

ENFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2016 – 7:00 P.M.
ENFIELD TOWN HALL - COUNCIL CHAMBERS
820 ENFIELD STREET - ENFIELD, CT

1. Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance
2. Fire Evacuation Announcement
3. Roll Call

Commissioner Ballard took the roll and present were Chairman Charles Duren and Commissioners Elizabeth Ballard, Charles Ladd, Mary Scutt, Nicles Lefakis, Linda DeGray, and Richard Szewczak.

Absent were Commissioners Alan Drinan and Peter Falk. Alternate Commissioners Linda DeGray and Richard Szewczak sat for the absent commissioners.

4. Approval of Minutes – October 20, 2016 – regular meeting

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Szewczak, to approve the minutes of the October 20, 2016 regular meeting as amended. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

5. Staff Reports

- a. Town Attorney (in writing) – No comments
- b. Zoning Enforcement Officer (in writing) – No comments

6. Public Participation

Maureen Mullen, of 1625 King Street, addressed the Commission to say she is still looking for the Soils Management Plan for the CREC Public Safety Academy. She would like to see them before the hearing on November 14, 2016.

Mr. O'Brien stated that there was a settlement between CREC and the Town of Enfield which was approved by the Commission, and one condition was that they submit a Soils Management Plan. It is not required for the hearing, so it will not be discussed.

Ms. Mullen stated that she wants to know what they are doing with the soil on that site in advance of the next meeting so that she can come before this Commission if she has an issue.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Soils Management Plan would be concerning the installation of silt fences, anti-tracking pads, etc. The relocation of the soil was already agreed upon.

7. Bond Release(s)

- a. PH# 2789 – Request for Site Restoration Bond release in the amount of \$69,000.00 for Chick-fil-A located at 25 Hazard Ave, in a Business Regional (BR)

District, Map 45 – Lot 8; Paramount Realty Services, applicant/owner. Tabled 10/20/2016

- b. SPR# 1585 – Request for Site Restoration Bond release in the amount of \$39,500.00; Landscape Bond release in the amount of \$24,750.00 for retail building with associated site work located at 118-122 Elm Street, in a Business General (BG) District, Map 57 – Lot 330; Robert-Thomas Construction, applicant/ J. Hannoush Family, LLC, owner. Tabled 10/20/2016
- c. PH# 2816 – Request for Site Restoration Bond release in the amount of \$57,600.00; Erosion & Sediment Control Bond release in the amount of \$3,300.00 for retail building with associated site work located at 65 Palomba Drive, in a Business General (BG) District, Map 56 – Lot 7. Tabled 10/20/2016

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis, to keep the bond releases for PH# 2789, SPR# 1585, and PH# 2816 on the table. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

8. Public Hearing(s) continued from 9-1-2016

- a. PH# 2846 - Special Use Permit for Café/Bakery shop with drive thru located at 2 Enfield Street; BL(Business Local) Zone; Map 035/Lot 0109; The Pride Limited Partnership, owner/applicant. (DoR: 7/21/2016; MCPH: 11/10/2016, MD: 1/7/2017) Continued from to October 20, 2016. Revised plans and Traffic Study received 10/26/2016.

Commissioner Duren called the meeting to order once more.

Commissioner Ballard read the legal notice and took the roll. Present were Chairman Duren and Commissioners Ballard, Ladd, Lefakis, Scutt, DeGray, and Szewczak. Absent were Commissioners Falk and Drinan. Alternate Commissioners DeGray and Szewczak sat for the absent commissioners.

Mr. Robert Bolduc addressed the Commission representing Pride Limited Partnerships. He also introduced John Furman from VHB and Jim Channing who is the Attorney for Pride.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the new plans were only received yesterday and therefore were distributed to the Commission for the first time tonight.

Mr. Bolduc presented a rendering of what the bakery/café building and property would look like after the project was completed. He also presented the interior floor plans of the bakery/café, a detailed site plan, a clearer site plan, and the site location in connection to the Pride gas station. He explained that he met with Longmeadow officials who believe this plan is the best option thus far.

Mr. O'Brien stated that he also met with the Longmeadow officials who suggested changes to the plans.

Mr. Bolduc stated that the Town Manager of Longmeadow suggested flipping the signs of the middle entrance/exit on Route 5 to be exit only to the right as opposed to entrance

only. Pride has decided to try that out and then if it doesn't work the signs can be flipped to entrance-only. He stated that the plans meet all of the Enfield Zoning requirements except for the required buffer. Pride is asking for a waiver of the buffer requirement. Mr. Bolduc then presented a plan of what the buffer will look like. There will be Cyprus and canopy trees on a berm with a white vinyl fence around it. He then presented the larger landscaping plan, stating that it exceeds the Commission's existing requirement. He presented what the patio would look like including barriers between the outdoor dining area and the parking lot, and what the furniture on the patio will look like. Finally, he presented the decibel audio maps. The Engineer of the proposed speaker system supplied the decibel levels. There are 60-80 decibels of sound coming from Route 5, and the speaker produces 48 decibels of sound at the point of the speaker. The decibel levels drop the farther the sound travels from the speaker.

Commissioner Duren asked what the hours of operation will be.

Mr. Bolduc stated that the bakery/café will close at 10pm. He also stated that the only audible noise from the speaker would be within the cone of sound shown on the plans.

Commissioner Duren stated that his main concern was with the change in the traffic flow in and out of the property. He stated that there was discussion regarding the reconfiguration of the lanes on Route 5.

Mr. Furman stated that the original traffic study did not include both sites, and they had to go back and do a larger traffic study. In the new traffic study they focused on how the site in Longmeadow operates. They then focused on circulation within the site and then circulation outside of the site. The facility accepts more customers right now than any study would show. If traffic calculations were done using the ITE trip generation rates, this station is generating double of what the study would normally show. There are currently six curb cuts, and one of them is being removed. They also plan on relocating one curb cut towards the south in Longmeadow so that it is farther away from the intersection. The plan is to also have everyone coming onto the site to be facing the building. The gas pumps won't operate until an employee turns the pump on, and they won't turn the pumps on until the cars are facing the right way. To leave the site, people will have the choice to go either north or south. Longmeadow staff agreed with these plans, but the Town Manager suggested having half the pumps require cars face one direction and half the pumps require cars face the other way.

Mr. Bolduc stated that there are road issues and that the approach should be to handle the road issues separately from issues on site.

Mr. O'Brien stated that there are zoning issues with the property that prevents the Commission from approving the application tonight anyway. The lot size and frontage length are smaller than the Enfield Zoning Regulations require in that zone. Therefore, the applicant will need to get a variance on those items from the Zoning Board of Appeals.

The Commission can choose to deny the application tonight without prejudice or the applicant can withdraw the application.

Mr. Bolduc stated that he would like to withdraw the application.

Commissioner Duren stated that the applicant may still complete the presentation of the proposed plans and traffic study.

Mr. Bolduc stated that he would rather withdraw the application.

Mr. O'Brien stated that if he finished presenting the plans and the traffic study, then the Commission can provide comments and feedback. He can then address their concerns before the next time he comes back for approval by the Commission.

Mr. Bolduc stated that he would like to withdraw the application and get everyone from Longmeadow and Enfield together in one room to discuss the project.

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis, to accept the withdrawal of PH# 2846 without prejudice. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

New Public Hearing(s)

- a. XSP# 13-26.02 – Site plan modification application to modify Riverview Street access to Enfield High School restrictions. 1264 Enfield Street; R-33 Zone (Residential); Map 19/Lot 68; Town of Enfield owner/ Enfield High School Building Committee, applicant.(DoR: 10/11/2016; MOPH: 12/15/2016)

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis, to hear XSP# 13-26.02 before PH# 2846. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Commissioner Ballard read the legal notice and took the roll. Present were Chairman Duren and Commissioners Ballard, Ladd, Lefakis, Scutt, DeGray, and Szewczak. Absent were Commissioners Falk and Drinan. Alternate Commissioners DeGray and Szewczak sat for the absent commissioners.

Wendy Osada and Randy Daigle, Chair and Vice Chair of the Enfield High School Building Committee, addressed the Commission and explained that there were traffic concerns with the combined high schools. OSTA denied the Building Committee's request for a traffic light on Route 5, where there are long lines of traffic that form near the high school. There have been many near-accidents. The Building Committee is still pursuing a new traffic signal, but it could take years before they get one. The Principal and Superintendent of Schools both support the opening of the Riverview Street entrance to the high school because it will help decrease the amount of traffic and the associated safety hazards.

Chairman Duren stated that some high schools have helped decrease traffic by dismissing students at alternating times.

Ms. Osada stated that the issue is not with dismissal times. Parents who drop their kids off to school do not want to sit in traffic, and therefore they drop their students off on Route 5 and make a U-turn to leave.

Commissioner Duren asked what the procedure is for allowing students to drive to school.

Ms. Osada stated that students have to pay for a parking permit.

Mr. Daigle stated that based on enrollment in each grade, there is a certain number of parking spaces required.

Ms. Osada stated that restricting student driving is not allowed by the Building Committee.

Commissioner Duren stated that it could be a method of traffic calming.

Ms. Osada asked where the statute is that says the gate cannot be opened.

Commissioner Duren stated that he is just trying to figure out all of the alternatives available.

Ms. Osada stated that it was proposed that a traffic control officer be hired, but it would cost 8 hours' worth of overtime. She asked whether there is a statute saying the gate cannot be opened.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the statute is that the Commission needs make a decision based on the health, welfare and safety of the public.

Ms. Osada stated that there are two residential neighborhoods adjacent to Enfield High School, and that the Riverview Street neighborhood is less densely populated, but the heavy traffic is currently being diverted to the more densely populated neighborhood on Pearl Street.

Commissioner Scutt asked who is in charge of opening and closing the gate.

Ms. Osada stated that Public Works is in charge.

Carl Libby, of 3 Riverview Street, stated that he is against opening the gate because of the safety hazards it would pose to his four young children. He stated that a car has already crashed onto his lawn because a student was rushing to pick up another student who was walking on that street. The students tend to drive too fast and the Traffic Safety Division agrees that the gate shouldn't be opened. He also expressed concern for

emergency access to both the high school and to residents on Riverview Street if the gate were opened.

Clemens Polek, of 20 Riverview Street, expressed his family's position against the opening of the gate. He expressed concern for: the property values of homes on that street decreasing; littering and vandalism which already takes place on his property; emergency access to the high school if the gate were opened; student drivers on the dangerous blind curves in that neighborhood; and students parking on people's lawns and driveways.

Jennifer Casalone, of 9 Riverview Street, expressed concern for the gate being opened because there are no sidewalks on Riverview Street, whereas Pearl Street has sidewalks. Students walking to school and running cross-country already have to use the road, which would become dangerous if there is heavy traffic.

Jennifer Bruoyette, of 19 Laurel Park, was in support of opening the gate because Pearl Street already experiences extreme traffic conditions and parking on either side of the street. The roadways become extremely narrow, and emergency personnel already had difficulty accessing her home once.

Steven Roy, of 20 Riverview Street, expressed his opposition to opening the Riverview Street gate because he lives directly adjacent to it. He expressed concerns for emergency personnel accessing the science building and the buildings with automotive and mechanical equipment if there were ever an accident. He also stated that deviating from the original traffic study recommendations could be dangerous to students, staff, and nearby residents.

Judy Polek, of 20 Riverview Street, stated that students are always speeding and revving their engines on her street as it is. The corners at either end of the emergency gate are blind spots as well, and this already makes backing out of her driveway dangerous. She is against opening the gate.

Theresa Roy, of 20 Riverview Street, stated that she is against opening the gate because it would pose a safety threat to the neighbors. Students already speed through the neighborhood. Opening the gate would also cause light and noise pollution to the residents living on Riverview Street.

Elizabeth Davis, of 201 North Maple Street, stated that she is in support of opening the gate on Riverview Street because it would alleviate the traffic and hazards that exist in the Pearl Street neighborhood. A major issue with opening the Riverview Street gate is the safety of the children in that neighborhood, but there are more children whose safety is at risk in the Pearl Street neighborhood. Every child deserves the same safety precautions.

Tom Tyler, of 18 Bridge Lane, stated that he was against opening the Riverview Street gate because it was only ever meant to be used as an emergency access route into the school, and it should remain that way.

Barbara DeSouza, of 18 Fairfield Road, stated her support for opening the gate at Riverview Street because the traffic was never a problem until the two high schools combined. Now there is one neighborhood suffering all of the impact from the increase in traffic, which is not fair. Opening the Riverview Street gate would alleviate some of that impact to Pearl Street, where there is a higher density of low-income families.

Bob Tkacz, of 601 Hazard Avenue, stated Riverview Street and Bridge Street are very dangerous roads with blind spots. Opening that gate and adding speed bumps or traffic lights would only make it more dangerous. The gate to Riverview Street historically was only meant for emergency access, and should remain that way.

Shannon Grant, of Neil Drive, stated that she was in favor of opening the gate. She drops her daughter off at the access gate every morning and there is a fence that blocks the visibility on Riverview Street causing a blind spot. If something could be done about that, then that road could be made safer.

Gina Sullivan, of 11 Spier Avenue, stated that she was in favor of opening the gate. She stated that the safety of children in one neighborhood should not be valued more than the safety of children in another neighborhood. Therefore, if the gate on Riverview Street remains closed, then Pearl Street should be closed to traffic going to and from the high school as well.

Robert and Diane Tapp, of 16 Riverview Street, stated that they are against opening the gate because of the safety risk associated with students speeding through a residential neighborhood with no sidewalks.

Clemens Polek, of 20 Riverview Street, stated that the wing of the high school that abuts Riverview Street is the science and vocational wing. There are automotive and dust machines in there that are powerful and dangerous. If something emergent happened in the classroom, the fastest way to get there is through the emergency gate, which should remain for emergency vehicles only.

Patricia Crisinati, of 8 Riverview Street, stated that the Town should come up with a better solution to the traffic issues associated with the combined high school other than opening the Riverview Street gate. She stated that the circulation through the high school property is an issue as it is, and that a potential solution could be adding another access road somewhere else to the high school.

Wendy Osada, Vice Chair of the Building Committee, stated that she has not received any of the responses from Engineering, the Fire Department, or the Police Department.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the only official comment is from Sergeant Meier. The Fire Marshal stated his comments verbally.

Ms. Osada requested the official comments. Turning into the high school property is hazardous because of the magnitude of people going there at one time. The Building Committee was denied the traffic signal. The driveway leading to the Riverview Street gate that appears too narrow is in fact a road and not just a fire road. The Building Committee is assessing the installation of speed bumps on Riverview Street and Bridge Street to help slow the traffic associated with opening the gate.

Commissioner Duren stated that adding the speed bumps may be an issue with the Fire Department.

Ms. Osada stated that the Building Committee is working with the Fire Department. There is a more inherent danger with students getting to school every day under the current conditions.

Commissioner Szewczak stated that normally when plans are presented they are presented by a Design Professional who should have looked into all of these issues and should be able to answer questions. If the Building Committee brought the Design Professional to the public hearing, some of the questions posed tonight might be able to be answered.

Ms. Osada stated that the OSTA traffic study did not represent that traffic flow was okay as it currently is.

Commissioner Duren asked whether there is a letter from Malone and Macbroom. The State was saying that a lot of the warrants were not met that would support the need for a new traffic signal.

Ms. Osada stated that most of the warrants would not be met even with a new traffic study.

Commissioner Szewczak stated that the Commission would like to hear the recommendations of the Design Professionals who tend to have reasons for choosing to open or close certain entrances.

Ms. Osada stated that former Commissioner Longhi was concerned because she lived on Enfield Street and traffic was horrible before the two high schools were combined. She asked the Planning Director to get in touch with Traffic Division about a new traffic light. She stated that if the Commission wanted it, the Building Committee can have a new traffic study done.

Commissioner Scutt agreed with Commissioner Szewczak and stated that it is necessary to have the current volumes of traffic used in the traffic study and the recommendations of a Traffic Engineer and Design Professional to base their decision on.

Commissioner Duren stated that there is a school full of children. If there was ever a fire or an emergency in the science labs, the Fire Department needs to be able to access the school without obstruction, therefore the Commission needs to listen to the Fire Chief.

Mr. Daigle stated that emergency vehicles have always used the main road entrance. They have never used the Riverview Street entrance.

Ms. Osada stated that opening the gate could be made a temporary solution.

Commissioner Scutt stated that it might be a better solution to open it temporarily.

Ms. Osada requested that the public hearing be continued to December 1st.

Steven Roy addressed the Commission once more and stated that the original traffic study should remain in effect, and a new traffic study should not be done.

Shannon Grant addressed the Commission again stated that kids already have to jump back from the gate because of speeding traffic going by and the vinyl fencing on Riverview Street makes it difficult to see.

Diane Tapp addressed the Commission again stating that students should not be allowed to be dropped off at the emergency gate, nor should students be dropped off on Enfield Street. There is not one good solution to this issue, but it might help to stagger the time kids come into school and the time they are dismissed.

Bob Tkacz addressed the Commission once more stated that the odds of a disaster taking place on Enfield Street from all the traffic is slim. The high school has been open for 60 years, and the enrollment in the '60's and '70's was much higher than it is currently with the combined high schools. There were never any traffic issues then, so there shouldn't be a major issue once the construction on the access road and parking lot is complete.

Patricia Crisinati stated that Riverview Street is extremely dangerous for drivers and pedestrians because of the visibility and the traffic on the other side of the gate. She suggested adding another access road from somewhere else.

Carl Libby stated that both the Police Department and the Fire Department have expressed their concerns with opening the gate, and that a major societal concern today is with emergencies taking place at schools. It makes the most sense to keep the emergency gate closed for emergency vehicles only.

Jennifer Casalone addressed the Commission and asked whether the new traffic study would include pedestrian traffic. She also asked with it would assess the need for a new sidewalk, whether another public hearing would take place to discuss the new traffic study, and how long opening the gate temporarily would be for.

Paul Crisonati asked whether the expanded traffic study would include Bridge Street, Laurel Park and Pearl Street. He also asked whether the number of cars going in and out of the high school could be limited, and whether the traffic study would include the number of people taking the bus versus not taking the bus to school

Ms. Osada stated that a traffic study is being done to assess the actual current conditions as opposed to using estimated traffic counts, and that is why a new traffic study has to be done.

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Scutt, to continue the public hearing for XSP# 13-26.02 until December 1st. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

- b. PH# 2848 – Special Permit application for convenience store for a beer permit located 935 Enfield Street; R33 Zone; Map 026/Lot 0079; Khodiyar, LLC, owner/ Bhavin K. Patel, applicant.

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Scutt, to table PH# 2848. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

9. Old Business

- a. PH# 2836.02 – Site plan modification application for the installation of Green House additional structure located 144-146 South Road; Zone BL (Business Local); Map 055/Lot 008 and Map 055/Lot 006; S & R Property, LLC, owner/applicant. (DoR: 10/06/2016; MAD: 12/10/2016) Tabled 10/20/2016

Mr. Darshanand Rajnauth, of 144-146 South Road, addressed the Commission and provided engineered drawings of what the proposed greenhouse will look like.

Commissioner Duren stated that the Commission wanted a manufacturer's engineered specs on what the greenhouse would look like.

Mr. Rajnauth presented a sample of the materials that will be used to build the greenhouse along with a letter from his engineer.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Commission was looking for more information on the engineering details of the greenhouse. This usually comes in the form of specs from the manufacturer.

Kiran Majmudar, the site engineer, addressed the Commission and stated that he supplied a cross-section of the greenhouse with engineering details, and they brought samples of the materials.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Planning office has not seen these materials before. He also stated that there are outstanding issues that were expressed by the Fire Department, and a disagreement between Dana Steele and the Town Engineer that needs to be resolved.

Mr. Majmudar explained that the capacity of the materials and that the drainage was being reviewed again by Dana Steele. The Town Engineer and Dana Steele ended up agreeing with each other in the end.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the emails from Dana raised more questions because he mentioned not having included the full property in the drainage report, and that there are still concerns from the Fire Marshal to be addressed.

Commissioner Duren stated that this public hearing will need to be continued until those concerns are addressed.

Commissioner Szewczak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Scutt, to table PH# 2848. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

- b. SPR# 1595.03 – Site plan application for the construction of 4,650 s.f. building addition with site improvements located 6 Niblick Road; IP Zone (Industrial Park); Map 055/Lot 0089; Niblick Road Realty, LLC owner/applicant. (DoR: 10/06/2016; MAD: 12/10/2016) Pending at IWWA.

Guy Hesketh addressed the Commission and stated that the Fire Marshal and Town Engineer had no comments on the proposed plans.

Commissioner Duren asked whether the plans were signed and sealed.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the applicant provided two sets of signed and sealed plans for the Planning office.

Commissioner Szewczak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Scutt, to approve SPR 1595.03. The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

9. New Business

- a. SPR# 1685 – Site plan application for an auto repair and sales facility specializing in restoration, fabrication and custom order retail sales located 110 Prospect Street; I-1 Zone (Industrial One); Map 021/Lot 0019; ZAK Unlimited, LLC owner/applicant. (DoR: 9/1/2016; MAD: 11/15/2016)

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis, to accept the withdrawal of SPR# 1685 without prejudice. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

- b. SPR# 1597.03 – Modification of site plan for mixed use building located 496 Enfield Street; BL Zone (Business Local); Map 33/Lot 100; Urvashi, LLC owner/applicant. (DoR: 9/1/2016; MAD: 11/15/2016)

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis, to accept the withdrawal of SPR# 1597.03 without prejudice. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

- c. SPR# 1692 – Site plan application for dog obedience training classes located 32 South Maple Street; Zone I-1 (Industrial 1); Map 084/Lot 0007; Ralph Gorton Sweet, Jr., owner/ Gail C. McLaughlin d.b.a. Bark Inn Kennel, applicant. (DoR: 10/20/2016; MAD: 12/24/2016)

Gail McLaughlin, of Stafford Springs, addressed the Commission and explained that the dog obedience classes started with another gentlemen in the Powder Hill barn. She bought the operation, then sold it, and now she wants to take it over again.

Commissioner Duren stated that he remembered the obedience classes taking place in the Powder Hill barn for many years.

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Scutt, to approve SPR# 1692 with seven conditions.

Standard Conditions:

1. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.
2. This approval is for the specific uses, site, and structures identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the uses, site, or the structures will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
3. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
4. This approval does not include signage.
5. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:

6. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Planning office has signed off on the final work.
7. A request for final project review from the Planning Department must be made at least 10 days before a Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval is requested from the Building Official.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

- d. SPR# 1693 – Site plan application to replace a 15,860 sf industrial building with a 20,160 sf addition with site improvements located 243 Shaker Road; Zone I-2 (Industrial 2); Map 95/Lot 6; Yankee Casting Company, Inc. owner/ applicant. (DoR: 10/20/2016; MAD: 12/24/2016)

Kevin Vecchiarelli, from Yankee Casting Company at 243 Shaker Road, introduced himself to the Commission along with Dana Steele who is the Professional Engineer from J.R. Russo and Associates.

Commissioner Duren stated that there were no comments received from the Police or Fire Departments. The only Engineering Department comment is that the Standard Town Notes should be added to the plans. He also asked whether this application went before the IWWA for approval.

Mr. O'Brien stated that this application was approved by the IWWA with conditions. One of the conditions concerned the large mound of sand that exists on site.

Commissioner Duren noted that there are no north arrows on the maps.

Mr. O'Brien stated that without comments from the Fire Marshal, the Commission can choose to approve the application with a condition that any comments from the Fire Marshal must be addressed, or the Commission can choose to table the application.

Dana Steele addressed the Commission and presented the plans for 243 Shaker Road. He explained that the site is about 850 feet off of the road on a private roadway. The property is 5.79 acres. In 2013, plans were approved for a 4,000 square foot addition to the front of the building, which required a variance, and a 41,000 square foot addition in the rear of the building with a larger detention basin. A fire in March 2016 destroyed about 15,000 square feet of the building before either of the additions were built. The current proposal is to replace the portion of the building destroyed in the fire with a larger building. This would eliminate the need for the previously approved additions. A fire wall will need to be installed between the two buildings. One feature of the building that was destroyed in the fire was a tower, which is proposed to be replaced. The building is therefore proposed to be taller than it was previously, but will be less than the maximum allowed building height. There is already a driveway around the site and a parking in front, which will be reconfigured to eliminate one curb cut. The reconfiguration will also decrease the amount of impervious surface. He then presented the Stormwater Management plans, the Architectural plans, and samples of the proposed building colors.

Mr. O'Brien asked when a design of the tower will be presented.

Kevin Vecchiarelli stated that they already have the tower design.

Commissioner Scutt asked what the tower will be used for.

Kevin Vecchiarelli explained that the tower is supposed to hold the sand from the mound, which is not actually toxic. The sand is considered a specialty waste. Yankee Castings is currently looking for a place to put the sand from the mound. There may be a location in Chicopee that is looking for fill which will take the sand from the mound.

Mr. O'Brien asked what the time frame was for getting rid of the sand from the mound.

Tim Vecchiarelli, the Secretary-Treasurer of Yankee Castings, stated that the mound debris wasn't regulated until 1970. Yankee Castings is now working with Massachusetts and the Connecticut DEEP on how to get rid of the sand.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the Commission could require a report monthly or annually as to the status of the mound.

Mr. Vecchiarelli stated that the agreement with the DEEP is that there will be no net increase in the amount of sand in the mound, and that they will work to decrease the amount of sand. They already have to give a monthly report to the DEEP.

Commissioner Duren suggested that the Commission require an annual report.

Commissioner Szewczak agreed, and suggested expanded the building 5 more inches.

Charlie Macsata, the Fire Marshal, arrived and addressed the Commission stating that there was a miscommunication between the applicant and Jim Nolan. The Fire Department is 100% in support of this project and has no comments or concerns.

Commissioner Duren asked that a memo be written for the file. He also asked whether the applicant read the conditions and agrees with them.

Kevin Vecchiarelli asked what the first condition concerning an operations plan was.

Mr. O'Brien stated that it was just a condition so that the Commission would know how materials were being handled on site, such as the sand from the mound.

Mr. Steele asked that condition number three be modified because there will be no outside storage of materials other than the sand mound, which won't be added to and will be gradually mitigated.

Mr. O'Brien stated that condition number three was concerning the other debris around the property.

Mr. Vecchiarelli stated that any debris on the property would be cleaned up after the construction of the new building.

Commissioner Szewczak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Scutt, to approve SPR# 1693 with 19 conditions.

Site specific conditions (to be met prior to signing plans):

1. The applicant will submit an operations plan.
2. The applicant must address the concerns of the Health and Fire Departments.
3. There will be no outside storage of materials.

4. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
5. The application number SPR# 1693 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
6. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
7. A list outlining how any conditions of approval have been met shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature.
8. Four sets of paper plans with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.

Applicant will submit:

9. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.

Standard Conditions:

10. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.
11. This approval is for the specific uses, site, and structures identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the uses, site, or the structures will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
12. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
13. This approval does not include signage.
14. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by November 3, 2017 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
15. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by November 3, 2021 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
16. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:

17. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Planning office has signed off on the final work.
18. A request for final project review from the Planning Department must be made at least 10 days before a Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval is requested from the Building Official.
19. A report on the status of the sand from the sand mound will be submitted to the Planning office annually.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

- e. SPR# 1695 – Site plan application for building addition of 9,670 s.f with site improvements located 80 Shaker Road; Zone I-2 (Industrial 2); Map 76/Lot 0185; Frank Camerota, applicant; 80 Shaker Road, LLC, owner (DoR: 10/21/2016; MAD: 12/25/2016)

Mr. Frank Camerota addressed the Commission and explained that Camerota Truck Parts, previously located at 245 Shaker Road, bought 80 Shaker Road and would like to build a 9,670 square foot building addition. He explained that the application previously went before the IWWA, and it was approved with the condition that snow stockpiling signs be installed to direct snow plows. This is so that snow will not be stockpiled on the berms of the detention basin.

Commissioner Szewczak asked whether there will there be loading docks.

Mr. Camerota stated that there are two loading docks in the back of the building and they will be keeping one of them. He also stated that this building was the former Parker Hannifin building, and it is 100% air conditioned.

Commissioner Szewczak asked whether the manholes that exist where the building addition is proposed to go will be removed.

Mr. Camerota stated that the manholes are currently covered in tar and are not used.

Commissioner Scutt made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ladd, to approve SPR# 1695 with 15 conditions.

Site specific conditions (to be met prior to signing plans):

1. All plans submitted for signature shall require the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
2. The application number SPR# 1695 shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
3. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be made part of the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
4. A list outlining how any conditions of approval have been met shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature.
5. Four sets of paper plans with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.

Applicant will submit:

6. A list outlining all changes to the plans shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature. The list should cite the sheet number where each change has been made.

Standard Conditions:

7. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.
8. This approval is for the specific uses, site, and structures identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the uses, site, or the structures will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
9. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
10. This approval does not include signage.
11. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained by November 3, 2017 or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
12. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed by November 3, 2021 or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
13. By acceptance of this permit and conditions, the applicant and owner acknowledge the right of Town staff to periodically enter upon the subject property for the purpose of determining compliance with the terms of this approval.

Conditions which must be met prior to the Issuance of a Certificate of Compliance:

14. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Planning office has signed off on the final work.
15. A request for final project review from the Planning Department must be made at least 10 days before a Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval is requested from the Building Official.

The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

10. Other Business

Mark Dion addressed the Commission and stated that he is looking to install a sign on the building located at 37 Pleasant Street. The regulations do not currently allow roof signs. He stated that he installed a piece of foam on the roof to show what the sign will look like and took photos of it. He presented those photos to the Commission.

Commissioner Duren stated that there are a few signs on Pearl Street that are similar to what is proposed.

Mr. Dion stated that he read the regulations and there are no monument signs, pole signs, or roof signs allowed in a TVC zone. That leaves him with installing a sign on the building. The issue with that, is that the TVC zone used to be full of businesses and residents, so people were always walking around and back then a sign on the building was sufficient to advertise the business. Currently, the original buildings in the TVC zone have been removed and there aren't businesses in that area. People would not be able to see or find his restaurant without a sign on the roof. He also has a temporary sign that hangs down from the roof line which displays what is cooking in the kitchen for the day, which is very low-hanging.

The consensus of the Commission was that the location of the sign on the building is acceptable in a TVC zone.

Commissioner Sczewczak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Lefakis, to accept the sign shown in the photographs today as being consistent with the regulations. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

12. Correspondence

13. Commissioner's Correspondence

Commissioner Scutt stated that the Yardhouse Tavern paved their parking lot, but people are still parking on the grass.

Mr. O'Brien stated that the owner of the restaurant has taken the position that the state maintains the grass area, so if people want to park there then he can't do anything about it.

Commissioner Duren asked why the house that caught fire several years ago on Church Street hasn't been demolished yet.

Mr. O'Brien stated that there are issues with several of the buildings in that area. The regulations say that they get one year to rebuild what they had there after the fire. He stated that he does not know why the building hasn't been demolished, but the Town Manager has put it on the list of things to look into for his code enforcement task force.

Commissioner Ladd stated that someone approached him saying that they want to buy the properties in that area and flip them, but they don't want to pay the blight fees associated with them. Can those fees be waived?

Mr. O'Brien stated that it is up to the Town Council to waive the liens if they want to.

14. Director of Planning Report

15. Authorization for Administrative Approvals

16. Applications To Be Received

Mr. O'Brien stated that the office received an application from Lia Honda, but that the IWWA determined that they would like Lia Honda to submit an application to them. There are code enforcement issues with the car dealerships on Palomba Drive, where they park cars on the conservation easements. There are significant wetlands in that area as well.

17. Opportunities/Unresolved issues

18. Adjournment

Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner DeGray, to adjourn. The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote.

Prepared By Jennifer Pacacha, Assistant Town Planner.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Falk, Secretary