

PLANNING BOARD & ZONING COMMISSION June 13, 2011 Meeting

Commission Members Present: Alan Gannuscio, Vincent Zimnoch, Janet Ramsay and
Alternate Jim Szepanski

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

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:10 pm.

Commission roll call was taken.

Chairman Gannuscio seated Alternate Szepanski for Commissioner Brown for all of the
evening's proceedings.

MINUTES:

**Chairman Gannuscio referred to the May 9, 2011 meeting minutes and asked the
Commission members and staff for any comments or corrections. Ms. Ramsay stated that
she had not had a chance to read the minutes. Mr. Gannuscio moved to hold over the
approval of the May 9, 2011 meeting minutes to the next Commission meeting. Ms.
Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was
approved.**

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- a. Continued public hearing on the application to amend Section 605 and add new
Sections 607 and 602d to the Zoning Regulations.**

Chairman Gannuscio read the rules for conducting a public hearing.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Recording Secretary to read the legal notice. The Recording
Secretary then read the legal notice that was published in the Journal Inquirer on June 1 and
June 9, 2011.

Town Planning Consultant O'Leary offered copies of the proposed amendment to any
members of the public present that evening that wished to review it. He then noted that it
was an application by the Commission to modify the Regulations with regard to political and
election signs. He went on to say that the reason for the proposed amendment was to try to
make the Regulations easier to understand and enforce in addition to addressing the safety

aspects with regard to the placement of political and election signs. Mr. O'Leary stated that they were also trying to bring the Zoning Regulations, with regard to political signs, into sync with some of the prevailing existing case law on the topic.

Mr. O'Leary referred to the proposed Political/Election Sign Regulation with the revised date of April 9, 2011 and summarized the proposed new Section 602 D by noting that it was the section of the Regulations that touched upon some of the public safety aspects. He then read the following from the proposed amendment:

“Signs shall not be permitted in a location or area as to create a traffic hazard, or otherwise obstruct the view from motor vehicles. In addition, signs shall not be permitted in any location or area within:

1. 15 feet of intersecting street lines;
2. 15 feet of commercial driveways along the street line; and
3. 15 feet of the street line along either side of a commercial driveway.”

Mr. O'Leary pointed out that this proposed new section would apply to all signs, not just political signs.

Mr. O'Leary referred to proposed new Section 605, Political and Election Signs, and noted that existing Section 605 would become Section 606 and existing Section 606 would become Section 607. He went on to say that one of the main changes being proposed with the amendment is the statement; “No permit or fee is required for political/election signs.” He also pointed out that it would apply to signs for an election or referendum.

Mr. O'Leary then read the proposed Section language:

“Political/election signs are permitted for any referendum or election. They must not be installed more than 30 days prior to such event and must be removed no later than seven (7) days following same. Any such signs must be located behind the street line and conform to the requirements of Section 602. The maximum size and height limitations imposed upon commercial signs shall apply to political/election signs in all zoning districts. The maximum number of political/election signs allowed on each property shall be one for each contested office or issue. No permit or fee is required for political/election signs.”

Mr. O'Leary stated that the existing Section 605 K would be removed from the Regulations.

Mr. O'Leary stated that the proposal had been sent to CRCOG and that they had provided a review and report back to the Commission. He went on to say that a copy of the proposed amendment had also been placed in the Town Clerk's Office.

Chairman Gannuscio referred to the changes proposed to Section 605, specifically: "the maximum number of political/election sign permitted on each property shall be one for each contested office or issue". He then pointed out that there had been instances where there was a sign for each candidate on a property. He then questioned whether the proposed amendment would cause a problem for those households where maybe a husband and wife, etc. don't agree on a candidate and each wanted to place a sign on the property for the candidate of their choice. Mr. O'Leary stated that they could clarify it by including the language "one per candidate, office or issue".

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any questions or comments. Mr. Szepanski stated that he liked proposed Section 602 D, but then questioned whether they were prepared to enforce the amount of tag sale signs in Town that did not meet Criteria 1, 2, or 3 listed in the amendment. The discussion continued and Mr. Szczesny pointed out that a lot of those signs were located in the Town right-of-way. He went on to say that he did not see why Public Works couldn't just take them down. Mr. Szepanski asked if Public Works would be willing to do so. Mr. Gannuscio stated that they would have to speak with Scott Lappen, Public Works Director, about removing those signs located within Town rights-of-way. Mr. O'Leary agreed that, if the signs were a safety hazard, they should be removed.

Mr. Zimnoch referred to the maximum height and size limitations and asked if they would use the commercial sign ruling based upon frontage for a residential district as well. Mr. O'Leary replied that in conversation with the Town Attorney case law stated that you could not discriminate against political signs, but that that was geared more toward the commercial zone. He went on to say that there was no requirement that residential and commercial zones be the same. Mr. O'Leary noted that a 32 square foot sign was allowed in the commercial zones, but that they could bring that size down for residential zones. He then commented that they could specify a maximum size imposed upon signs in commercial zones of 32 square feet and a maximum size of 6 square feet for residential zones.

Chairman Gannuscio referred to one of Scott Chadwick's final drafts of the proposed amendment and read the following:

"The size, number and height limitations imposed upon commercial signs shall apply to political/election signs located in non-residential districts."

He then suggested that they do commercial and residential with a distinction between the two zones. Mr. O'Leary agreed that that would be a good distinction to make.

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



Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny if he had any questions or concerns. Mr. Szczesny commented that the issue of signs in the right-of-way was important and that they may want to consider adding some language stating that any signs located in the Town right-of-way should be removed. A brief discussion followed and Mr. O'Leary suggested that they add on to the last sentence so that it would read as follows:

öNo permit or fee is required for political/election signs and they shall not be located within public rights-of-way.ö

Mr. Steele asked if that would just be for political signs or for all signs; should that language be in Section 602 or 605. Mr. Zimnoch replied that it should probably be in both sections. Mr. O'Leary stated that they could add that last sentence in Section 605 as Item 4 in Section 602 D.

Mr. Steele questioned how to interpret the criteria listed in 602 D. A discussion followed and it was agreed by all that the criteria should be as follows:

- ö1. 15 feet of intersection street lines;
2. 15 feet of commercial driveways along the street line; and
3. shall not be located within public rights-of-ways.ö

It was also agreed that a diagram in the appendix would be helpful. Mr. Steele stated that he and Mr. Szczesny would work on preparing the diagram. Mr. Steele commented that the main enforcement issue would be defining the street lines, because they were not visible. Mr. O'Leary stated that, if a sign was anywhere and it caused a traffic hazard, it would need to be removed; that was the prevailing point.

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

Chairman Gannuscio asked for any public comments in support of the proposed amendment. There were none.

Chairman Gannuscio asked for any public comments in opposition to the proposed amendment. There were none.

Chairman Gannuscio suggested that they keep the public hearing open for final review of the revisions made that evening as well as review of the sketch for inclusion in the appendix. All of the Commission members agreed.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to continue the public hearing on the application to amend Section 605 and add new Sections 607 and 602 D to the Zoning Regulations. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

b. Continued public hearing on the special use permit and site plan review of Clean Energy for the property located at 80 Ella Grasso Turnpike.

Brian Perone, Business Development Manager, and Brian Young, Project Manager, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Young summarized the changes that had been made since the previous meeting as follows:

- the setback had been corrected;
- the dimensions had been added;
- the photometrics had been provided; and
- clarification on the canopy had been provided.

He went on to say that each of the comments that had been provided by the Town staff had been addressed in the three sketches and updated plans.

Mr. O'Leary referred to his memorandum dated June 12, 2011 and noted that, if the Commission was happy with the revised plans that were provided that evening, the remaining few items could easily be handled via conditions of approval. He went on to say that the new structures were farther away from the property line than the existing structures. He also noted that many of the existing structures had been granted variances when they had been constructed. Mr. O'Leary then referred to the following items from his memorandum:

2. The Commission could make an interpretation that since both proposed structures are located further away from the property lines than the existing structures, that this is permitted as a lessening of a non-conforming situation.
3. The existing condition plan shows a landscape setback along the rear of the property boundary that is approximately 4 feet at its most narrow point (behind the sidewalk) and expands beyond the sidewalk to 10 feet. The proposed plan maintains a 4 foot landscape area along most of the rear property line. The Commission could conclude that since the existing 4 foot width is not further decreased that it is not an enlargement of a nonconforming situation.
4. Sheet G-1.0 now shows a better detail of both canopies side by side, showing that they are comparable in overall height and the heights of both canopy fascia. Colors and signs are also shown. Assuming that the canopy sign size is generated by the width of the canopy facing the road (48 ft.), then the proposed canopy signs appear to meet the regulations. The plan should show the exact sign area (calculated by placing a box around the letters and logo).
5. A Proposed Lighting plan is provided. The applicant should provide a detail of each new fixture to verify that these are full cut-off fixtures as required by the Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Young stated that he would provide the fixture details. Mr. O'Leary stated that they could add the detail as a separate detail sheet or right on the plan. Mr. Young stated that the Clean Energy logo on the canopy fascia would be lit and asked if the Commission would be opposed to that. Chairman Gannuscio replied that the Commission would have no problem with that.

6. A sidewalk has been placed along the frontage of the site as required by the Zoning Regulations.

Mr. O'Leary stated that if Items 1, 4 and 5 of his June 12, 2011 memorandum were considered as conditions of any approval by the Commission then he had no objections to what had been presented that evening.

Mr. Steele referred to his letter dated June 13, 2011 and stated that he had reviewed the revised plan. He then summarized his letter as follows:

1. The vertical data for the topographic survey is assumed and does not conform to Section 1102.A.2.c. Due to the limited nature of the topographic changes to this existing site, I would not object to waiving this requirement.
2. Required yard setback lines should be shown on the existing and proposed layout plans. There appear to be a number of existing encroachments. Any existing variances should be indicated on the plans.
3. The existing trench drain shown on Sheet C2.0 does not appear to work with the grading plan. The applicant shall modify plan to show the trench grate reset to match new elevations and the pipe to drywell replaced as needed.
4. Sheet C1.0 shows a new 4 foot wide concrete sidewalk. The Regulations require 6 foot walks in commercial districts. Revise the plan to show a 6 foot walk. Revise the grading plan to indicate walk will ramp flush with pavement at driveways. Provide sidewalk detail conforming to Town standards on Sheet C3.0.
5. The final plans shall include the surveyor and engineer's live seal and signature on Sheets 2, 5 and 6. The applicant shall submit 3 paper sets and a mylar of Sheets 2, 5, and 6 to the Town Engineer for signature prior to filing.

Mr. Steele stated that he would be comfortable with an approval of the application that references Items 2 through 5 from his June 13, 2011 letter as conditions of approval.

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

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny for any questions or comments. He had none.

Chairman Gannuscio asked for any public comments in favor of the application. There were none.



Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Chairman Gannuscio asked for any public comments in opposition to the application. There were none.

Chairman Gannuscio commented that things seemed to have been worked out quickly and quite well between the applicant and Town staff.

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

Chairman Gannuscio moved to close the public hearing on the special use permit and site plan review of Clean Energy for the property located at 80 Ella Grasso Turnpike. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to approve the site plan of Clean Energy for the property located 80 Ella Grasso Turnpike as submitted with the following conditions and that the Commission waive the requirement of the vertical datum for the topographic survey:

A. Items 1, 4 and 5 from Mr. O’Leary’s June 12, 2011 memorandum as follows:

- 1. As noted in my previous memo, a copy of the variances originally granted to the property should be placed on the plans.**
- 4. Sheet G1.0 now shows a better detail of both canopies side by side, showing that they are comparable in overall height and the heights of both canopy fascia. Colors and signs are also shown. Assuming that the canopy sign size is generated by the width of the canopy facing the road (48 ft.), then the proposed canopy signs appear to meet the Regulations. The plan should show the exact sign area (calculated by placing a box around the letters and logo).**
- 5. A “Proposed Lighting” plan is provided. The applicant should provide a detail of each new fixture to verify that these are full cut-off fixtures as required by the Zoning Regulations.**

B. Items 2, 3, 4 and 5 from Mr. Steele’s June 13, 2011 letter as follows:

- 2. Required yard setback lines should be shown on the existing and proposed layout plans. There appear to be a number of existing encroachments. Any existing variances should be indicated on the plans.**
- 3. The existing trench drain shown on Sheet C2.0 does not appear to work with the grading plan. The applicant shall modify plan to show the trench grate reset to match new elevations and the pipe to drywell replaced as needed.**
- 4. Sheet C1.0 shows a new 4 foot wide concrete sidewalk. The Regulations require 6 foot walks in commercial districts. Revise the plan to show a 6 foot walk. Revise the grading plan to indicate walk will ramp flush with pavement at driveways. Provide sidewalk detail conforming to Town standards on Sheet C3.0.**



5. **The final plans shall include the surveyor and engineer's live seal and signature on Sheets 2, 5 and 6. The applicant shall submit 3 paper sets and a mylar of Sheets 2, 5 and 6 to the Town Engineer for signature prior to filing.**

Mr. Szepanski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to approve the special use permit of Clean Energy for the property located at 80 Ella Grasso Turnpike. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

- c. **Public hearing on the proposed addition to Section 402 of the Regulations regarding permitted zones for the operation of taxis, limousines and livery operations involving two or more vehicles.**

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Recording Secretary to read the legal notice. The Recording Secretary then read the legal notice that was published in the Journal Inquirer on June 1 and 9, 2011.

Chairman Gannuscio commented that there were a number of locations in residential areas where there were a congregation of taxis and livery vehicles occurring in Town which had become unsightly. He went on to say that with nothing on the books to regulate the issue he had asked Mr. O'Leary to draft an amendment to the Chart of Permitted Uses located in Section 402 of the Zoning Regulations to address it. A copy of the proposed amendment was distributed to Commission members and staff.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any questions or comments. Mr. Szepanski stated that he thought that the amendment was good. Mr. Zimnoch commented that he had not observed the problem, but that he could see how it could be an issue.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny for any questions or comments. Mr. Szczesny asked if the Commission could consider adding language specifying two or more vehicles per lot in order to try to define it more specifically, especially with regard to apartment complexes. A discussion followed and Mr. Gannuscio suggested letting the amendment go as it had been written and then they could see how it went with regard to enforcement. The Commission members all agreed.

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

Chairman Gannuscio asked for any public comments in support of the amendment. There were none.



Chairman Gannuscio asked for any public comments in opposition to the amendment. There were none.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to close the public hearing on the proposed addition to Section 402 of the Regulations regarding permitted zones for the operation of taxis, limousines and livery operations involving two or more vehicles. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to approve the proposed addition to Section 402 of the Regulations regarding permitted zones for the operation of taxis, limousines and livery operations involving two or more vehicles as written with the change effective June 30, 2011. Mr. Szepanski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

REVIEWS:

a. Review of the site plan modification application of McDonald’s c/o Bohler Engineering for the property located at 195 Ella Grasso Turnpike.

Rona McFarlane, Area Construction Manager for McDonald’s, and Luke DeStefano, Bohler Engineering, were both present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. DeStefano distributed a modified site plan and building elevations to the Commission members and staff. He then noted that the project had been ongoing since 2007 and that the modified site plan was very similar to the plan that had previously been approved by the Commission in 2007, but that had never been built. He went on to say that earlier this year a 50’s-style building had been proposed and approved by the Commission with some conditions. Mr. DeStefano stated that those conditions of approval had been incorporated into the revised plans before the Commission that evening. He then summarized those items as follows:

- light fixtures were added to the plans;
- a hedge row along Old County Road was added;
- an additional street tree was added along Route 75; and
- notes stating that the sidewalk ramps would conform with all applicable Town standards were added to the plans.

Mr. DeStefano stated that McDonald’s had since decided to go back to the original barrel-roofed façade which was very similar to what had been approved by the Commission in 2007 rather than the 50’s-style building that had been approved earlier this year.

Mr. DeStefano noted that beyond the actual building façade, the revised plan was identical to what the Commission had approved the last time.



Your complimentary
use period has ended.
Thank you for using
PDF Complete.

[Click Here to upgrade to
Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny if he had any questions or comments. Mr. Szczesny clarified that the plans that he had received were in response to the conditions of approval that had been previously imposed by the Commission and that those conditions had been addressed on the revised plans. Mr. DeStefano stated that that was correct. Mr. Szczesny then stated that as long as Mr. Steele was satisfied with the revised plans they were okay with him, since the only thing that had changed were the architectural elevations. Ms. McFarlane pointed out that it was now a little less flashy.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Steele if he had seen the notes on the plans prior to that evening. Mr. Steele replied that the only note was regarding the sidewalk and that he had no problem with what was being proposed.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. O'Leary if he had seen the revised plans prior to that evening. Mr. O'Leary replied that he had not. Ms. McFarlane commented that it was basically the original design, but with stone and brick. Mr. O'Leary then reiterated that it was essentially the original design that had been previously approved, but that they were now adding the stone finish to it. He then commented that he liked it with the stone.

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

Mr. O'Leary asked if the area in front that looked like a patio was going to be open. Ms. McFarlane replied that that was going to be a patio with seating and a low level fence around it to keep children from wandering out toward the road.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to approve the site plan modification application of McDonald's c/o Bohler Engineering for the property located at 195 Ella Grasso Turnpike. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

ACTION ON CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

There were none.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. Discussion with Commission and Staff

There was no discussion.



NEW BUSINESS:

a. Public Input

There was none.

b. Receive New Applications

i. **Unlimited Auto Sales & Detailing application to modify their Motor Vehicle Dealer's License approval to allow minor repairs as an accessory use on the property located at 59 King Spring Road, Unit D & E.**

Attorney Paul Smith addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant and stated that they had been before the Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals back in February and had received approval from both. He went on to say that the applicant had volunteered the conditions of approval that had been imposed. He then noted that the applicant did auto detailing for car rental agencies and for the people who repossessed vehicles; he did not provide his services to the public. He explained that the applicant detailed the vehicles and then brought them to the auto auctions for sale.

Attorney Smith stated that the applicant's interest in obtaining a Motor Vehicle Dealer's License was the fact that he could sell the vehicles at auction without going through a third party. He then explained that only licensed auto dealers could sell vehicles at auction.

Attorney Smith stated that, after receiving the approval from the Commission and the Zoning Board of Appeals, the applicant had submitted his paperwork to the Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) for the license. He then explained that the DMV wanted a modification to the conditions of those approvals which would allow the applicant to do minor repairs to motor vehicles. He went on to say that the DMV wanted the following language:

- "The licensee is authorized to make general repairs on vehicles owned by the company."

Attorney Smith stated that as part of their packet to the DMV they were going to be submitting a letter from someone that had a Repairer's License which stated that they would do repairs on the applicant's vehicles. He went on to say that the DMV would accept that even though the repairs would be done at another location, but that they still wanted the limitation of "no repairs" removed from the Commission's approval. He then pointed out that the DMV was okay with the applicant not having the required tools and equipment to actually do repairs on the premises.



Attorney Smith stated that the Industrial 1 Zone allowed for repairers' licenses and that the allowance to do general repairs on vehicles owned by the company would be an accessory use. He then reiterated that the applicant did not intend to do any repairs.

Attorney Smith noted that the applicant had submitted an application with the Zoning Board of Appeals which would be considered in July.

Attorney Smith stated that his proposal would be to have it modified so that it allowed the licensee to do general repairs of vehicles, but also to add another statement specifying that no repairs would be done on the premises for the public. He then suggested that another condition be that any repairs be done within the confines of the building. Attorney Smith pointed out that the applicant did have an oil separator for the floor drain and that they had received approval from the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) as part of the DMV process. He then noted that the applicant had also received the approval of the Water Pollution Control Authority (WPCA) prior to submitting their application to the DEP.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny and Mr. O'Leary for any comments or concerns. Mr. Szczesny stated that he had no concerns. Mr. O'Leary stated that he liked the condition that Attorney Smith had suggested; "no repairs shall be done for the public and repairs to be done inside the building." He then asked what the other conditions were for that original approval. Attorney Smith then distributed copies of the meeting minutes that contained those conditions. He went on to say that all of the other conditions were not a problem. He then explained that they had delineated the parking on the plan and that the license as limited be shown on the plan was fine as was no sales to the public.

Attorney Smith suggested the following language:

• Licensee is authorized to make repairs to vehicles owned by the company. •

• No repairs to be done on the premises for the public. •

• All repairs to be done inside the building. •

Mr. Steele asked if the applicant owned the vehicles that he detailed. Attorney Smith replied that he did not, but that he would take title of the vehicles and bring them to the auction to sell. He then explained that in order to sell a vehicle at the auction you needed to hold a Dealer's License and own the vehicle.

Mr. O'Leary stated that, with the caveats on the change, he had no problem with it.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny for his comments. Mr. Szczesny stated that he did not see any significant issue with what had been proposed.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any questions or comments. Mr. Szepanski asked Attorney Smith if he had a plan that showed the outdoor parking; the number of spaces. Attorney Smith replied that he did not. He then indicated on the plan where that parking would be. Mr. Szepanski asked if the applicant ever had a volume that went beyond the designated area. Attorney Smith replied that the applicant usually ran six to eight cars a day through his facility, but that there were occasions that it went over that. He then explained that the applicant had an arrangement with the owner of the property to use the large common area for parking when needed. Mr. Szepanski commented that he had seen 20 to 30 vehicles parked on the dirt on weekends.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any further questions. There were none.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to amend the Commission's approval of Unlimited Auto Sales & Detailing, LLC's application for a Motor Vehicle Dealer's License to allow general repair of vehicles owned by Unlimited Auto Sales & Detailing, LLC, with no repairs on site for the general public and any repairs performed on the site be performed within the confines of the building. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

c. Informal discussion regarding the T&M and North Group, LLC request for acceptance of roads.

Mr. Steele stated that they needed to continue the informal discussion. He explained that he was waiting for a final as-built of the open space area. He went on to say that Public Works intended to pave the parking lot. Mr. Steele stated that he was not prepared to write a letter regarding acceptance of the roads yet, but that there were no major obstacles.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to continue the informal discussion regarding the T&M and North Group, LLC request for acceptance of roads to the next Commission meeting. Mr. Szepanski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

d. Informal discussion regarding the Sewer Service Area Map by the Windsor Locks Water Pollution Control Authority for potential inclusion in the Plan of Conservation and Development.

Fred Mueller, engineer with Tie and Bond, and Gary Kuczarski, Water Pollution Control Authority, were both present.



PDF Complete

Your complimentary use period has ended. Thank you for using PDF Complete.

[Click Here to upgrade to Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

Mr. Mueller explained that the facilities planning process was basically a twenty year outlook of what the WPCA needed to be doing. He went on to say that the conclusion was that no major upgrades were required at the treatment plant, but that there needed to be a capital improvement program for the wastewater treatment facility and its infrastructure.

Mr. Mueller stated that the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) had been requesting that all communities develop a Water Pollution Control Plan and Sewer Service Area Map. He then distributed them to the Commission members and staff. He explained that Windsor Locks was essentially all sewered with the exception of the western half of town where the sewers went to the MDC Poquonock Plant.

Mr. Mueller stated that the following evening there would be a WPCA meeting and public hearing on the plan. He went on to say that he wanted to be able to tell the WPCA that he had presented the Sewer Map to the Planning and Zoning Commission and that the Commission understood what it was and that all of the Commission's questions had been answered. Mr. Mueller noted that the DEP ultimately wanted the Town to adopt the Sewer Service Area Map into the Infrastructure Section of the Plan of Conservation and Development.

A discussion of the map took place regarding the Babylon site.

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

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he saw it as a welcome addition to the Plan of Conservation and Development. He went on to say that if the WPCA approved it, the next step would be to include it in the Plan of Conservation and Development as an amendment.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Mueller if he needed a formal motion from the Commission. Mr. Mueller replied that he did not. Mr. O'Leary pointed out that when it came back to the Commission it would require an application and a public hearing in order to adopt it and add it to the Plan of Conservation and Development. He then stated that when Mr. Mueller got to that point, he should contact Mr. Szczesny or him since they should have some explanatory text to go along with the map.



PDF Complete
Your complimentary use period has ended.
Thank you for using PDF Complete.

[Click Here to upgrade to Unlimited Pages and Expanded Features](#)

BILLS AND CORRESPONDENCE:

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received Mr. O’Leary’s bill for his final retainer of the year for the months of May and June, 2011 in the amount of \$3,333. He then moved to approve Mr. O’Leary’s bill in the amount of \$3,333. Mr. Szepanski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

A discussion regarding the scheduling of incoming applications took place.

Mr. Szczesny stated that he had received a letter from an applicant looking to open a cigar shop at 5 National Drive. He went on to say that as a component of that business the applicant wanted to have a smoking lounge. He then asked the Commission members for their interpretation of whether it would be a permitted use. The discussion continued briefly and Mr. Szczesny stated that the Health Department had said that it would be okay as long as the applicant did not sell any food and that the Fire Marshal had had no issues with it. It was then decided that a site plan review that included a floor plan would be required.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that the only thing scheduled for the Commission’s July meeting was the continuation of the public hearing regarding the amendment to the Zoning Regulations. He then asked the Commission members if they wanted to cancel the July meeting. The Commission members all agreed that they should cancel the July meeting.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to cancel the July Commission meeting. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 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.