

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
January 13, 2014 Meeting Minutes

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

Commission Members Present: Vincent Zimnoch, Jim Szepanski, Peter Juszczynski, Alexa Brengi, and Curtis Ruckey

Commission Members Absent: Alan Gannuscio

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

I. Call to Order

Chairman Zimnoch called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

II. Roll Call

Commission roll call was taken. Mr. Ruckey was seated for Mr. Gannuscio by Chairman Zimnoch.

III. Approval of Minutes from the December 9, 2013 Regular Meeting

Mr. Ruckey noted that the minutes marked him as absent at the December 9, 2013 meeting when he was actually present. Mr. Szepanski was concerned that a condition of moving the dumpster was omitted from the approval of 448 Spring Street. Mr. Steele said Mr. Zuraw was going to move the dumpster and the plans showed it being moved. Mr. Steele's issue was with its location, adding that it needed to be brought closer to the building. Chairman Zimnoch stated that the commission would hold off on approving the minutes until Mr. Gannuscio could be present.

IV. Public Hearings (none)

V. Reviews (none)

VI. Action on Closed Public Hearing Items (none)

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion with Commission and Staff regarding:

i. T&M and North Group, LLC request for acceptance of roads

Mr. Steele stated that the deeds have all been reviewed by his office and the Town Attorney and have been sent back to the developer's attorney. They have to review them, execute them, and return them. The Town Attorney has tried called the developer's attorney but has not connected with him yet. The problem has been that there were two developers on the project, and both need to sign the documents.

VIII. New Business

A. **Public Input** (none)

B. **Receive New Applications** (none)

C. **Informal Discussions** (none)

D. **Resolution for Approval (pursuant to Section 8-24 of the C.G.S.)**

- i. Design, construction, and installation of improvements to Windsor Locks High School, including window replacement and installation of new rooftop energy recovery ventilators and convectors, substantially as described in the plans prepared by The Lawrence Associates dated September 24, 2013.

Ms. Rodriguez stated the high school is seeking favorable comment from the commission regarding this project, based on CGS 8-24. She distributed information on CGS Section 8-24, which explains why the commission has to go through this process. She also distributed a packet with budget details of the project, including construction costs, and miscellaneous expenses. The total cost will be approximately \$7 million.

Chairman Zimnoch introduced the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Windsor Locks approves the following project pursuant to Section 8-24 of the General Statutes of Connecticut:

Design, construction, and installation of improvements to Windsor Locks High School, including window replacement and installation of new rooftop energy recovery ventilators and convectors, substantially as described in the plans prepared by The Lawrence Associates dated September 24, 2013.

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve this resolution regarding window replacement and energy improvements at Windsor Locks High School, pursuant to Section 8-24 of the General Statutes of Connecticut.

E. **Incentive Housing Zone Resolution**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that in February 2009 the commission resolved to allow staff to apply for grants through the State of Connecticut, OPM, to look into a state statute that is called the Incentive Housing Zone. At the time, for a number of reasons, this grant was not applied for. What OPM can do is offer planning assistance, research, minor engineering, and feasibility in terms of location analysis, and sewer capacity, so that when a town is interested in applying for these funds, it could look at whether this would be appropriate in town. The incentive to the town is \$2,000 per unit, and

it's for affordable housing, not low-income housing. The difference between the two is that affordable housing is based on the recommendation of not paying more than 30% of your income on your housing. How many units that are affordable can a town like Windsor Locks absorb? What would be the right scale? Is there a portion of downtown or Route 75 that is appropriate for this? This grant would do the planning and research so these questions could be answered. Mr. Steele asked if this would be for apartments, condos, subdivisions, or any kind of residential units. Ms. Rodriguez responded she did not think it would be for subdivisions. She said there would be an incentive for the town and for the developer. Depending on the density that is chosen, it would be either \$1,000 or \$2,000 per unit. There would have to be some sort of deed restriction on the property so that for 30 years those units would be preserved. She stated, "Not less than 20% of the dwelling units will be conveyed subject to an incentive housing restriction requiring that for at least 30 years after the initial occupancy of the development such dwelling units shall be sold or rented at or below prices which will preserve the units of housing for which persons may pay 30% or less of their annual income where such income is less than or equal to 80% or less of the median income." In other words, if it was a 20-unit building, four of the units would need to be affordable, and the rest would be market rate.

Mr. Szepanski asked what this would do for the town. Ms. Rodriguez replied that if the town is looking to have some properties developed, it could be a good thing. There are also some theories in the planning field that talk about keeping public staff like teachers and police living in town, retaining families in town, and attracting young families to the town.

Ms. Rodriguez stated for the record, "Windsor Locks seeks \$20,000 in Incentive Housing Zone (IHZ) funds to cover Phase I predevelopment costs such as legal/planning expenses, feasibility studies, identifying, and recommending specific IHZ locations, drafting IHZ regulations, and/or minor engineering studies."

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission resolve to (1) endorse submission of the predevelopment grant application for planning assistance under the Housing for Economic Growth Program referenced in Section 8-13 (m-x) of CGS; and (2) certify that it will consider the creation of one or more housing incentive zones.

Ms. Rodriguez commented that the application is due January 31 and she will take this to the Board of Selectmen.

IX. Communications and Bills (none)

OTHER

There was some discussion about which date to put on the revised plans for Off Track Betting, 11 Schoephoester Road. It was decided to use tonight's date of January 13, 2014 for the approval date.

X. Adjournment

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourn the January 13, 2014 meeting at 7:42 pm.

*Respectfully submitted,
Debbie Seymour
Recording Secretary*