I. **Call to Order**

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:11 pm.

II. **Roll Call**

Commission roll call was taken.

III. **Approval of Minutes from the January 9, 2017 and February 13, 2017 Regular Meetings**

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Szepanski) and PASSED (Unanimous, 3-0; Brengi and Valdez Abstaining) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the minutes of the January 9, 2017 regular meeting as published.

Mr. Szepanski pointed out that there was an error in the February 13, 2017 minutes in Section VIII-B (i), Receive New Applications. The words “a public hearing for” should be deleted from the motion so it reads: “...the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a site plan review for JSL Asphalt at 71-75 King Spring Road to construct office building for March 13, 2017.”

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Szepanski) and PASSED (Unanimous, 4-0; Zimnoch Abstaining) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the minutes of the February 13, 2017 regular meeting as corrected.

IV. **Public Hearings** (none)

V. **Reviews**

A. **Site plan review for JSL Asphalt at 71-75 King Spring Road to construct office building**

Kevin Johnson and Chris Zibbideo from the engineering firm Close, Jensen, & Miller, and Jeff Hitchings of JSL Asphalt addressed the commission. Mr. Johnson gave a brief orientation of the site. This site, located in the Industrial-I zone, is about 6.5 acres. It used to be two separate parcels known as 71 and 75 King Spring Road,
but has merged and is now known as 75 King Spring Road. The applicant is proposing to construct a new one-story building approximately 50 feet wide and 99 feet long, divided into two sections. The front section would be office space, and the rear would be a maintenance garage for repair and servicing of JSL’s fleet trucks. There are 19 parking spaces on site for 13 employees. There will be no additional employees. In the areas of the parking around the building, what is currently hard packed gravel will be converted to bituminous concrete. They are accessing the site with a driveway utilizing an existing curb cut. The rear areas will remain hard packed gravel and some of the stock piles will be re-configured and re-oriented. The site currently drains in multi-directions. They are proposing to maintain those existing drainage patterns. Around the building there are some landscaped islands which have curbing. Everything else is flush paving, and what they are proposing is to sheet flow the site drainage from the front portion of the site into a rain garden that they’ve created in the front of the site. The purpose of the rain garden is to receive any storm runoff. They are proposing all new utility systems to this building. They are proposing 7 building mounted lights and 2 post mounted lights, and everything will be mounted at a 14-foot mounting height, with LED, full cutoff fixtures. A photo of a building was distributed to the commission. The building itself will be one-story with a metal roof and metal siding and some masonry, similar to what the photo shows. They are proposing a couple of deciduous trees on each side of the entrance drive, with foundation plantings around the building. In the internal islands there will be broadleaf evergreens, ground covers, ornamental grasses, and perennials, and the rain garden will have ornamental grasses and perennials. There is an existing trailer that is part of the existing asphalt operations which will be removed, and this gravel area will be converted to a mulched area. Mr. Johnson mentioned the Erosion and Sedimentation Controls that would be used during construction and post construction.

Mr. Johnson stated that he did meet with staff several times during the development of these plans and received comments from both Ms. Rodriguez and Mr. Steele. He proceeded to discuss these comments. In Mr. Steele’s letter dated March 13, 2017, item #1 noted that the applicant had not tabulated the green space for the landscaping correctly, so they did revise the plan. The parking lot area is the shaded area, and the darker shading is the landscaped areas. When you take that overall area, they are required to have 15%. They are shy of that 15% by 104 square feet. They could meet the 15% requirement, ending up with a 30 square foot surplus, and maintain the 24-foot aisle behind the parking, but the connecting aisle between the main driveway and the parking field they could narrow to 22 feet. Mr. Steele felt they should leave the 24 feet, but they will leave it up to the commission. They could modify the plan and achieve the 15%, or leave it with the 24-foot aisle and be slightly deficient of the requirement.

Items #2 and 3 regarding revision of sheets 6 and 8 will be taken care of. Item #4 regarding using existing water and sewer services: those utility systems are in the middle of the existing site, and they would have to get by an existing gas main, so they would prefer not to have those obstacles and to keep the plan as it is proposed. The second part of item 4, showing standard town details for temporary and
permanent pavement repair, will be done. Regarding items #5, 6, and 7, they have no problems providing an E&SC bond for $3,500, an as-built survey, and the DEEP registration for the grease interceptor.

Mr. Johnson then discussed comments from Ms. Rodriguez’s report dated March 13, 2017. Under item #6, the last sentence, providing more landscaped areas, is the same comment in Mr. Steele’s report (item #1) about the green space that was already addressed. Item #10, Sidewalks: the applicant will be looking for a sidewalk deferral since there are no sidewalks on King Spring Road and there would be nothing for a sidewalk to connect to. Item #11, Architectural Plans: the overgraph was distributed and discussed.

Mr. Steele discussed his report dated March 13, 2017. With regard to the utility connections, it’s fine with him to keep the plan as proposed. Regarding landscaping item #1: as configured with a 24-foot aisle, the entire width is about 14%, where 15 is required, and they showed they could meet the 15% by narrowing that area to 22 feet. Mr. Steele stated that normally the regulations require 24-foot aisles, but it seems to be in relation to the parking spaces, and since this has no spaces in front of it, it seems reasonable to have it narrower. From a practical standpoint, he doesn’t see the value in narrowing it 2 feet just to get a little more square footage. If the commission is concerned about the technicality of being short on that 15%, one thought he had was they are doing enhancements to the existing wooded area where the trailer is, so if the commission wants to consider some of the other improvements being made to the site as counting towards that, then there’s some flexibility in that regard. They’re taking an area and making it more of a landscaping area by putting a natural material on it, so if you count that they have more than enough area. Technically it’s outside of the parking area so you’d have to make the determination that in this case because it’s an existing site that they’re modifying and doing improvements to other parts of the site you can take those things into consideration. But if the commission is more comfortable just isolating it as that, technically with the regulations they could meet it with the simple condition that they reduce that access driveway by 2 feet. Mr. Steele said he suggests the former rather than the latter as a matter of practicality.

Ms. Rodriguez briefly discussed her report dated March 13, 2017. She noted that the site is in an Industrial 1 zone and the property to the north is in Suffield, and she sent notification to the Clerk’s office in Suffield as a courtesy. An additional thing to note is that the applicant has provided evidence of the merger of the two parcels, and documents were filed in the Town Clerk’s office. A letter was submitted from the Wetland Agent because this project is about 400 feet away from wetland soil which is in the far northeast corner. Ms. Rodriguez read into the record favorable comments from the Fire Marshal and Police Chief.
Mr. Steele asked what the address will be for this new building. Mr. Hitchings replied that he believes it will be 75 King Spring Road. Ms. Rodriguez stated that she will confirm that. Mr. Steele commented that the applicant did a good job of communicating with him and Ms. Rodriguez, and this application has gone through smoothly, which is encouraging.

Ms. Rodriguez asked Mr. Steele if he could talk about the rain garden. He explained that the DEEP is requiring municipalities to regulate and maintain their storm drainage systems in town roads so that they don’t pollute streams and other natural resources. As part of that the state has put a mandate on the towns to keep an eye on the private properties that drain into their system, since the town is accepting responsibility for making sure that water is clean. One of the things they have been doing and need to continue to do is address water quality on site plans and any new site that’s developed by fully complying with the latest technology and standards for treatment of storm water. Even on existing sites for redevelopment they like to improve the storm water runoff as much as possible because it eases the burden on the town to meet those mandates, and so it’s helpful to work together with DPW to evaluate each site and come up with solutions.

Chairman Gannuscio asked commission members for opinions on narrowing the aisle to 22 feet or accepting the mulch area as part of the 15%. All agreed that the mulch area was acceptable and made more sense.

There was a brief discussion about granting a sidewalk deferral for this application. Chairman Gannuscio remarked that he does not think the town would ever put money into putting in sidewalks on King Spring Road and he would be willing to defer sidewalks here. Mr. Steele asked if the applicant understands that a deferral would mean they would be entering into an agreement to install them at such a time as there is a walk to connect to, at their cost. Mr. Hitchings replied yes.

It was MOVED (Szepanski) and SECONDED (Brengi) and PASSED (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the site plan review for JSL Asphalt at 75 King Spring Road to construct an office building with the following conditions listed in the Town Engineer’s letter dated March 13, 2017: items 1 through 3 as written; item 4, “to provide standard town details for temporary and permanent pavement patch;” items 5 through 7 as written; and condition 8, to be subject to an agreement to install sidewalks to be filed on the land records.

VI. Action on Closed Public Hearing Items (none)

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion with Commission and Staff (none)

B. Action Items (none)
VIII. New Business

A. Public Input (none)

B. Receive New Applications

i. Site plan modification for Fleetmasters for additional parking lot area and a 4,649 square foot building at 422 Spring Street

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Zimnoch) and PASSED (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a site plan modification review for Fleetmasters for additional parking lot area and a 4,649 square foot building addition at 422 Spring Street for April 10, 2017.

ii. Site plan modification of existing approval for three storage buildings for Park Place Storage LLC at 200/400 Old County Circle

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Valdez) and PASSED (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a site plan modification review of existing approval for three storage buildings for Park Place Storage LLC at 200/400 Old County Circle for April 10, 2017.

iii. Special use permit for Windsor Locks Public Schools for placement of WLPS transition program (RISE) at 255 Main Street

It was MOVED (Gannuscio) and SECONDED (Zimnoch) and PASSED (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a public hearing for a special use permit for Windsor Locks Public Schools for placement of the Windsor Locks Public Schools transition program (RISE) at 255 Main Street for April 10, 2017.

C. Informal Discussions (none)

D. Action Items (none)

IX. Communications and Bills (none)

OTHER

Ms. Rodriguez will send along an update of the status of projects.

Chairman Gannuscio mentioned the businesses along Main Street that are moving out. Ms. Rodriguez said they met with the property owner to hear their perspective.

Mr. Zimnoch stated the Hungry Rhino is now open.
The Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) was briefly discussed.

Chairman Gannuscio talked to the Finance Office about using money from the supply account for more signs.

There have been observations of many parked cars in three locations in town: the old Shell station at the end of South Center Street; on Halfway House Road by Gem Jewelers; and behind The Cuttery on Spring Street.

X. **Adjournment**

   It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourns the March 13, 2017 meeting at 8:15 pm.

   Respectfully submitted,

   *Debbie Seymour*
   *Recording Secretary*