had been built as a buffer. Mr. Pouliot noted that Gary LeClair had taken a look at the deed to the property and had not been able to find anything that stated that the area could not be disturbed.

Mr. O'Leary pointed out that the existing berm and trees did have the height. He went on to say that they would typically get the bottom screening on a berm with other shrubs and trees. He then asked if any of the trees existed along the side so that some of them could stay. Mr. Haim commented that they might damage the root structure of the trees when they dug up the berm. Mr. Zimnoch stated that 10 or 12 foot Arbor vitae could be purchased to replace the height, but that it would cost more to do so. Mr. Pouliot noted that the berm itself would be 4 to 5 feet high.

Mr. O'Leary questioned the terminology "easement" and whether it was a true easement that restricted Mr. Pouliot's rights. Mr. Pouliot stated that the plans had said a "25 foot buffer" and below that it said a "planted buffer". Ms. Rodriguez stated that the subdivision plans said "planted buffer".

Mr. Zimnoch commented that as long as the buffer was preserved it would be okay. He went on to say that that was what he felt the intent had been. He then noted that they would want to have agreement from the neighbors to remove and replace the existing berm and trees. Mr. Pouliot stated that he had gone over to the neighbor's home earlier that day to speak with them about the berm, but that they had not been at home at the time. He then asked what his neighbor's rights versus his rights would be if they did not agree to have the berm removed and replaced. He again reiterated that the berm was on his land and that it had been put in incorrectly. Mr. Zimnoch commented that he did not think that the neighbors would object to the plan if Mr. Pouliot were to explain everything to them.

Mr. Brown commented that he would hate to see the large trees removed and then suggested that they just add some plantings underneath the trees. Mr. Haim pointed out that, if they were to cut the berm back in size, the trees would probably die anyway

Chairman Gannuscio commented that there was no recorded evidence of the conservation easement and that what Mr. Pouliot was looking to do was to restore it to what its original purpose had been. Mr. Pouliot stated that that was correct. He then commented that he wanted to put up a very attractive building with landscaping that was done properly to make the entire site look good.

The landscaping discussion continued and Mr. O'Leary suggested that they prepare a little better landscape plan. He went on to say that he would be okay with using red cedar trees, but that they should be taller when planted.

9. Dealt with the architectural elevations and the lack of color renderings. Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Pouliot if he had any plans from Morton. Mr. Pouliot replied that he did and then proceeded to distribute them to the Commission members and staff. He then pointed out that the walls were 16 feet and that the peak height was 26 feet. Mr. Steele noted that 30 feet was allowed for the roof peak height.

Mr. Haim summarized the architectural drawing of the building. Mr. Pouliot then stated that the building would be white with charcoal nova brick. Mr. Zimnoch asked what the exterior of the building would be. Mr. Pouliot replied that it would be painted steel. Mr. O'Leary asked if the walls and roof would be the same color. Mr. Pouliot replied that it would be two-toned; the walls would be white and the dormers, accents, roof, doors and window trim would all be charcoal.

Mr. Brown asked if Mr. O'Leary would like to see a landscape plan before the Commission voted on the application. Mr. O'Leary replied that most of the issues could be handled with conditions for staff review.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Town Engineer Steele to go through his comments. Mr. Steele stated that he had submitted a letter dated September 11, 2009 which had contained 15 items. He went on to say that his letter had been based upon his review of the August 14, 2009 plans. He then noted that he had received a revised set of plans dated September 11, 2009 earlier that day and that he had done a preliminary review of those plans.

1. All of the paved areas of the site would drain by surface runoff into the street. Mr. Steele commented that he had no problem with the surface runoff. He went on to say that the roof needed to be tied in. He then noted that he had received a verbal confirmation that that would be done by the applicant's engineer, but it was not clear on the plans. Mr. Steele stated that he was still waiting for calculations from the applicant's engineer to confirm the pipe size.
2. The question regarding the height of the building had been answered that evening. It was going to be 26 feet high.
3. The configuration of the parking area had been addressed.
4. Dealt with the landscape buffer. Mr. Steele noted that there had been an extensive discussion regarding the buffer earlier that evening. He then explained that he had originally suggested

that the applicant submit a copy of the conservation easement so that staff and Commission members could see the exact wording, but they had been informed that evening that there was no conservation easement; there was just an area designated on the subdivision plan.

5. Dealt with the site lighting plan.
Mr. Steele asked the Commission members if they would like to see a lighting plan or if they were okay having the site lighting plan be for staff review. He then explained that the only thing that had been submitted that evening were the manufacturer's specification of building mounted light fixtures that were full cut-off. He went on to say that they might need a little more information than what had been submitted. Chairman Gannuscio stated that they would leave the lighting plan for staff review. All of the Commission members agreed. Mr. Zimnoch then asked how many lights there would be. Mr. Haim replied that there would be two wall packs on the building and four small ones for the security.
6. Dealt with sidewalks.
Mr. Steele stated that there were currently no sidewalks on Northgate Drive.
7. Dealt with the size of the trees.
Mr. Steele stated that it had been addressed.
8. Mr. Steele stated that it had been addressed. He then noted that there had been a discussion earlier in the evening on whether the overhang constituted a building and, therefore, needed the 10 foot setback. He went on to say that the applicant had stated that he would prefer to increase the overhang back to the original 22 feet rather than the 16 feet shown on the plans. Chairman Gannuscio stated that they had determined that the overhang would not be considered the building and, therefore, they could go back to the original 22 feet. Mr. O'Leary agreed.
9. Mr. Steele stated that he had spoken with the applicant's engineer and that he had agreed that the handicapped ramp that had been shown on the plan was not needed; the sidewalk was actually flush with the parking area.
10. Dealt with the parking calculations.
Mr. Steele stated that the plans had been changed to show six parking spaces (four in front of the building, one on the side and one inside the building). He went on to say that he had no problem with the spaces, but noted that the

parallel space on the side of the building would be a little awkward to pull out of. He then noted that it was not a major concern of his and, if the Commission was satisfied with the parking, it would be okay.

11. The sewer lateral needed to meet the sewer regulations.
Mr. Steele stated that it had not been addressed yet, but noted that it could easily be addressed.
12. The pavement details needed to meet the Town standards when they patched the road after cutting it.
13. An E&S bond was recommended in the amount of \$4,000 to be provided by the applicant prior to start of construction.
14. The Commission might want to consider a landscape bond for the berm.
Mr. Steele stated that there were a couple of ways that it could be handled: “the berm needs to be installed and planted prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy” or the Commission could require a landscape bond. A brief discussion followed regarding how soon the berm work and plantings would be done. Mr. Steele then stated that the condition should be “berm will be planted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy”.
15. An as-built survey was required prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any questions. They had none.

Chairman Gannuscio read the following questions from the memorandum of Gary Kuczarski, Superintendent of Water Pollution Control, dated August 13, 2009:

“What is the nature of business?

Will an oil/sand/water separator or other pretreatment be needed?

Floor drains in manufacturing area?

Sanitary sewer not to exceed 10%. Print shows 12.5%.”

Mr. Gannuscio noted that the nature of the business had already been stated earlier that evening. He then asked Mr. Pouliot about the oil/water separator and floor drains. Mr. Pouliot stated that there would be no separator or floor drains. Mr. Gannuscio pointed out that the sanitary sewer question had also been in Mr. Steele’s letter and that it was being addressed.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received comments from Scott Lappen, Director of Public Works, dated August 14, 2009 stating that he had no comments other than deferring to Water Pollution Control.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Ms. Rodriguez if she had received comments from Fire and Police. Ms. Rodriguez stated that she had received a memorandum from the Fire Marshal dated September 3, 2009 stating that he had no issues. She then stated that she had not received anything in writing from Police, but that the Police Chief had said that he had no concerns.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. O'Leary, Mr. Steele and Ms. Rodriguez for any further comments or questions. They had none.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any final comments or questions. They had none.

Chairman Gannuscio asked for a motion regarding the application. Mr. Zimnoch moved to approve the site plan application of DKP Properties, LLC for the property located 1 Northgate Drive with the following conditions:

- 1. Items 1, 5, 11, 12, 13, and 15 from Mr. Steele's September 3, 2009 letter.**
- 2. A revised plan for a berm and landscaped buffer along the south side of the property shall be submitted to the satisfaction of Town staff.**
- 3. The berm and landscaped buffer shall be completed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.**
- 4. The lighting plan shall be submitted for staff approval.**
- 5. The requirement for sidewalks shall be waived.**
- 6. A 22 foot wide overhang shall be allowed.**
- 7. The dumpster enclosure should include some type of screening of dumpster from the street.**

Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

c. Informal discussion regarding a vehicle salvage business.

There was no one present for the discussion.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Recording Secretary to add the discussion to the following month's agenda.

b. Receive New Applications

ii. Subdivision modification application of Northgroup, LLC for Windsor Locks Farms.

Robert Stanhope of T & M Building Company addressed the Commission and stated that all of the homes in Windsor Locks Farms had been built. He went on to say that they had been trying to finish up some of the details in order to turn over the subdivision to the Town. Mr. Stanhope stated that both the developer and the Town had felt that there were a few items that needed to be changed on the subdivision plan. He then noted that the Commission's approval of the changes was necessary in order for them to move forward.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if it was something that could be reviewed that evening or if it should simply be accepted and scheduled for review at a later date. Mr. O'Leary stated that it did not require a public hearing; it was just a modification to an approved subdivision plan. Mr. Steele suggested that they discuss it that evening and then see how the Commission felt about it.

Mr. Steele stated that he had submitted a letter to the applicant back in December, 2007. He explained that the letter had outlined items that had still needed to be completed before he would recommend that the Town consider accepting the roads as Town roads. Mr. Steele noted that there had been a discussion with the developer about the possibility of making some changes which dealt primarily with the open space area and the detention basins. He then explained that the Regulations required that there be a chain link fence around the open space area. He pointed out that the detention basins also had chain link fence around them. Mr. Steele stated that one of the detention basins with the chain link fence around it was located within the open space area which also had a chain link fence around it. He went on to say that the second detention basin was located at the front of the site and that it too had a chain link fence around it. Mr. Steele stated that the developer had not been very excited about the aesthetics of the chain link fence and after discussing it with Scott Lappen, Director of Public Works, he had agreed that it was worth looking into other alternatives. Mr. Stanhope stated that there was currently a timber rail and trees around the two detention basins. Mr. Steele commented that the timber rail looked nice and delineated the area.

Mr. Steele commented that the open space was ultimately going to be a ball field and that their concern was in trying to retrieve balls that might go over the fence. He went on to say that there was also a concern with regard to maintenance around a chain link fence. Mr. Steele noted that when the open space had first

been proposed as a ball field the Town had also asked for some parking. He explained that the applicant had proposed 13 gravel parking spaces that were shown within the right-of-way that ultimately became Cody Lane. He reiterated that when Cody Lane went in, the space for the gravel parking disappeared.

Mr. Steele stated that further discussions with Park and Recreation and Public Works had taken place and they had all agreed that 13 parking spaces might not be enough. He went on to say that they had then discussed the idea of providing some additional parking. He then noted that they had originally submitted a plan to the developer for 55 paved parking spaces to be located in the open space adjacent to the subdivision, in the open field in the North Wind Estates open space area.

Mr. Steele stated that the applicant had provided information on the existing conditions in that area and that he had then prepared the plan for the 55 paved parking spaces. He went on to say that the developer had come back with the cost estimates and the cost for the paved parking lot did not match up with what was being offered in swap, therefore they compromised and went with a gravel parking area. Mr. Steele stated that he had just completed the plan earlier that day and that the applicant was just seeing it for the first time that evening. He then distributed copies of the plan to Commission members and staff.

Mr. Steele stated that he had tried to show a parking area in the open space area within the North Wind Estates Subdivision and adjacent to the area where the ball field was proposed for. He explained that he had located the driveway so that it created an intersection with Kate Way and Cody. He went on to say that there would be a paved apron going into the site and then a gravel surface for the rest of the site. Mr. Steele noted that lines were shown on the plan, but that there would be no lines painted on the gravel parking area.

Mr. Steele commented that he was not sure that they really needed 55 parking spaces and, therefore, maybe they could phase them in. He then reiterated that the applicant had not had a chance to get prices for the gravel parking area yet. Mr. Zimnoch pointed out that, if there were no lines painted in the parking area, they probably would not get 55 cars parked there.

Mr. Steele stated that the plans showed an interior landscape island in order to conform to the Regulations. He went on to say that the 55 parking spaces required one tree per ten spaces, totaling 6 trees. He then noted that he had shown those six trees toward the front by the road. Mr. Steele commented that the

applicant had had a few trees that they had wanted to relocate from the subdivision and that he was not sure if some of those trees could be incorporated into the parking lot.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if the chain link fence around the detention basin was intended for safety reasons. Mr. Steele replied that safety had been the intent of the chain line fence. He went on to say that the timber rail did not keep people out, but it did delineate the area and would keep people from accidentally walking into the detention area. Mr. Zimnoch commented that the detention basin was typically dry. Mr. Steele stated that that was correct with regard to the basin located towards the front of the subdivision, but that the basin that was located in the open space area was a little wetter; although it was not deep, it was very shallow. Mr. Gannuscio commented that the timber rail and plantings were certainly more aesthetic. Mr. Zimnoch stated that the purpose that the chain link fence would serve was dubious; he did not see the need for the chain link fence. Mr. Gannuscio agreed.

Mr. Zimnoch commented that the parking area might be oversized, but that it might be filled sometimes to about 2/3 capacity; especially with no lines painted in the parking area. Mr. Steele stated that no lighting had been proposed. Mr. Zimnoch then commented that the way in which Mr. Steele had the parking area set-up it was prepped for paving in the future. Mr. Steele stated that that was correct.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. O'Leary for any comments. Mr. O'Leary stated that all of the changes were positive; it was a great direction to go in. He went on to say that it fit into the single-family subdivision better and was more aesthetic. He then noted that the Commission might want to revisit the chain link fence language in the Regulations in the future.

Mr. Stanhope stated that they would need to cost out the parking area, but that it looked pretty close. Mr. Steele noted that Scott Lappen, Public Works Director, and Dave Farr, Park and Recreation Director, had not seen the new plan yet. He then stated that it would make sense to continue the review to the next meeting.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Ms. Rodriguez if she had any comments with regard to the street tree issue. Ms. Rodriguez stated that there had been a handful of residents who did not want the trees in their front yards. Mr. Stanhope stated that they had ended up with five extra trees and that they had already planted them. He explained that the issue with the trees had taken place the previous fall and

they had had to plant them before they died. Mr. Gannuscio asked if all of the required trees were accounted for. Ms. Rodriguez replied that they had all been accounted for except for a few of the Beaudry homes.

Mr. O'Leary commented that the idea of street trees was to have trees by the street. He went on to say that he would like to know more about it. Mr. Stanhope explained that some of the residents had already planted their own trees in their front yards; therefore the developer had given them their trees to plant in their backyards. He then stated that the requirement had been met. Ms. Rodriguez stated that there were a handful that had not been planted, but that they were the Beaudry homes. She went on to say that they were currently in the process of dealing with those trees.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that the issues at hand were the trees, the parking, the waiver of the chain line fence, and the handicap cuts in the sidewalk.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to schedule a review of the subdivision modification application of Northgroup, LLC for Windsor Locks Farms for Tuesday, October 13, 2009. Mr. Scarfo seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

BILLS AND CORRESPONDENCE:

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received Ms. Rodriguez' email regarding the vehicle salvage business, the Board of Finance letter regarding the Town's annual report and a letter from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) regarding a complaint on Spring and Hathaway. He then gave the DEP letter to Ms. Rodriguez.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Ms. Rodriguez if she still needed a filing cabinet. Ms. Rodriguez replied that she did. Mr. Gannuscio noted that they had \$750 for supplies for the year and a brief discussion took place regarding the purchase of the filing cabinet and supplies for the Recording Secretary. It was agreed that the Recording Secretary would come up with a list of necessary supplies and order them along with Ms. Rodriguez' filing cabinet.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received a bill from Mr. O'Leary for his July/August, 2009 retainer in the amount of \$3,333. He then moved to approve Mr. O'Leary's bill in the amount of \$3,333. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. O'Leary if he wanted to go over the political signs that evening. Mr. O'Leary stated that they had not had a workshop in a while and then suggested that they might want to have one at which they could also revisit the Plan of Development. Mr. Gannuscio stated that they would let the political sign issue go until the workshop. He then asked Mr. O'Leary about the density, shared parking and a possible village district. Mr. O'Leary stated that that was something that had come from Patrick McMahon. He then noted that they could discuss them as part of the Plan of Development discussion.

Chairman Gannuscio pointed out that the October 13th meeting was a Tuesday and then asked Mr. O'Leary if he was going to be available that day for the meeting/workshop. Mr. O'Leary replied that he would not be available that day. Mr. Gannuscio suggested that they cancel the October 13, 2009 regular meeting and schedule a special meeting for October 19, 2009.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to cancel the October 13, 2009 regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to schedule a special Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on October 19, 2009 and conduct a workshop on the items listed under 7a on the evening's agenda as well as conduct the review of the subdivision modification of Northgroup, LLC that had been scheduled for October 13, 2009 and the discussion of the vehicle salvage business.. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that it was time for enforcement on Ella Grasso Turnpike. A brief discussion of various sign violations on Ella Grasso Turnpike then followed.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members and staff if they had anything further for discussion. They did not.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Ferrari
Recording Secretary

THIS IS A DRAFT

Please check the following month's meeting minutes for official approval of these minutes and any amendments or corrections that were made.