

ENFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES FOR COMMISSION CONSIDERATION
THURSDAY, July 9, 2020 – 7:00 p.m.
Virtual Meeting

Call to Order & Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Nelson called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

Roll Call

Commissioner Szewczak took the roll and present were Commissioners Richard Szewczak, Virginia Higley, Ken Nelson, Frank Alaimo, Charles Ladd and Alternate Commissioners John Petronella and Vinnie Grillo. Absent were Commissioners Mary Scutt, Linda DeGray and Dane Thorogood.

Also present were Laurie Whitten, Director of Development Services; Jennifer Pacacha, Assistant Town Planner; James Tallberg, Town Attorney, and Elizabeth Bouley, Recording Secretary.

Chairman Nelson seated Commissioner Grillo.

Approval of Minutes

- a. June 25, 2020 – Regular Meeting

Motion: Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Higley, to approve the minutes of the June 25, 2020 Regular Meeting.

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

Votes: 6-0-0

Public Participation

Chairman Nelson asked three times if anyone in the public would like to speak regarding items not on the agenda; no one came forward.

Bond Release(s)

- a. **PH# 2904** – 130 Elm Street – Bond Release Request for the Erosion & Sedimentation Control Bond in the amount of \$3,800.00 and the Site Restoration Bond in the amount of \$75,100.00.

Motion: Commissioner Szewczak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Ladd, to release the Erosion & Sedimentation Control Bond in the amount of \$3,800.00 and the Site Restoration Bond in the amount of \$75,100.00.

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

Votes: 6-0-0

New Public Hearings

- a. **PH# 2973** – 55 Cottage Road – Special Permit application for a home addition located within the Lake Overlay District; Randy Daigle, owner/applicant; Map 80/Lot 178; R-33 Zone.

Ms. Pacacha stated that this will be tabled until the amendment is done.

- b. **PH# 2978** – 37 Post Road – Special Permit application to allow a hair stylist to operate as a home occupation; Alisa Kraushaar, owner/applicant; Map 54/Lot 292; R-33 Zone.

Commissioner DeGray arrived at the meeting.

Commissioner Szewczak took the roll and present were Commissioners Richard Szewczak, Virginia Higley, Ken Nelson, Frank Alaimo, Charles Ladd, Linda DeGray and Alternate Commissioners John Petronella and Vinnie Grillo. Absent were Commissioners Mary Scutt and Dane Thorogood.

Alisa Kraushaar, 37 Post Road, stated that she is seeking the Commission's approval to open a salon at her home.

Commissioner Higley asked about the hours of operation which Ms. Kraushaar confirmed to be 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Saturday.

Commissioner Alaimo asked if the applicant had proper licensing through the state to operate a salon. Ms. Kraushaar stated that she has been licensed for fifteen years and has maintained all of her licensing.

Chairman Nelson stated that Post Road is busy and asked if the applicant has available off-street parking. Ms. Kraushaar stated that she has off-street parking as well as a very long double driveway. She stated that she is only taking one client at a time and does not expect to have to use the road for parking.

Chairman Nelson asked if the applicant would be ok with a condition of approval stating that there will be no more than two clients at the property at a time. Ms. Kraushaar stated that she would be fine with this.

Chairman Nelson if anyone would like to speak in favor or against the application.

Lisa Batchelor, 6 Deer Run, stated that she would not be opposed to the application.

Chairman Nelson asked three times if anyone would like to speak in favor or against the application; no one came forward.

Motion: Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Higley, to close the Public Hearing.

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Votes: 7-0-0

Motion: Commissioner Szewczak made motion, seconded by Commissioner Ladd, to approve PH# 2978 with conditions.

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

General Conditions:

1. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or the structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
2. This approval does not include signage permits.
3. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
4. 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.

Site Specific Conditions:

Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:

5. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be incorporated into the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
6. A list outlining how the conditions of approval have been met shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature.
7. 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.
8. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.
9. The hours of operation will be 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday through Friday.
10. Parking will be off-street only.

Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:

11. Two sets of paper plans with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission.
12. This approval will become effective upon the filing of a Special Use Zoning Certificate signed by the Commission Secretary on the Land Records by the applicant. Such certificate must be filed within 120 days of approval by Commission. Proof of such filing shall be in the file prior to the issuance of any permits.

Note: The Conditions of Approvals do not take the place of other requirements found in the Town Codes, Regulations, and Application Instructions.

Votes: 7-0-0

- c. **SPR# 1826** – 113 North Maple Street – Site Plan Review application for a proposed 501,500 square foot industrial warehouse building with associated parking and drainage; WE 113 North Maple Street, LLC, owner/applicant; Map 82/Lots 1-4; Industrial-1 Zone.

Commissioner Szewczak took the roll and present were Commissioners Richard Szewczak, Virginia Higley, Ken Nelson, Frank Alaimo, Charles Ladd, Linda DeGray and Alternate Commissioners John Petronella and Vinnie Grillo. Absent were Commissioners Mary Scutt and Dane Thorogood.

Val Ferro of Good Earth Advisors introduced the team present for the applicant, which consisted of the following: Adam Winstanley, Principal at Winstanley Enterprises, LLC; Jeff Saforek, COO of Agri-Mark; Linda Constanzo, Senior Vice President at Winstanley Enterprises, LLC; Jim Petropulos, President of Hayner/Swanson, Inc.; and Matthew Skelly of Fuss & O'Neill, Inc.

Ms. Ferro stated that they will be providing their technical presentation in full for the record and for the residents.

Town Attorney James Tallberg reminded the Commissioners that their actions tonight must be based upon what is brought before them at the Public Hearing. He stated that Commissioners should not speak to the media or take information outside of the Public Hearing and advised any Commissioners who had spoken to the media to recuse themselves.

Mr. Winstanley provided a brief history of his firm's past projects in Enfield, including the Hallmark campus. He went over the size and physical features of the property, stating that they could go with a significantly larger building size on this lot and still meet all zoning regulations. Mr. Winstanley stated that Agri-Mark is a much less intensive use than other possible tenants they had met with.

Mr. Saforek provided a description of Agri-Mark as a company, including the products they produce. He stated that they are family-owned and strive to be a good neighbor and good stewards of the environment.

Ms. Ferro described the proposed development. She utilized an aerial photograph to illustrate the previous approved site plan from the 1990s. Ms. Ferro explained the subdivision of the original property, stating that there had been a lot of industrial development planned for this land. She stated that the Industrial zone designation is supported by the town's Plan of Conservation & Development (POCD) and utilized a color-coded map to illustrate the Industrial zoned land in town.

Ms. Ferro went over some of the site specifics including adjacent properties and buffers, stating that all of the land is zoned Industrial. She described the inspections and studies that had been

performed as due diligence in order to best develop the property. Ms. Ferro stated that the proposed facility is a distribution and warehousing which is an allowed use and requires a Site Plan Review rather than a Special Permit. She went over the requirements of the Site Plan Review regarding building coverage, impervious coverage, building height, setbacks and parking, and described how the plan adheres to these requirements.

Ms. Ferro described the operations of the proposed facility including hours of operation and truck activity/noise. She stated that there would not be more than 15 minutes of truck idling and there is no queuing expected.

Mr. Petropulos went over some of the key engineering points such as topography of the property, soil testing results, utilities and stormwater management.

Mr. Skelly stated that North Maple Street is a state owned roadway. He described the routes to the highway from the access driveways of the property. Mr. Skelly went over the details of the traffic study that had been performed.

Mr. Skelly addressed the comments they had received from the Police Department one by one. He concluded that the Office of the State Traffic Administration (OSTA) is in the process of reviewing their findings and will need to sign off on all of it before any of it can be approved.

Ms. Ferro described the site lighting plan, stating that all fixtures will be LED and dark sky compliant. She utilized elevation drawings to illustrate the architecture and design details of the building and materials that will be used.

Ms. Ferro went over the full landscaping plan for the property.

Ms. Ferro stated that this is a distribution use in an Industrial zone. She stated that there are no air quality emissions or hazardous wastes being produced. Ms. Ferro concluded that this application meets all criteria and is ready to be approved.

Commissioner DeGray asked about wetlands, to which Chairman Nelson replied that Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency (IWWA) approved this application a month ago so they need to focus on the Planning & Zoning issues in front of them. Ms. Ferro stated that they are voluntarily treating the wetland as a vernal pool.

Chairman Nelson asked if the owner of the building could make a contract with the snow removal company to use the low decibel backup alarms. Ms. Ferro stated that this is a possibility and there are a few options to keep the snow plow noise down.

Chairman Nelson asked when this parcel was designated I1, to which Ms. Ferro replied that it had to have happened prior to 1990.

Chairman Nelson asked how many waivers are being requested with this application, to which Ms. Ferro replied that technically there are none.

Chairman Nelson stated that he cannot find sidewalk details on the plans, to which Mr. Petropulos replied that sidewalks will be added. Chairman Nelson stated that sidewalks should be a condition of approval.

Chairman Nelson requested that I-91 signs should be placed at the exits, to which Ms. Ferro agreed.

Ms. Whitten went over the rules for the Public Hearing.

Dale Butrymowicz, 11 Winter Way, stated that they had only learned about this application thirteen days ago and have had to scramble to put together their concerns. He stated that the town and the applicant have had much more time to discuss it. Mr. Butrymowicz stated that an attorney had been retained and a petition had been submitted from people opposing the application. He stated that there should be accommodations made for people who cannot get into the meeting.

Celeste and Ken Estvanik, 14 Winter Way, stated that they are abutting property owners. They brought up their concerns regarding the second tenant being unknown, the traffic study not accounting for school bus and drop-off traffic, and soil contamination on the property. Mr. Estvanik asked what recourse the Commission and taxpayers will have if tenants change in the future. Ms. Estvanik stated that their property values are being impacted by this project. Mr. Estvanik asked what the value this project will have for the town of Enfield in the form of tax dollars or jobs.

Chairman Nelson stated that the Commission has no authority to discuss or control tax abatement and the Town Council deals with this.

Ms. Estvanik stated that this project as proposed is going to negatively impact the town as a whole. She stated that more conditions should be added to protect quality of life and safety.

Mr. Estvanik stated that the proposed berm should be higher and planted densely with mature trees. He suggested a tall attractive barrier if the soil is contaminated. Ms. Estvanik asked if the truck bays can be shielded from sight and sound; they went on to express concerns with the trucks as far as safety, queuing, light spillage and noise for both the known tenant and any future tenants.

Ms. Estvanik stated that they are seeking a continuance in order to address some of the outstanding issues and questions.

Discussion took place as to whether emails from Karen LaPlante should be read into the record. Ms. Pacacha stated for the record that Ms. LaPlante is commenting as a resident and not as a representative for the Enfield Conservation Commission. Ms. Whitten stated that she will read Ms. LaPlante's last memo when they get to that batch.

Anthony Renna, 12 Ryefield Drive, asked what prime time hours are in terms of the traffic study and asked if there had been any thought given to rerouting the traffic coming down North Maple Street.

Mr. Renna asked if the CO2 is a definite for the refrigerant being used for this building.

Kathleen Sarno, 102B North Maple Street, addressed the Commission on behalf of the list of names she had provided to Ms. Whitten. She stated that there are forty-five abutters at Maple Heights. Ms. Sarno stated that the expected trip generation seems excessive for the area, particularly with Hazardville Memorial School down the road. She stated that she is concerned with the noise of the trucks and the times they will be running, and asked if the applicant would consider putting a buffer up in front of Maple Heights. Ms. Sarno asked what will be done with the feral cats in the area and stated that a big concern is the identity of Tenant B as well as the parking lot, the lights and the noise. She stated that she is all for development but they should do light industrial rather than this.

Tracy Hoover, 34 David Street, stated that she is the PTO President for Hazardville Memorial School. Ms. Hoover asked for clarification on the traffic study and the date that was utilized. She stated that the sidewalk and I-91 signs would be very helpful as well as No Right Turn signs at both entrances during drop-off/pickup hours in order to accommodate health and safety concerns for the children and school staff. She stated that school drop-off/pickup traffic is expected to increase due to transportation concerns with COVID-19.

Owen Jarmoc, 33 School Street, stated that the Winstanley buildings are beautiful and he appreciates Winstanley being transparent and communicative. He urged the Commission to make their decision based on the facts. Mr. Jarmoc stated that many people in Enfield are very happy about this project.

Tom Grigley, 18 Deer Run, stated that there are many people opposed to this plan and it is not in harmony with the neighborhood. He stated that a facility of this size this would be better placed in an industrial park with no residential abutment. Mr. Grigley asked who Tenant B is going to be, and stated that it is irresponsible for the town to approve a facility when they do not know what is going into it.

Mr. Grigley asked about garbage and recycling storage location, screening and pickup plans.

David Bruton asked how the easement diagonally across from the property will be addressed. He asked if there is a way to get rid of the driveway behind Winter Way and whether there could be a truck turnaround on the property so trucks could exit onto Moody. Mr. Bruton asked if the conservation easement can be extended so there is a permanent berm that can never be removed. He asked if a Phase 1 environmental inspection had been performed and if the utilities have adequate capacity for this project. Mr. Bruton asked why the lighting poles need to be so high and suggested that they use evergreens rather than deciduous trees for buffering.

Mr. Bruton suggested enforcing specific truck traffic in the area and concluded that it is highly unusual that the Town Engineer has not commented on this project or addressed any of the issues.

Rob Lessard, 5 Deer Run, asked what this project would do the neighborhood property values. He stated that he agrees with the signs pointing traffic to I-91.

Bob LaFlamme, 337 Elm Street, stated that the driveway on the South side to North Maple Street is quite a distance from the building. He stated that if the driveway were closer to the building it would reduce the truck traffic from the proximity of Misty Meadow. He stated that he is concerned with the noise associated with this facility. Mr. LaFlamme read a portion of the zoning regulations pertaining to the purpose of the regulations and implored everyone to keep that purpose in mind.

Attorney Ken Slater of Halloran & Sage addressed the Commission as a representative for several of the neighbors on Winter Way and Deer Run, who he named for the record. Mr. Slater stated that the plans require more review and need to be modified to include any changes.

Scott Noble, 17 Deer Run, suggested that exits 46 and 49 should be included as some people may use those exits to cut through when exits 47 and 48 are too congested. Mr. Noble stated that the corner of North Maple and North Street is busy and he is concerned with traffic and safety. He stated that there will be additional truck turns and employees associated with Tenant B, which will add more congestion.

Ryan Moore, 10 Ryefield Drive, stated that he has concerns with the traffic survey and the school when kids are picked up. Mr. Moore asked the Commission to pause this project and give them more time.

Craig Comfrey, 10 Deer Run, stated that the property is huge and asked why the development was not considered for a different location. Mr. Comfrey asked how they can find out exactly what kind of tax revenue this building is going to give the town. Chairman Nelson stated that the Town Council can address any questions about the taxes.

Jerry Hamilton, 110 North Maple Street, stated that this project is going to be right in his front yard. He asked if the existing vegetative buffer will stay in place, and stated that he is concerned with who the second tenant is going to be. Mr. Hamilton stated that Winstanley is getting a fifteen year tax break while his property taxes are going up again this year.

Mr. Hamilton stated that soil contamination had been found at Fermi and this property may have contaminated soil as well. He stated that he is in communication with CTDEEP and will be working with them to make sure these issues are looked at in depth. Mr. Hamilton stated that this is going to have a negative impact on the marketability of their homes and he does not understand why this project has been so secretive.

Susan Fracasso, 50 North Street, stated that she has lived in the area all of her life and has serious concerns. She stated that the roads are already in bad shape and increased traffic will make them worse. Ms. Fracasso stated that she is concerned about storm drainage and the identity of Tenant B.

Stephen Jarmoc, 33 School Street, stated that he has been a farmer on the property for many years and all of the pesticides used have been approved and not found to be a problem. Mr. Jarmoc stated that Mr. Winstanley is allowing him to still farm the property, and it has always been zoned Industrial. He concluded that there will be increased revenue for the town and he is all for the project.

Art Latulippe, 8 Misty Meadow Road, described the hours of operation and how many trucks an hour this will end up being just for Agri-Mark. He went over the potential volumes of trucks that will be on the roads once Tenant B is added.

Steve and Kathy Meade, 3 Deer Run, addressed the Commission. Mr. Meade stated that they are concerned about the berm and read through some of the regulations pertaining to a berm. He stated that the town has a history of not adequately describing berms. He expressed concern about the maintenance of the berm as well noise attenuation issues.

Mrs. Meade stated that she is concerned with safety at the crosswalk at the intersection of North Maple Street and Winter Way.

Vinnie Weseliza, 12 Deer Run, asked when the separate lots became one merged lot and whether it had been done properly. He went on to state that none of the abutters have been contacted by the town or Winstanley regarding the project. He stated that he would like to see the sound and sight buffers improved and he is concerned about contamination of the soil. Mr. Weseliza suggested that an electronic crosswalk may improve safety in the area.

Mike Lizzy, 15 North Maple Street, asked if the gas main on the street and the water main are large enough to accommodate the needs of the building.

Jamie Dickman, 14 Deer Run, asked the Commission to consider congestion and surrounding building structures as well as safety. She stated that the future plans for the Annex should not be impacted by this project and that tax revenue should be disclosed. Ms. Dickman voiced concerns with the traffic study being done during COVID-19 restrictions, stating that trucks cannot be accommodated in this area due to safety concerns. She stated that she would like to add a conditional requirement that trucks should only be allowed to enter and exit from Moody Road with only employee parking available via North Maple.

Ms. Dickman stated that this use does not compliment the heritage and charm of Hazardville and the plans do not comply with recommended building heights for the area.

Ms. Dickman requested that a noise study be performed and brought up concerns regarding pollution. She requested that any meat products not be permitted in order to protect the neighborhood.

William Bleau, 15 Deer Run, stated that given the proximity of the school to the site and the fact that Lego employees are currently working at home, he would like more clarification on the accuracy of the traffic study. He stated that he is concerned about the unknowns including Tenant B and future expansion. Mr. Bleau stated that reputation should not be used to make a decision.

Ron Isabelle, 9 Deer Run, stated that he would like to see safeguards in place including restrictions on the building height and the future development of other lots on the property. He suggested a four-way stop sign be installed in order to deter tractor trailer trucks.

BJ and Chris Gomeau, 19 Winter Way, addressed the Commission. Mr. Gomeau stated that he has concerns with truck traffic and safety. Ms. Gomeau stated that she is concerned with trucks idling and not knowing the identity of Tenant B. She stated that more time is needed to work out some of these concerns.

Matthew Rogers, 8 Winter Way, questioned why they are only just now hearing about this project. He stated that he is concerned with noise, traffic, proximity to schools and the berm filled with questionable soil. Mr. Rogers stated that he thought a landscape setback with specific standards was required, and he would like more time to look at the plans more closely and understand what is being done.

Lisa Batchelor, 6 Deer Run, asked why the driveway to the southern entrance on North Maple needs to be wide enough to accommodate trucks since the truck traffic is being diverted to Moody Road. She stated that a four-way stop and electronic crosswalk could help. Ms. Batchelor asked if there is a plan to protect residents while construction is taking place. She asked whether the construction crews will be from Connecticut and surrounding states that have not been ordered to quarantine due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Warren Kessler, 56 Moody Road, stated that the section of Moody Road he lives on is already overburdened with tractor trailer traffic. He stated that the increased noise and vibrations will decrease his quality of life. Mr. Kessler stated that the building proposal will create a nightmare scenario for his neighborhood.

Sandy Borawski, 9 Winter Way, asked that a new traffic study be performed which takes into consideration traffic from cars and school buses. Ms. Borawski stated that it is unacceptable to approve the plan without knowing the identity of Tenant B. She asked what the bumpouts at the entrances on the site plan are for and whether there will be trucks idling in these areas. Ms. Borawski stated that berms and trees will not stop the noise from hitting the second floors of the houses in the neighborhoods. She stated that Industrial next to Residential is not compatible.

Brian Borawski, 9 Winter Way, stated that he has worked for distribution for years and they are always noisy. He provided examples of the noise produced by trucks at facilities like the proposed one. Mr. Borawski concluded that this belongs in an industrial park.

Debbie Chicorka, 19 Misty Meadow Road, stated that she concurs with everything that has been said tonight and would like to know if the soil is going to be tested. She stated that she would like a guarantee that moving the soil will not endanger the people and animals in the neighborhood.

Tim Prosinski, 8 Ryefield Drive, stated that he is concerned with the soil contamination.

Dina St. George, 25 Misty Meadow Road, stated that this development needs to be in an industrial park. She stated that she hopes the Commission delays the project and she would not like to see this industrial factory.

Bill Kiner, 4 Abbewood Drive, stated that his views tonight are his own and not representative of the Town Council. Mr. Kiner stated that this application in its current form is not beneficial to the

residents of Enfield. He stated that adverse conditions will arise if this project moves forward. Mr. Kiner concluded that there should not be a rush by the Commission to get this done.

Lisa Rogers, 8 Winter Way, stated that the neighbors should have known about this earlier and this plan is similar to a truck stop. She stated that there are many concerns including the environment and safety. Ms. Rogers asked how the citizens will be protected during the construction period and when the construction will be happening. She concluded that she hopes the Commission is listening and will put this on pause.

Ms. Hoover requested that the Commission show their faces on the screen, to which Chairman Nelson replied that they are all present and just trying not to slow down Zoom.

Sharen Santoski, 102 North Maple Street 13A, stated that the Connecticut State idling law allows for three minutes of truck idling but the applicant mentioned fifteen minutes. Ms. Santoski asked how the rooftop refrigeration units will be screened, and where the full list of items that can harm an aquifer are located. She asked what safeguards are in place for the residents, and brought up the issue of Manning Road, stating that they should be able to learn from it. Ms. Santoski requested that the hearing remain open in order to allow them to address these issues.

Kurt Ehrhardt, 10 High Meadow Lane, asked how far from the road this building will be set back. He asked where the buildout will be with the current design. Mr. Ehrhardt asked if they had gone to the DOT and had an independent traffic study done. He stated that the trucks are still very loud even if they are the quietest ones in the industry.

Motion: Commissioner Alaimo made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Szewczak, to extend the meeting.

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Votes: 7-0-0

Ms. Ferro requested that the chat box be recorded, reproduced and entered into the record. She went on to state that this project has not been discussed with the town for two years, but rather the town was notified of this project on May 19, 2020.

Ms. Ferro stated that Winstanley always pursues environmental investigations and in this case they conducted Phase 1 investigations on all of the parcels as well as targeted Phase 2's at Lot 1 and Lot 3. She stated that everything was well below reporting criteria and no remediation was found to be necessary.

Chairman Nelson stated that he was involved with the Town Council at the time that Fermi's contamination came into light, and that contamination was from hauled-in fill rather than the land itself.

Ms. Ferro stated that there is a process for merging lots and that they had filed the merge applications and other documents with the town according to town requirements.

Ms. Ferro stated that if there was a change of use, parking, or intensity of use, they would have to go back before the Commission for permission. She stated that town Staff ensure that site plan conditions are upheld, and there are rigorous processes in place to ensure construction is being performed as required.

Ms. Ferro stated that there is some gray area with enforcement regarding the idling of trucks, but they will meet whatever threshold they have to meet.

Ms. Ferro explained that the berm is not being constructed as a requirement, but rather to help with noise attenuation and landscape screening. She stated that a mix of vegetation was used on the berm as studies indicate that a mixture of both deciduous and evergreen trees work best for noise attenuation.

Mr. Petropulos explained the purpose of the bumpouts on the driveways, which he stated are for portable snow scrapers. He stated that they have been in contact with various companies regarding the utilities and they have adequate capacity to service the facility.

Mr. Petropulos stated that the project will take approximately fifteen months from start to finish and the berm will be the first thing built to protect the residents. He went over some of the distances from the building to property lines and abutters.

Ms. Ferro stated that the zoning regulations do not address speculative development, so not having a tenant lined up is acceptable.

Mr. Skelly stated that the traffic study does account for a second tenant. He explained how the trip generations are calculated, what is meant by morning and afternoon peak hours, and the potential for rerouting trucks. Mr. Skelly stated that they expect the trucks to make their way to the nearest highway as quickly as possible.

Mr. Skelly explained the timing of the 2019 and 2020 traffic studies and stated that school drop-off/pickup has been accounted for. He stated that the traffic study has been done according to DOT standards.

Mr. Skelly stated that the crosswalk to Winter Way has good site distance in both directions; however, if the town chooses to enhance the crosswalk they can. He went on to state that the four-way stop is likely not going to work there, but the town has the ability to do it if they want to.

Mr. Skelly clarified that the DOT compared the 2020 study to a comparable date a year prior, but not one year ago exactly. He described the OSTA process and stated that there will be a lot of DOT oversight and review for this project.

Chairman Nelson stated that proper berm height is five feet, and asked how this berm became ten feet. Ms. Whitten stated that this is not a required berm but rather a proposed berm because the applicant feels it is warranted. Chairman Nelson asked if the landscaped berm to protect the neighbors is against the regulations. Ms. Ferro stated that it is not required and does not have to

be referred to as a berm. Ms. Pacacha clarified the regulations as they pertain to berm height maximums.

Chairman Nelson asked if the landscaping standards are being met for the amount of trees that need to be planted. Mr. Petropulos stated that they are taking into consideration the vegetation that currently exists. Ms. Ferro stated that Staff had reviewed it and if there is a miscount and more vegetation is required, they will provide more vegetation. Chairman Nelson stated that this would get caught during final inspections prior to the release of bonds.

Chairman Nelson asked about the screening of the rooftop units. Ms. Ferro explained how the parapets offer screening from ground level.

Mr. Petropulos described the location of the trash compactors at the loading docks. Ms. Costanzo stated that each tenant is responsible for the removal of their trash. Chairman Nelson asked where dumpster containers will be placed, to which Ms. Costanzo replied that it will just be the compactors at the loading docks.

Chairman Nelson asked how the trash compactors work with the dumpster screening requirements, to which Ms. Whitten replied that if the compactors are in the loading dock they are not visible but if they are outside of the building they will still need to be screened. Chairman Nelson stated that he has never seen compactors screened in anywhere in Enfield and that he does not want to end up with two or three dumpsters throughout the parking lot. Ms. Ferro stated that they are not proposing dumpsters outside of the compactor area.

Commissioner Higley asked if Staff had reviewed the parking and confirmed that it is adequate. Ms. Pacacha read through the portion of the regulations pertaining to this issue, with Commissioner Higley concluding that they do adhere to the regulations.

Commissioner Szewczak asked if the light poles need to be as high as they are in the parking areas. He added that he did not see comments from the Town Engineer, which should be addressed. Commissioner Szewczak stated that he is concerned with the traffic associated with Hazardville Memorial School drop-off and pickup. He stated that they need to explore this school traffic more and how it will be integrated with the truck traffic.

Commissioner Szewczak stated that the GPS monitors used by truckers may have them coming from a different direction and not just I-91.

Ms. Ferro stated that a lighting consultant examined the lights and they were tweaked to ensure everything was as dark as possible. She stated that the lights are at standard heights and she cannot guarantee that a shorter light pole will be feasible.

Ms. Ferro reiterated that the school traffic was included in the traffic study. Commissioner Szewczak questioned whether Mr. Skelly could state as a fact that the school traffic was definitely included in the study. Mr. Skelly stated that the school traffic was absolutely accounted for and he can provide certification from the DOT that this is the case. Mr. Skelly explained the methods used to count the traffic and stated that this includes school buses and drop-off/pickup cars.

Additional discussion took place regarding the accuracy of the traffic study. Chairman Nelson stated that they have no other choice but to rely on past data from the DOT.

Commissioner Ladd asked about the Fire Department's request to connect the driveway. Ms. Ferro replied that they did commit to the sidewalks and that connection, but they received the comments late and were not able to get the plans adjusted.

Discussion took place regarding ending the meeting and whether the bylaws allow the Commission to extend the meeting past midnight.

Motion: Commissioner Alaimo made a motion to suspend the rules and extend the meeting past midnight.

There was no second to the motion.

Discussion took place regarding when the Commission can meet next regarding the outstanding concerns.

Commissioner Alaimo asked if the traffic studies are validated by the state and sealed, to which Mr. Skelly replied that when they sign off on it there is a signature from the director of OSTA but it does not have a seal. Mr. Skelly stated that all of the information they receive from the state is accurate to the best of his knowledge as an engineer.

Attorney Tallberg reminded the Commission that this application does not require a Public Hearing and advised against delaying a Public Hearing that did not need to happen in the first place. He suggested that the Commission find a sensible way to move forward without more delay.

Motion: Commissioner Alaimo made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Higley, to close the Public Hearing.

The motion passed with a 5-1-0 vote with Commissioner Szewczak voting against and Commissioner DeGray having left the virtual meeting.

Votes: 5-1-0

Commissioner Szewczak stated that there were additional site specific conditions to be added based on today's meeting, including the additional signage, addition of sidewalks, and the connection between the two driveways.

Chairman Nelson stated that if there is a miscount in the number of plantings, it will be caught during final inspections. He stated that the berm is not under the regulations and is more of a landscaped island than a buffer or berm. Chairman Nelson stated that the sidewalks should be on the site plan and he is in agreement with the signage directing traffic to Moody Road and to I-91.

Chairman Nelson stated that past members had the ability to change the regulations and are now in the meeting challenging the very regulations they were in a position to change. He stated that they are not currently in the position to change the regulations, and are bound to the regulations in front of them.

Commissioner Szewczak stated that there should be another condition that the light pole heights should be reduced. He stated that their hands are tied due to the regulations and the area being zoned Industrial. Ms. Ferro stated that they are willing to try to lower the light poles but they do not want to do it at the risk of compromising illumination.

Commissioner Alaimo asked if it is possible to put a guardrail along the road for the safety of the children, to which Chairman Nelson replied that the applicant does not own the property and they cannot ask them to do this.

Ms. Pacacha stated that Commissioner DeGray is still on the call.

Motion: Commissioner Szewczak made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Alaimo, to approve SPR #1826 with four additional conditions for the signage, sidewalks, review of light pole heights and the connection between the two parking lots in front of the building.

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Votes: 7-0-0

MOTION TO APPROVE SPR# 1826 for a proposed one-store 501,500 square foot distribution center that would accommodate two tenants, with the associated parking lots, landscaping, and drainage at 113 North Maple Street; WE 113 North Maple Street, LLC owner/applicant; Map 82/Lot 1-4; I-1 Zone according to the below referenced plans and with the following conditions of approval:

General Conditions:

1. This approval is for the specific use, site, and structure identified in the application. Any change in the nature of the use, site, or the structure will require new approvals from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.
2. This approval does not include signage permits.
3. There is to be no exterior sheet metal venting pipes visible from the street.
4. Exterior mechanicals and electricals are to be boxed and screened.
5. This project shall be constructed and maintained in accordance with the referenced plans.
6. A building permit for the construction of facilities as approved must be obtained within 24 months of approval or this approval shall be rendered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
7. All construction authorized by this approval shall be completed within five (5) years or this approval shall be considered null and void, unless an extension is granted by the Commission.
8. 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.

Site Specific Conditions:

9. Parking of trucks in the open within one-hundred fifty (150) feet of a Residence District boundary line shall be limited to vehicles of not over 26,000 pounds gross vehicle weight. Trucks in excess of 26,000 pounds of gross vehicle weight-used in conjunction with operation of any business permitted in this district shall not be parked in the open within 150 feet of a Residence District, except during normal business hours.
10. Any lighting used to illuminate off-street parking areas shall be directed away from residential properties so as not to create a nuisance. In a parking area containing three (3) or more parking spaces, such lighting shall be extinguished one-half (1/2) hour after the close of the business.
11. A sidewalk not less than four (4) feet wide shall be constructed and may be located in either the landscaped setback or street right-of-way.
12. No motor vehicle repair work shall be permitted in conjunction with loading facilities.
13. The comments of the Traffic Safety Officer must be addressed.
14. If a well is found on the property it must be properly abandoned per the requirements of the North Central District Health Department.
15. Addition directional signage for access to I-91 must be added to the final plans.
16. Sidewalks must be constructed along both road frontages.
17. Final review of the site lighting is required for the possible lowering of lighting posts.
18. The two front parking lots along the frontage of the building must be connected.
19. The landscaping must be checked in the final plan review for compliance with Enfield Zoning Regulation requirements.

Conditions to be met prior to signing of plans:

20. All plans submitted for signature shall bear the seal and live signature of the appropriate professional(s) responsible for the preparation of the plans.
21. The application number shall be displayed on the plans in or near the Title Block area.
22. A copy of the approval letter and conditions shall be incorporated into the final plans submitted for signature, preferably located on the cover sheet or first sheet of the plan set.
23. A list outlining how the conditions of approval have been met shall be submitted along with final plans submitted for signature.
24. 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.
25. The conditions of this approval shall be binding on the applicant, land owners, and their successors and assigns.

Conditions to be met prior to the issuance of permits:

26. Four sets of paper plans with any required revisions incorporated shall be submitted to the Planning Department for signature of the Commission. The Director of Planning may require Mylars.
27. The applicant shall also submit final plans as approved by the Commission in a digital format compatible with the Enfield Geographic Information Systems Electronic Submittals Ordinance.
28. The applicant shall post a bond for Site Restoration in an amount to be determined by the Town Engineer and the Director of Planning.

29. The applicant shall post a separate bond for Erosion and Sediment Control submitted in the form of cash or certified check, pledged to the Town, in an amount to be determined by the Town Engineer and the Director of Planning.
30. The applicant shall post a Landscaping Bond to the Town, in an amount and format determined by the Director of Planning.
31. A pre-construction meeting between the applicant, site contractors, project engineer and Town Staff shall be held.
32. Any required certificates and/or approvals from State or Federal agencies (i.e. CT-DOT, DEEP, Army Corps of Engineers) shall be obtained by the applicant and reported to the Planning and Zoning Commission file. Any changes to the plans required by such entities may require a plan modification from the Enfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

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

33. Complete as-built plans certified to Class A-2 accuracy shall be submitted prior to the issuance of any certificates of zoning compliance. The as-built plan shall also contain a certification by a Professional Engineer that they have inspected the site improvements and that they have been installed in accordance with the approved plans. Any deviations or omissions must be noted.
34. The design professional who prepared the approved PZC architectural drawings, shall provide as-built drawings with a certification that they have complied with approved plans. Any changes need to be noted on the plans and a list of changes submitted.
35. No Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval may be issued until the Zoning Enforcement Officer has signed off on the final work. When minor site work cannot be completed because of weather or other pertinent reason, a conditional approval may be issued for a period not to exceed 180 days, providing satisfactory surety shall be posted with the Town of Enfield in an amount sufficient to complete the site work and with surety acceptable to the Town of Enfield.
36. A request for final project review and certificate of zoning compliance must be made to the Planning Department not less than 10 days before a Certificate of Occupancy or other final approval is requested from the Building Official.

Note: The Conditions of Approvals do not take the place of other requirements found in the Town Codes, Regulations, and Application Instructions.

REFERENCE PLANS:

Map 82, Lots 1,2,3,4 Proposed Agri-Mark Distribution Facility, 113 North Maple St., Enfield CT, prepared for record owner WE 113 North Maple ST, LLC, c/o Winstanley Enterprises, LLC 150 Baker Ave. Ext, Concord MA 01742;978-287-5000, www.winent.com, prepared by HIS Civil Engineers/Land Surveyors, 3 Congress St., Nashua NH 03062, 603-883-2057; 131 Middlesex Turnpike, Burlington MA 01803, 781-203 1501; dated June 1, 2020

- | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|
| 1/22 | Master Site Plan |
| 2/22 | Abutters, Notes and Legend |
| 3-4/22 | Existing Conditions |
| 5-6/22 | Site Grading & Utility Plan |
| 7-8/22 | Site Layout Plan |
| 9/22 | Erosion Control Plan – Phase I |

10/22	Erosion Control Plan – Phase 2
11-13/22	Utility Profiles
14-17/22	Detail Sheet – General Site
18/22	Detail Sheet – Erosion Controls
19-20/22	Landscape Plan
21/22	Detail Sheet – Landscaping
22/22	Photometric Plan

Map 82, Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 113 North Main Street Warehouse, Enfield, CT, prepared for Winstanley Enterprises, 150 Baker Avenue Ext., Concord, MA 01742; 978-287-5000, www.winent.com, prepared by HIS Civil Engineers/Land Surveyors, 3 Congress St., Nashua, NH 03062; 603-883-2057; also prepared by NV5 200 Brickstone Square, Andover MA 01810; 978-296-6200; dated June 9, 2020.

T-001	Cover Sheet
A-001	Proposed Site Plan
A-100	Overall First Floor Plan
A-111	Quadrant Plans – Zone 1
A-112	Quadrant Plans – Zone 2
A-113	Quadrant Plans – Zone 3
A-114	Quadrant Plans – Zone 4
A-115	Quadrant Plans – Zone 5
A-116	Quadrant Plans – Zone 6
A-500	Overall Building Elevations

Chairman Nelson stated that by having a Public Hearing the people were given false hope as the Commission is bound by the regulations. He stated that the residents should be thankful that Winstanley is the partner they have next to them.

Ms. Whitten stated that the Commission should adjourn and everything else on the agenda should be tabled until the next meeting.

Adjournment

Motion: Commissioner Ladd made a motion, seconded by Commissioner DeGray, to adjourn.

The motion passed with a 7-0-0 vote.

Votes: 7-0-0

Prepared by: Elizabeth Bouley

Respectfully Submitted,

Richard Szewczak, Secretary