

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**September 10, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

*These minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting.*

Commission Members Present: Alan Gannuscio, Vincent Zimnoch, Jim Szepanski, Alexa Brengi, and Cindy Cooper

Commission Members Absent: Kayleigh Royston (Alternate)

Town Staff Present: Jennifer Rodriguez (Town Planner), and Dana Steele (Town Engineer)

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

**II. Roll Call**

Commission roll call was taken.

**III. Approval of Minutes from the August 13, 2018 Regular Meeting**

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0; Zimnoch Abstaining) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the minutes of the August 13, 2018 regular meeting as published.

**IV. Public Hearings**

**A. Potential approval of the General Plan of Development in the AIOZ for the Thrall property on Old County Road and 327 South Center Street for a proposed sports village (property owner OJ Thrall, Inc./Joseph B. Thrall II)**

Mr. Szepanski read the rules for conducting a public hearing.

The Recording Secretary read the two legal notices that were published in the *Journal Inquirer* on August 1, 2018 and August 8, 2018, and again on August 24, 2018.

Chairman Gannuscio reiterated what we are doing this evening: Part of the zoning regulations when it deals with property that is in the AIOZ (Airport Interchange Overlay Zone) requires first a General Plan of Development before anything further comes forward in terms of more final plans. This evening's proceedings are only going to take testimony and comment on the General Plan of Development. It does not mean that there will be a final approval of any sort of the property. It's just a general plan for what is being proposed.

Attorney Paul Smith, 27 South Main Street, representing the applicant, JABS Sports Management, LLC, addressed the commission. He introduced Andy Borgia, who is a principal of JABS Sports Management. He also introduced John Mancini of BL Companies, who are the engineers and architects on the project. Attorney Smith gave Chairman Gannuscio and the recording secretary a letter stating that the application and plans have been modified to eliminate the inclusion of any portion of the open space property owned by the Town of Windsor Locks as part of the application and asking the commission to accept this letter as a modification of the existing application. Attorney Smith stated that at this point the only property involved in the development is the Thrall property on Old County Road, and anything involving 327 South Center Street has been eliminated from the application.

Attorney Smith went on to give a brief overview, referring to several maps. The Thrall property is 76.2 acres on the east side of Old County Road at the Windsor line, across from the Honda property. To the south is the Route 20 connector which runs along the entire length of the Thrall piece. To the north is the Town of Windsor Locks open space. In the front are a few business zoned lots that are undeveloped at this point. In the rear, to the east, is some commercial property and the Oak Ridge and Woodridge multi-family condominiums. In summary, the abutting properties are open space, the highway, with industrial on the other side and industrial on the front, and the multi-family units and some additional business zoned property in the back (to the east). The proposal in front of the commission is to get the General Plan of Development (GPD) under the AIOZ zone. This property is zoned Business 1 with the AIOZ overlay. The heart of his client's proposal is to build a youth sports complex with some peripheral accessories to be used as a supplement to those people that are using the facility. They are going to modify the entranceway to this property. One of the reasons they are asking for the town and commission to consider a GPD at this point is they need this in order to finalize their planning with DOT in terms of access. They are intending to expand the existing intersection where Route 20 entrances and exits are to allow them direct access to the site by light control. They have submitted a detailed traffic study of their proposal and it looks like it should work reasonably well. It's all going to be by light control and has to be DOT approved.

Attorney Smith continued on, describing the site itself. He commented that the principal usage is the youth sports complex part of it, which is in the middle and to the rear. Initially going in, the entranceways go to both the south and north area of the property. Some of this may change a little bit as they go to final site plan, but the proposal at this point is for two hotels, an amusement center, restaurants, theaters, retail, and public tennis courts. When you get into the heart of the facility, there is a proposed community building designed to house 16 basketball courts. There are the outdoor facilities with a championship field capable of seating 5,600 [this was later corrected to 6,500] and eight turf fields. In the rear of the facility there will be six dormitories to house the young athletes. The vision is this is the type of complex where you might get teams from all over New England and the Northeast to come. It's designed so the teams can stay within a group in the dorm with their coaches and

chaperones within the facility and then use the fields for soccer and lacrosse. As you run a tournament you end up with some teams playing the championship game at the end of the tournament cycle in the championship field. You also have the proposed basketball, or community building, with teams playing tournaments. One court can seat a couple of thousand people for championship games. This complex is designed to bring in teams from all over the Northeast to compete in tournaments on site (for basketball, soccer, lacrosse, and volleyball) and to encourage them to stay on site. The retail, hotel, and amusement portions are designed to serve the parents and families of those children that might come. The facility is designed for kids from 8 to college age. If it's not tournaments then it would be some sort of sports camp. When the Windsor Locks open space piece was eliminated from the proposal, the dormitories were relocated to the far east so there would be a buffer for potential noise to the condominiums.

This is designed to be a self-contained facility with its own security and over 400 full time employees. The retail and hotel portion may change a little bit in the future. They have looked at the parking and what they need and what satisfies all the requirements. They have looked at storm water drainage which will be dealt with on site and will have no impact on any of the abutting properties. They have designed it so the dorms serve as a significant buffer to any real activity going on for very little impact if any on the neighbors or abutters to the property. They believe this project will be a significant value added project for the town. It's a great use, very benign, and it's all about getting kids here and having them play sports. It will be operated year round. To the abutters the impact should be nominal. They have tried to be sensitive to the issues of noise and lighting with regard to the multi-family units, and they believe they have taken this into account in terms of their design. Attorney Smith commented that there was another plan that was submitted that gives a preliminary idea of buffers but he was not sure if it made it into the commission's packet. It was determined that commission members did not yet have this, and copies were distributed. This plan has more detail of the buffer area between the dormitories and the condominiums. There is a fairly significant area in each of the cross sections-significant distance with some natural buffering of trees between the multi-family units and the facility, well over the zoning requirements with the minimum on the corner of over 100 feet to the property line with the other corner going out to 220 feet and then from there a significant distance of at least 100 feet to any building. The cross sections show a pretty significant zone of tree property that will serve as a buffer. They are willing to discuss additional buffering and plantings at the site plan stage if the commission determines it's necessary. They have tried to be sensitive to the multi-family units that are located to the east.

John Mancini, Senior Principal with BL Companies, 355 Research Parkway, Meriden, addressed the commission. He clarified that all of the data that is up on the easel except for the renderings and the cross section was previously given to the commission, but for purposes of presentation, instead of having them at 24 by 36 size sheets, they've combined the presentation board so that there is a single drawing. It's the same material depicted everywhere as what's in their plan set.

Mr. Mancini went on to describe how this facility is going to function. The purpose of the design is to keep the youth athletes outside and independent of places where they have to cross a parking lot or walk from one side of the campus to another to go eat. The middle dorm building will have a multi-purpose community area with a taller ceiling where the youth participants will be eating. The whole idea of the design is to keep it safe and secure from the rest of the activities. They are looking to pull teams in from a broad geography, so people will be flying into Bradley, and shuttle buses will pick up teams from the airport. There will be a sign-in lounge area for the athletes to go through all of the forms that need to be filled out. They believe they have a solid business plan, as the parents and siblings of the participants will need activities and places to stay, shop, and eat. What exactly comes into this area is going to evolve over time in terms of the actual tenancy. There will be public tennis courts which will be maintained by the sports complex.

They believe they have enough parking. They will have bus service and mass transit bringing people to the site. Mr. Mancini explained that when there is an outdoor sport going on there will not be a championship tournament going on in any indoor facility. Participants will come in on a Wednesday for a tournament and make their way through the rounds to the championship, so you don't need parking for another group of teams who are coming in to play. By the time Sunday rolls around and the championship games are played, a lot of the teams that didn't make it that far are already gone. They are below the threshold for impervious coverage. They have provided an exhibit on how they calculated the interior landscaping. They met with the Fire Chief on the last plan and they had a similar approach on how they were getting to the dorms with the fire apparatus. They will sit down with the Fire Marshall tomorrow and accommodate his concerns.

Mr. Mancini briefly discussed the landscaping. For the cross sections, there is a lot of existing vegetation with very tall trees. For the most part, they are not touching any of the existing vegetation. In one area, they are only trimming back a small amount that's in the vicinity of the man-made pond in the corner, and that is going to be held by a hard buffer retaining wall that they're putting there. The property bows back and widens out along the residential uses, and they could have staggered the fields instead of stepping them, but then the alignment of the fields were going to be such that the pedestrian paths and the concession locations wouldn't be as clean. But this allowed them to create a pretty natural buffer. They paid a lot of attention to the buffer distance.

Mr. Mancini briefly discussed the storm water management plan. They received comments from the Town Engineer over the weekend, and they believe they have addressed or can easily accommodate his concerns. Right now in this schematic master plan, they have all the fields graded down to a certain location. When they go to the detailed plans, they have no problem grading the three fields back this way, and then taking that water and infiltrating it back into discharge points so they can make sure they are feeding the wetland fingers that are not on their property (they have to do it on their own property). They anticipate having a substantial geotechnical

program that will be starting soon so they will be doing test pit holes, borings, and infiltration tests, so they'll know the data pretty well. Mr. Steele's comment, "Do we really need to grade all the way down in one direction?" is not an issue at all. They will be managing their runoff from a water quality standpoint, and they will be doing this with underground retention basins. In addition, the turf ends on a concrete curb which helps you manage the runoff as well. Under all these fields will be infiltration of the actual runoff that's coming from the fields, so they won't be taking this clean runoff and mixing it with the runoff that's going into the infiltration basins that are used for the paved areas. They will be infiltrating all over this area and keeping the water in the ground where it's going today.

Next Mr. Mancini discussed the access to the site. The fire access right now is designated to loop the entire site. They will be meeting with the Fire Marshall right away. In order for them to get their OSTA (Office of State Traffic Administration) approval, they need to get their master plan approved. OSTA has approved their Traffic Analysis and Trip Generation rates that come from this site. They've given OSTA two concepts for access, and all of them involve a single point intersection. They can get all their traffic in by traveling on one section of road.

Their site will be serviced by all utilities. They are still discussing and having meetings but they anticipate that there is adequate capacity to serve this site but have to agree on what the design value is for this. Right now it's based on the type of designation of space. For water, they realize that if they need a booster pump for pressure, they will have to put one in. Right now there doesn't seem to be a problem with capacity, but they will be getting into more details at the next step.

Attorney Smith commented that he wanted to make some points regarding the uses and how they interface under the AIOZ zone. The only ones that don't easily check a box is the indoor recreation facility, which is the gymnasium/indoor athletic facility, and the other one is the dormitories. With some of the language of the regulations, the use of the gymnasium would fit into an amusement center or an outdoor recreation area, except it would be indoors. The dormitories would be close to hotels, designed for the kids to stay there, and each team would have their own bathroom and lounge area. Most of the traffic for the facility will generate off Routes 20 and 91. Shuttle buses will also be available, so it's not something that will pull a lot of traffic onto local roads.

Attorney Smith pointed out that in their opinion there will be a low impact on the town's services. They are providing their own security; there will be no undesirable traffic generated; and there will be no impact on the school system. The economic impact on the town will be significantly positive. With the new design, there will be no impact on the open space parcel. They are taking care of runoff on site. They are not looking for any special exemptions or changes with regard to side yards. The fields will retain the water, and there will be more water quality basins. Attorney Smith reiterated that they need the approval of their GPD in order to move forward with the DOT. All the buildings will have significant fire suppression systems.

Mr. Mancini explained why this location is a great location. This facility is 10 minutes from the airport, the Springfield Hall of Fame is 20 minutes away, and the Holyoke Volleyball Hall of Fame is 35 minutes away. There is a lot to draw upon, so the experience of the folks who come here will include a trip to those places as part of their package. We are also spoiled to have really great basketball in our state. And lastly, the town of Windsor Locks has a rich history in sports, so this is a really good fit for a community that really gets it when it comes to sports.

Jennifer Rodriguez, Town Planner, discussed her report dated September 7, 2018. Fire Marshall comments were received on September 10, 2018 and were read into the record. Ms. Rodriguez suggested that the commission might want to give direction to the applicant in terms of what they should provide to the commission for review and when. Police Chief comments were received on September 10, 2018 and were read into the record. Comments from the WPCA were received and will be discussed and read into the record during the Town Engineer's report.

Dana Steele, Town Engineer, discussed his letter to the commission dated September 8, 2018. He has reviewed the revised plans that were submitted for this application, including revised drainage calculations. The traffic study was not updated but his review includes an analysis of the traffic study as well as some of the information that was submitted tonight, particularly that cross section of the buffer between the residential uses to the east and the dormitories. His review looks at a number of issues such as storm drainage, construction phasing, noise and light impact and how that's being addressed, maintenance of the facility, traffic, the general layout of the site, and utilities. To summarize, the GPD regulations require the applicant to provide sufficient calculations to demonstrate that this use can actually work from a storm drainage standpoint, that they have reserved enough area for treatment and detention of storm water, provide calculations to show that they're not trying to do too much in the space that they have. He has reviewed that and is satisfied with the calculations from a standpoint of a GPD review. Once this moves on from the first phase to a site plan approval, he will be reviewing much more detailed calculations to verify some of the assumptions that were made in these calculations. He believes they are reasonable and conservative assumptions, but until those studies are done, we won't know for sure. However, he is comfortable that what they are proposing will work. Regarding comment #1: The one area where he sees a deficiency is on the east end of the project, stormwater basin #2. They are showing a long narrow basin along the eastern property line, and the slopes going down to that basin are too steep. He would like to see them flatter like the other basins throughout the site. He talked to the engineer about this, and they feel they can make those modifications and bring in some different technologies to solve that problem. Mr. Steele is comfortable with the plans as they've been submitted with the understanding that when it comes time for site plan review, they may have to shift things around a little bit to make room, which may mean losing an athletic field. This will be worked out at the next level.

Comment #2, construction phasing: Mr. Steele commented that Page MSP-4.0 is an important page because it has a lot of critical information on it for the commission's review. It's not clear from the phasing notes how much parking will be provided during the first and second phases and exactly what is going to be built. When the tennis courts are going to be built also needs to be spelled out on the plan.

Comment #6: The waivers the applicant is requesting are allowed under the AIOZ regulation because the idea is they propose a nice looking project and that justifies giving some flexibility in the design, not to compromise safety or anything critical, but to recognize that in order to encourage a really high end project, you would want to provide some flexibility. But you need to look closely at those. This GPD is an important approval. It's providing a framework and it's setting a bar and a standard for which both the commission and staff will review future applications. If a site plan comes in and it conforms with the GPD, generally speaking, you'll need to approve that, so that's why you set those standards now for quality and the general concept of uses and the general layout for noise and light so that when they come in we can hold them to those standards. If we don't define them now it puts us in a position later on of having to ask them for things that aren't specifically called out in the GPD. It's good practice to as much as possible get a good GPD that shows the waivers that make sense and not to grant waivers that don't make sense. Mr. Steele said he questions why waivers 6 and 7 regarding landscaping are needed. We don't get many applications like this of this magnitude, and our parking regulations are geared for smaller sites and not designed for things of this nature, so he thinks it does warrant some flexibility and some consideration, but we should think this through carefully how many parking spaces we need. About parking, Mr. Steele believes that to a great extent these things are somewhat self-regulating. He would encourage the commission to give the applicant some flexibility and leeway in these things, but it is good to think these things through and make sure the commission is comfortable with the proposal.

Comment #7: The regulations specifically say that the applicant needs a letter from the water company saying they have enough capacity, but they have not provided that yet. The reason for that regulation is you don't want someone proposing a use that's just not feasible. We have found with other uses along Old County Road that there have been some issues with water capacity. When this regulation was first adopted, part of the thinking was that you wanted to make sure that the developers knew what they were getting into and understood what the costs could be. This is a high water use application. The biggest demand with water is fire protection, so this is going to be a big concern and may be a big cost in this project, so the applicant needs to acknowledge that he is aware of this. Another factor that could come up during the construction process is an extra structure, a utility structure or pump house that you weren't counting on, and this could change their GPD. Mr. Steele commented that he feels it is better to have these things filled out on the GPD so there will be no "after the fact." They may not know the exact details and dimensions, but they could make some provisions for it so that the commission is comfortable with it and there are no questions moving forward into the next phases.

Comment #9: Mr. Steele stated that WPCA has some concerns about the amount of wastewater that will be generated by this project. They're not confident that their system has the capacity to handle it and don't know what cost is going to be involved in handling that additional capacity. Therefore, they are asking the developer to provide a detailed study to analyze this. They are willing to leave that detail for the site plan review process and not require it as part of this GPD, but this is a cost issue that the developer should be aware of. Ms. Rodriguez read into the record comments received from the WPCA on August 17, 2018. Mr. Steele suggested that if the commission moves forward to approve this GPD, this should be a condition of approval, that this study be provided prior to the site plan application.

Attorney Smith commented on a few items. He thought their lighting plan was 60 to 80 candle feet, not 150. With regard to signs, that is something they can probably defer to site plan approval. Mr. Mancini stated that they may have said 150 on the plan, but that was a mistake. They will have 60 foot candles for the regular fields and maybe 80 at the championship field, but it's LED so you can dial it down to 60 as well. All of the fixtures will be full cut off, and the light poles for the fields are 70 but the parking lot will be 24. If there is a sensitive area and they have to drop it to the standard height pole, that's not an issue. This was a typo on their part.

Mr. Mancini went on to discuss items in the Town Planner's and Town Engineer's reports. He reiterated that the foot candles will be 60 to a max of 80 for the championship field. They are only asking for the higher light poles on the fields and in the parking lot the 24. The parking lot landscaping area went from 12.6 without the basin area to 13.1 so they can leave it out, but they are asking for up to 10 and the regulations say 15, so they're in the middle of that. It's a lot of parking spaces and a big area, and they have a drawn out parking area. They can make the parking islands 10 feet wide. He believes the parking will self-correct itself. This facility has a lot of mixed elements to it, and it is impossible to do a shared parking analysis because they are saying they will be shuttling folks from the airport, and the buses will not stay on campus. They have roughly 2,100 parking spaces, which they feel will be enough, but they can add more shuttle service or change the hours of the tournaments. In other words, they will adjust the business model to make sure the parking is adequate. Regarding phasing, the main purpose is to build the sports complex, and the retail component, amenities, and support services will go in after. They do not need to build all this parking behind the hotels right away, but they can build some of them because it's near the gymnasium. For clarification purposes, they will do a colored figure indicating the parts that are being built for parking and the parts that are being built for buildings. They will clarify the number, height, and style of signs, and they have no problem designing the signs with a monument base with appropriate materials.

Mr. Mancini then discussed the landscaping to the adjacent residential use. They are maintaining all of the existing vegetation there, and they have no problem adding evergreen type landscaping to help the screening. The key to their design is to maintain the existing buffer that is there. Whatever they have to do to make sure that

storm water management has been handled on the site (remove a sidewalk or shrink the size of the patio area), they will be doing that at that design phase. They will make sure that all of the sidewalks are properly signed and pedestrian crossings properly taken care of. Mr. Mancini noted that Mr. Borgia is trying to build a sustainable development and something that he and the designers are going to be proud of. There will be a variety of different materials. The first 10 to 15 feet on these buildings will be brick, and the upper portions will have a combination of materials and metal panels with decorative finishes, or possibly a brick veneer. They will be doing an extensive geotechnical investigation of the site to get the permeability of the soils. Mr. Steele will be given all of this information with the detail of calculations. More notes will be added to the plan regarding the tennis courts as well as hours of operation and how the dorms will be used. The only outdoor area behind the building will be the patio walk area to get in and out of the cafeteria/convention area, but that is sunken down and well below the grade. In terms of the concerts and the convention, they will give the commission more information on that. There may be times that there could be an outdoor concert. The outdoor stadium/arena is probably 2,000 feet away from any residential buildings located beyond the dorms that are six and seven stories tall. Mr. Mancini pointed out where the shuttle bus dropoff would be. Regarding the waivers for landscaping, they have shown why they won't need to change from the 10 feet wide on the islands. For this size project, getting a letter from Connecticut Water is nearly impossible, but they know it's their responsibility to provide that to the commission for the next phase. Mr. Mancini indicated the probable location of a booster pump or sewage pump if it was necessary and would have no problem making the small building housing a sewage pump out of brick. He concluded by thanking the commission for listening to their presentation and by saying that the staff has been very available to provide them with immediate answers.

Attorney Smith summarized that they will address some of the concerns contained in the staff reports by giving additional detail for this plan. Some of the concerns such as the Connecticut Water and WPCA issues can be reasonably addressed by conditions of approval, being finalized at the site plan phase. They are open to any comments or input from the public and the commission.

*Chairman Gannuscio called a short break at 9:15 so members of the public could take a look at the drawings and renditions. The meeting was called back to order at 9:28.*

Mr. Zimnoch stated that due to the late hour and the large amount of people present, comments would be limited to three minutes per person.

At this time Chairman Gannuscio opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in support of this application.

Tina Bro, Woodridge Drive, spoke in favor of this application. She loves sports and feels something like this would bring more people to our community and would put Windsor Locks on the map; however, she has some concerns about noise and water coming onto her land, but if these concerns can be taken care of, then she's all for it.

The floor was then opened up for comments in opposition. The following people spoke in opposition to this application.

Mickey Danyluk, 53 Grove Street. He has concerns about runoff from roofs, parking lots, and astro turf fields. 76 acres is 3 ½ Noden Reed Parks. There is potential for a deluge of runoff water from rain and melted snow. The topography of Windsor Locks needs to be considered.

Donna Dowd, 102 Raymond Road. She asked what benefit we as taxpayers are getting from this facility. She asked if they are paying taxes. She is also concerned about the noise and especially an open air concert arena.

Peggy Sayers, 81 Spring Street. Before this plan is accepted she would like there to be something in writing on paper showing that all those things (referred to in Mr. Steele's report) have been accomplished. She also has concerns with the traffic and the access and the changes for the Route 20 connector. She feels it's important that a noise study be conducted before any plan is accepted.

Lee ??????, 16 Woodridge Drive. The slope of the land behind the dormitories concerns her because there is water there already, and she does not want any water coming on to her property. She hopes the town gets some kind of guarantee that whatever they do won't adversely affect them. She is also very concerned about the noise and the lighting.

Mr. Bracken, 12 Tinker Lane. He is concerned about additional traffic on Old County Road because it already has too much traffic. He does not feel there is enough parking. He believes there will be problems with the unsupervised youth; specifically, assaults and intoxicated juveniles.

William Russo (no address given). He said it would have been nice if Attorney Smith could have done some overheads so the public could have seen the presentation. He sees problems in the EMS area; specifically, the ambulances. This is a massive sports complex being run year round, with the possibility of lots of injuries. Windsor Locks Ambulance is now overburdened, and he doesn't feel our EMS could support that. He believes there will be many false alarms by kids in hotels, which will have an impact on our police, and there is a cost factor. There is a water capacity issue and the ability to do the sewage through WPCA. He feels the commission needs to be sure everything is in order before this project is approved, even if it means having the sports complex put money up front to answer these questions. He also feels there is

no need to subsidize this complex with our tax dollars. He objects strenuously having any tax incentive for this project. Lastly, he questioned the credibility of this developer.

Carl Schiessl, 93 Raymond Road, speaking on behalf of Waterworks Conservation Group. He stated that the Town Engineer said two things tonight that he found persuasive. One, that this GPD approval sets the framework for future review, so set the standard now for quality, and then Mr. Steele specifically referenced noise and lights. He urged the commission to be extra careful and not just approve this in order to promote some sort of proceeding at the State DOT. The other thing Mr. Steele said was we don't see many applications of this magnitude. This requires extra care on the front end, and Mr. Schiessl urged the commission to do its homework in advance with no rubber stamping. The Waterworks land and the sports village are fundamentally incompatible uses. The Waterworks land is intended to preserve open space, a place for wildlife to thrive and for people to enjoy through passive recreation during the day. Contrast that with the things you've heard about noise. Dormitories are not noise barriers, and that's only the east side of the property. The lights seem to be an issue. Noise and lights affect quality of life for everybody, people and animals. Runoff water. The town does not have a rich history managing runoff. Feeding the wetland field. Turf fields have microplastic fibers. They can get into the waterway and run into the natural habitat. We have to be sure if we're building 9 artificial turf fields that we are not polluting the land around it. As a condition of GPD approval, he would like the commission to consider requiring that the developer pay for an independent study or studies or appraisal for the following issues: noise, lights, water runoff, and environmental impacts. You have one chance to get this right, and if you get it wrong, you'll be destroying our most valuable natural resource. Don't be careful, be extra careful.

Gary Merrigan, 560 Halfway House Road. When his firm and a couple of commission members who are still on this commission brought this AIOZ forward, many months were spent defining the uses and the compatibility of this zone. He sees nowhere where a 6,500 seat open stadium to host concerts is in the AIOZ. It is an abuse of the applicant to dream that this is compatible. It has to be sensitive to the environmentally regulated area and it has to be in harmony within the development and abutting properties. He urges the commission to get it right the first time. We need a study for the lights and the noise and letters from all utilities, up front.

Mr. Bracken, 12 Tinker Lane. The eight fields including the one big field are only going to be used from May to October, and the rest of the season they're useless. In reality, the only part that's going to be functioning all year round are the hotels and the retail stores.

Gail Stegman, 308 South Center Street. She would like two things clarified: the distance between the dorms and Woodridge and on the south end to Oak Ridge. She thinks it's about 100 feet on the south end and the other to Woodridge is not quite 200 feet. That distance is not very far, and there is going to be a lot of noise. She is also

concerned about children playing on the artificial turf. Artificial turf is made up of tiny pieces of rubber which children can inhale and/or ingest, causing them harm. She asked if there is anything better than artificial turf. There is also going to be water runoff from the artificial turf, with the little pieces of rubber going into their water, lawns, and animals. Please hold them accountable.

Stu Roland, Raymond Road. He would like the developer to explain what happened in Long Island with the development he did. Chairman Gannuscio stated that this is not a question within the scope of this board, and Mr. Roland can discuss this with the developer individually.

Joanne Casello, ????? Drive. She is very concerned about the noise, the lights, and the traffic.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Mancini if he had the distance from the dorms to the condos. Mr. Mancini replied that the dimensions are on the plan. For Oak Ridge condos, the closest point from the closest building on their property to the dorms is roughly 190 feet. The next set of buildings that are on the same property, closest point, is 270 feet to the middle dorm, and then the next development the closest building there to the dorms is 390 feet. There is very mature tree growth, and they have no problem planting evergreens at the lower canopy area.

Mr. Steele clarified that there are 148 rooms in each hotel, equaling 296 rooms for the two hotels, and 420 rooms for the six dorms.

Mr. Mancini reiterated that they are a sports facility for youth, and they are not in the business of doing concerts, so if this commission and the neighbors are concerned about this, they will take a condition that there will be no concerts either indoor or outdoor. Attorney Smith commented that the impetus is the sports facility for the youth, and they intended to take all the comments of the public and staff, and ask to continue this to the next meeting. They are happy to take the public's comments under consideration. For lighting, if you look at the plan and the lighting they've designed, there is very little, if any, spillage off site. But they will look at those things.

Mr. Mancini clarified that the need for OSTA review is based on a certain size development, and this is in that category. There are three steps, and they already have the step one approval, which is the approval of the trip generation rates leaving this facility, which means OSTA concurs with their analysis on the number of trips that they're projecting onto the road system. OSTA also realizes that their access to the site is limited to the 200 foot frontage on Old County Road. So the issue is just the geometric shape of that, and they have to recognize they have to widen the lanes and redo the signalization. They have met with OSTA several times; but in order for OSTA to continue down that road they need to make sure there's a real master plan approved, or GPD approved. Chairman Gannuscio asked about the trip numbers. Mr. Mancini replied that they have to create those numbers and then they have to be

approved by the DOT. The reference that everyone uses is ITE (Institute of Traffic Engineers) Trip Generation. That's where there is limited use code categories for things that they're listing (such as a shopping center, an arena, a basketball facility). That's how you put that all together, and then the DOT has their own people, and they agree or disagree with your numbers, and they give you that first step approval, which they have received.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that this is a lot to digest. There is still a lot of information still to be provided, and he agrees that continuing this to the next meeting would be the best option at this point. Commission members all agreed.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission continues the public hearing on the General Plan of Development in the AIOZ for the Thrall property on Old County Road for a proposed sports village to Tuesday, October 9, 2018 at 7:00 pm.

*Chairman Gannuscio called a short break at 10:08. The meeting was called back to order at 10:17.*

**V. Reviews** (none)

**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**

1. Site Plan Modification, 317 Ella Grasso Turnpike, Lanter

Kevin West, 6 Wilcox Street, Simsbury, addressed the commission. They are requesting permission to remove a small portion of mulched low planting area on the south side of Ella Grasso Turnpike. The area is actually 10 by 140, not 10 by 80. This can be verified by reviewing some of the pictures that were sent. It starts before the end of the building. In the picture provided by Ms. Rodriguez from 2016, it starts short of the building and ends before the transformer. It constitutes about 1,400 square feet. This will increase the impervious coverage from 71.7 to 72.1, which is well within the regulation, where you have 75% allowed. The reason for this is the current tenant in here is Lanter Delivery, and

they're occupying approximately 2/3 of the current building, over to where the transformer is located. They need to increase their business and therefore lease the remainder of the building as part of their freight forwarding operation. They need to have three additional doors on the front of the building that would be for box trucks only. These would be trucks that would go out for local delivery with the parts and systems they provide. They are hoping that this is a small enough nature that it could be delegated to staff decision.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Steele and Ms. Rodriguez if they have seen anything formally. Ms. Rodriguez replied that she has not seen anything, and Mr. Steele said that he has had discussions with the applicant but has not seen any plans yet. Chairman Gannuscio remarked that, thinking back, in this particular site, wasn't this one of the conditions for a previous change to this site that this island or this area be set aside? Ms. Rodriguez replied, "Right." Mr. West responded that it was, but as he understands it, that petition never went forward, and they believe that the owner started to do this work of his or her own volition in preparation for that, but it never actually happened. Brad Wainman, 171 Penny Right Lane, Glastonbury, owner of the building, commented that they added it for an application where they were going to try to lease the building to Nestle's, and Nestle's never actually came, so it was a period of time where they started to do the work and then Nestle's never signed the lease. Mr. Steele said he was under the impression that there was grass area removed on the back of the building to have access on the back side, which is different from what is shown on this plan. Mr. Wainman responded, "That is correct." He went on to explain that he bought the buildings last February 2017. This building had been derelict for years. They have invested about a million dollars to upgrade the building. They own 315, 317, 319, and 1 Choice Road. They are taking this building back to what its original use was going to be, a cross dock. One of the requirements for this tenant to expand to the other half of the building is to have more back doors.

Mr. Steele questioned how this corrected the original statement that he made which is that they added pavement in the back and the removal in the front was to compensate for this. Mr. West replied that two years ago when they came in, this was not a condition of that removal. The condition that you see in the front, the letter pre-dates them, it was 2013 when that actually happened. It was two months after a site plan had been approved by whatever board existed then, when Nestle's was supposed to come in. If you look at the timeline of that letter, it was approved on a contingency, so that was not a contingency of their approval two years ago, it was back in 2013. Mr. Steele asked when the green space being removed in the back of the building would have occurred. Mr. West said they did remove an area in the back, but putting something in the front was not a contingency of that removal then. The contingency of the removal came five years ago, not 2017. There's a plan here that was done by Nestle that never actually came to be. This was dated January 2013. This letter that is being

referenced was dated March 2013, so that pre-dated anything they did collectively for the building. It was before their ownership, and that green space was a request by someone as a contingency on this site plan which was never developed.

Chairman Gannuscio replied, “Regardless of whose site plan it was, it was still a condition of approval.” A lengthy discussion continued about this concern and also about increasing impervious coverage and pavement on a site and increased stormwater. Mr. Steele stated he was not aware of any drainage problems at this road. He said, “The real question is, are you okay with them putting this pavement back without any other measures, based on what they’re saying: ‘It was paved before, and we just want to put it back to what it was,’ so if you agree that that is accurate, then we can just let them put it back. We need to know what standard to hold them to.” Chairman Gannuscio responded, “If your research shows that it was paved before, then I would say let staff review.” Mr. Steele said that it was definitely paved before. Mr. Zimnoch agreed that if it was paved staff review would be okay. All commission members were in agreement.

### **C. Informal Discussions**

#### **1. Home Occupation, Microbrewery**

Ms. Rodriguez noted that this is a residential property in an industrial zone, and the resident would like to do a microbrewery as a home occupation. This is a unique situation. It’s industrial, so it’s permissible. Chairman Gannuscio remarked that this is not the evening for the commission to discuss this, so this discussion should be continued to the October meeting. Commission members would like the gentleman to come in and talk to them and get it on the record.

### **D. Action Items (none)**

## **OTHER**

It was decided that a workshop for the commission to go through the POCD sections would be held on **Tuesday, October 16, 2018** at 7:00 pm. Ms. Rodriguez will check to see what rooms are available.

## **IX. Communications and Bills**

Chairman Gannuscio has a bill pending in the amount of \$720 for legal expenses for Pool Table Magic and would like approval for that expenditure from the commission’s Legal Account.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves payment of \$720 for David Sherwood regarding Kulungian vs. Windsor Locks.

**OTHER**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the approval from January for 465 Spring Street related to the approval of a general repair license with restrictions, and the DMV will not allow them to open because of the way the motion was worded. The approval was for a general repair license with restrictions, but the wording of the approval said not to be a general repair situation, so they conflicted. The DMV would like it to be amended to say that this IS a general repair approval with the following restrictions, and then they don't care about the restrictions because that's the town's enforcement piece. It was agreed that this be put under "Old Business, Clarification of Approval, 465 Spring Street" on the agenda for next month's meeting.

Ms. Rodriguez mentioned that she and Mark Pellegrini did a visit of Spring Street and he did some outreach to many of the users to ask if they were planning to expand or move any time soon. He provided her a list of all of the uses. He went property by property and did an analysis. This information will go to this commission because when you have more than 50% of the users in that zone doing something that's not permitted, even though they're legal, it's just good food for thought. She should have this analysis for the next meeting.

**X. Adjournment**

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Brenzi) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourns the September 10, 2018 meeting at 10:52 pm.

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Debbie Seymour  
Recording Secretary*