

**TOWN OF HADDAM
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING/MEETING
TOWN HALL
21 FIELD PARK DRIVE, HADDAM, CT
THURSDAY, 2 MARCH 2017
UNAPPROVED MINUTES
*Subject to Approval by the Commission***

ATTENDANCE

X	Steven Bull, Vice Chairman
X	Arthur Kohs
A	Michael Lagace
X	Jamin Laurenza, Chairman
X	Wayne LePard
X	Carmelo Rosa
A	Edward Wallor, Secretary
A	Robert Braren, Alternate
X	Raul de Brigard, Alternate - Seated
X	Frank (Chip) Frey, Alternate - Seated
A	Liz West Glidden, Town Planner
X	Jim Puska, Zoning Enforcement Officer
X	Bunny Hall Batzner, Recording Clerk

1. Call to Order

Mr. Laurenza, chairman, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

2. Attendance/Seating of the Alternates

Attendance was taken and all regular and alternate members were seated.

3. Additions/Corrections to the Agenda

None.

4. Public Comments

None.

5. Public Hearing/Public Meeting: Special Permit to Allow Development and Construction of a 30,000 Square Foot Warehouse Building, a 4,900 Square Foot Office Building, a Parking Area with 16 Spaces, a Loading Area, and Related Site Improvements for Property Located on 457 Killingworth Road and Adjacent Parcel and Shown on Tax Map 34, Lots 004-1 and 004-2. Applicant is GCI Outdoor, Inc.

Jeffrey Polke, owner/applicant, GCI Outdoor, Inc.; James Cassidy, engineer, Hallisey, Pearson and Cassidy; and Paul Geraghty, Esq., Geraghty and Bonnano; were present.

Mr. Polke distributed a new rendering and specifications sheet of the proposed warehouse and office building (Exhibit A, 2 pages; on file in the Land Use Office); and reported the plan is to build a larger warehouse facility and relocated to 457 Killingworth Road. Mr. Polke stated he believes the Commission has sufficient information as Mr. Puska has not indicated otherwise.

Existing Condition of Site - Mr. Cassidy reported the following: 4.88 acre parcel (zoned Industrial Park); Ponsett Brook and small associated wetlands area to back of parcel; large diameter deciduous trees; and topography slopes from the southerly property line (Elevation 322) down to the brook (Elevation 280).

Zoning Compliance Plan - Mr. Cassidy reported the proposal calls for building a 30,000 square foot warehouse (100 feet by 300 feet) and a 4,900 square foot office building (50 feet by 98 feet).. Total building area: 34,900 square feet. Main driveway toward the center of the parcel to access the office building and front parking area and for tractor trailers to exit from the loading dock area. Entrance only access at southerly end of property for turning maneuverability for tractor trailer.

Industrial Park Zone requirements - Mr. Cassidy reported the applicant meets or exceeds all requirements and reviewed: acreage: 2 acres minimum required, 4.88 acres existing; frontage: 200 feet required, 544 feet existing; front yard setback: 70 feet required, 71 feet - closest point front corner of warehouse; side yard setback: 30 feet with aggregate 70 feet required, 30.95 feet warehouse and 77.88 feet office building (total combined 108.83 feet); rear yard setback: 40 feet required, 322.74 feet; building coverage: 30 percent required, 16.4 percent; impervious coverage: 75 percent required, 27.6 percent proposed; building height: 35 feet maximum, do not have a final structural design; however, the tallest building will be the warehouse and it will be under the maximum height requirement; minimum setback from watercourse or wetlands: 50 feet required, 65.6 feet proposed.

Parking, Traffic, and Hours of Operation: Mr. Cassidy reported on the following: 16 spaces are required/proposed and noted additional spaces can be added in the paved turning maneuverability area to the front of the building. Traffic will be 15-20 employees (some being part-time), four tractor trailers, and two to three FedEx trucks scattered throughout the course of the day. Driveway situated to provide adequate sightlines in both directions. Hours of operation will be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. week days, no weekend hours, and no special business hours being requested.

Utilities: Property serviced by a private well and onsite septic system, located to the rear and north of the office building, respectively. Mr. Cassidy reported the septic was previously approved and he's re-designed the same area based on the use; and pursuant to the state health code, the system is designed to accommodate 24 employees for the office building. As for the warehouse, the state health code does not have a specific requirement for this type of use; however, three additional employees were added to make sure the system was more than adequate. Based on the original design the system was 50 percent larger than it actually needs to be based on the proposed use.

Stormwater Management System: Mr. Cassidy reported the proposal calls for the following: stormwater management basin (northeast corner of site); series of catch basins (CBs) within the parking area; swale along back of building with a series of yard drains in it to collect the roof leaders from the building. The CBs all consist of deep sumps with hooded outlets. The stormwater management basin is designed to continue the flow that's discharged out of it before it's allowed to continue to discharge onto Ponsett Brook; therefore, the same rate of flow will be leaving the site post development as it currently exists. Flow from the control structure will discharge to a level spreader (a series of galleys) in addition to a rip rap spillway (should there be a failure with the basin). Mr. Cassidy reviewed/explained they work.

Landscaping: Front Island: not a lot of grading proposed in this area and will try to preserve a number of the large trees. The front side of the building is at grade and the back side to be built into the slope (approximately four to ten feet). Plan to install an evergreen hedge row along the back side of the site to provide screening on that side; a series of canopy trees along the front of building; and approximately two acres of trees that will be preserved along the perimeter. The remaining area will be lawn with additional landscaping around the building. Mr. Polke stated the proposal is to preserve as much as possible.

Structures: Warehouse – two loading dock doors, windows added to provide another detail to the structure as well as provide natural light and conserve electricity, one story. Office building – one story with gabled roof, Chalet-look (specifically to the front). Mr. Polke reported earth tone colors are proposed in order to help structures blend in with the landscape.

Construction Time Frame and DOT Encroachment Permit - Mr. Cassidy stated the proposal calls for starting the buildings as soon as possible – potentially in May and completing the project in late October. Mr. Cassidy also stated they need to submit an encroachment permit to DOT and feel they have a reasonable design for the curb cuts, but understand they have to work with DOT for their approval.

Review of Special Permit Requirements - Mr. Geraghty briefly reviewed the following: **15.3.4** – complete application submitted; **15.3.6** – public hearing sign posted on site (photo submitted previously by Mr. Polke to the Land Use Dept.); **15.4.3** – conform to all site plan requirements; **15.4.4** – proposal is in harmony with the area citing the various zones (residential, commercial, and industrial park) between Little City Road and Routes 81 and 154 as well as the character of the structure, Route 9 intersecting the area, will not hinder the development of the area as there's limited area for development there at this time, and vegetation buffers to be maintained; **15.4.5** – under 50 percent coverage proposed on the lot; **15.4.6** – public health is protected by the proposed designed – well on site, septic system designed for a much larger demand than will be placed on it, everything is outside the wetland review area except for a portion of the parking, designed a stormwater retention area to reduce pollution, and no discharge directly into the brook; **15.4.7** – believes it to be an appropriate use as the Commission just recently changed the zone designation; **15.4.8** – as the area is a mixed use and largely developed, doesn't believe this proposal will be a detrimental impact to the adjacent properties; **15.4.9** – 550 foot sightline to the north and south, minimal truck traffic, structures setback to meet the setback requirements as well as low profile on the roof line so visibility from the road will not be impactful as well as the use of colors to blend into the landscape; **15.4.10** – maintain as many existing trees on the property as the entire site will not be developed, additional trees to be planted on the south side and a visual buffer on the street and north side.

Keith Lane, 1213 Killingworth Road, stated both parcels are identified in the Connecticut Historical Site as there are various items there; and asked Mr. Polke if he intended to preserve those features. Mr. Polke stated he was unaware of the property being on a registry for historical value; he was aware that one person had mentioned one of the lots had some historical value but not necessarily registered; and offered to listen to see what the feature is and be happy to make their best effort to retain it. Mr. Lane stated he was unable to attend the last hearing/meeting, but had submitted a package with the information from the Connecticut Historical Commission and did find various sites (most are along the brook side). Mr. Lane suggested those sites be maintained if they could. Mr. Polke stated more than likely that whole side of the property will not be touched. Mr. Polke again offered to meet with Mr. Lane to discuss the matter and walk the area. Mr. Laurenza asked who the package was submitted to. Mr. Lane stated the Commission and was read at the 22 September 2016 meeting. Mr. Lane stated the original dam was on the southerly property and the grist mill was on the northerly parcel.

Mr. Lane stated the water table is about two feet below grade level in the area where the stormwater management system is proposed; and questioned if it will impact the design. Mr. Cassidy stated the system is designed so the bottom of the basin is sitting on grade and not cut into the grade and a berm will be constructed around it.

Mr. Lane asked for clarification in regard to the septic system. Mr. Cassidy stated the septic system was originally designed for a four bedroom house (600 gallons a day) and based on the proposed office use (number of employees, 20 gallons per employee) of 490 gallons a day decided to leave the system at 600 gallons a day, therefore, making it more than adequate.

Rob Lamy, 808 Candlewood Hill Road, stated he's attended three meetings pertaining to this matter and there has been discussion about benefits to the town and tax base. Mr. Lamy also stated GCI's products are outdoor products and chairs and their credibility with their product is reflected in their proposal as it fits with Mr. Polke's business and his concern for the community.

Jennifer Lamy, 808 Candlewood Hill Road, stated there will be additional employees within the town who will use the restaurants, banks, and gas stations; the hours of operation will not conflict with the high school, and the truck drivers will also use the area businesses.

Jim Sibley, 100 Walkley Hill Road, stated it's an honor to the town that Mr. Polke considered Haddam as Haddam has been historically left behind as reflected in our tax rates; and the site has plenty of room and will be an asset to the town. Mr. Sibley also stated he had spoken to Mr. Polke and is impressed with his forward thinking of his business. Mr. Sibley recommended the Commission support the project.

Mr. Frey asked if the wall pack illuminators listed on the plans are for safety/security. Mr. Cassidy stated yes, as the parking spaces are up against the building and the lights are for those spaces; but did not see a need to place them on the north side as a pole light (no high level lighting) should be sufficient. Mr. Frey asked about sign lighting. Mr. Polke stated there may be a light focused on the sign and in harmony with the rest of the project, but if it were a nuisance, it could be turned off.

Mr. Rosa stated an attempt was made for architectural pleasing design for the office building; however, more consideration (similar elements of the office building) should be given to the warehouse. Mr. Rosa stated he likes the project, but the structure is large in a residential area. Mr. Polke stated the Village District has specific requirements, but not this area. Mr. Polke also stated he's working with the manufacturer to try to make it blend as much as possible into the landscape, but he does have color requirements he's being held by as to what the steel can be, and it gets difficult to keep adding to a 30,000 square foot structure. Mr. Polke stated the intent is to use trees for buffering and to repurpose all stonewalls on the property. Mr. Rosa again stated there are architectural elements being shown on the office building and some attention should be made toward the warehouse.

Mr. Bull asked how far reaching is the Commission in the building design of an industrial building. Mr. Laurenza stated he believes the Commission is only tied to the Village District. Mr. Geraghty stated there aren't specific standards, it's merely are the structures in harmony with the overall neighborhood. Discussion followed at length in regard to Sections 15.4.4 and 15.4.8 and whether potential elements could be added to the warehouse.

Mr. de Brigard asked what the surface of the parking area will be with Mr. Cassidy responding bituminous due to the tractor trailers going in and out. Mr. de Brigard asked how the roof drainage will work. Mr. Cassidy stated there are individual roof leaders that are tied into an underground system. Mr. de Brigard asked if there was a space between the tarmac and the base of the building. Mr. Cassidy stated yes, approximately five feet between the building and the pavement. Mr. de Brigard asked if there will be a lot of drainage coming across the parking lot. Mr. Cassidy stated the drainage coming across the parking lot will be from the pavement itself as the roof leaders do not discharge across the parking lot.

Mr. Laurenza asked Mr. Polke if he had spoken to Mr. Puska in regard to the memo from Jeff Jacobson, town engineer, Nathan L. Jacobson and Associates, dated 2 March 2017 (Exhibit B; copy on file in the Land Use Office). Mr. Polke stated yes. Mr. Laurenza read Mr. Jacobson's memo into the record. In the memo, Mr. Jacobson notes that he had only received some of the drawings on Friday, 24 February 2017, some via email on Monday, 27 February 2017, and the Storm Drainage Calculations and Stormwater Management Report today, 2 March 2017, allowing insufficient time to provide a detailed engineering review for the hearing/meeting. However, in reviewing the plans for compliance with the Zoning Regulations, Mr. Jacobson recommended the Commission discuss the following:

Section 14.2.3E.9, 14.3.5 and 14.4.24 – Architectural drawings not received as required by the Regulations. Recommended Commission review the character, colors, materials, etc., to determine if building design is acceptable and to confirm mechanical equipment is not visible from street. Also, confirm height of building is less than the maximum permitted 35 feet. Mr. Laurenza stated the first part of Mr. Jacobson's concern has been addressed; however, there is nothing pertaining to the mechanicals. Mr. Polke stated there will be no central air in the warehouse only heat through interior Modine heaters (stove pipe visible) and the office mechanicals will be behind the building to the back right. In regard to the height of the structure, Mr. Puska stated the drawings will be submitted with the application for zoning.

Section 14.2.3H.5 – Screening required for outside storage, refuse collection, etc. No such areas shown on the drawings; however, Notes 13 and 15, Construction Sequence, Drawing 8, indicates a Trash Enclosure and Outside Display Area. Recommended Commission review locations and methods of screening.

Mr. Polke stated there will be two dumpsters (cardboard and trash; 12-15 yard) with trees as buffer. Mr. Puska asked if that will be covered in the file drawing. Mr. Polke stated yes. Mr. Laurenza asked if the Commission was comfortable with trees or would they prefer fencing/gate. Mr. Bull asked for the proposed location with Mr. Cassidy stating between the warehouse and office building as far back as possible while still allowing access. Discussion followed in regard to a more common area to come in/out to dispose of cardboard, etc. Mr. Bull stated the Commission needs a defined location and how it will be screened. Mr. Puska stated these items can be added to the plan for the finished site.

Section 14.4.6H – Driveway limitation to one. Application does not fall under the exceptions to this rule. Recommended Commission review the two proposed driveway connections as well as the width of the southerly driveway (45 feet) as the Regulations state driveways shall not exceed a width of 30 feet at the street line. Mr. Cassidy stated for proper turning maneuvers for the tractor trailer he needs the width and the intention is for an entrance only for the tractor trailers. Mr. Puska asked if the width was the required guidelines for a radius for a tractor trailer. Mr. Cassidy stated he used a program called AutoTURN, WV65, and that he would rather have the wider curb cut so the tractor trailer will not cross the centerline. Mr. Cassidy also stated they have to go to DOT for an Encroachment Permit and it's pending their review. Mr. Cassidy stated the southerly entrance could be gated. Mr. Laurenza stated he understands the spirit of the Regulations, but from a safety aspect he does not want a tractor trailer crossing the centerline and it provides sufficient room for the fire trucks as well. Discussion returned to how the tractor trailers will enter/leave the site; the potential of a truck leaving the site and turning south; and widening the radius on the northern driveway as well.

Section 14.4.10 – Lighting locations not shown on the drawings; however, a light detail is shown on Drawing 13 (presumed exterior wall mounted light). Recommended Commission discuss the location of lights and determine if acceptable. Mr. Cassidy stated the proposal calls for one light over the overhead doors and a couple over the parking spaces. Discussion followed in regard to the use of minimum cut offs and motion detectors.

Section 14.4.17E – The Commission should determine if the loading docks are sufficiently screened from the street. Mr. Cassidy stated the proposal calls for retaining as much of the existing vegetation as possible and extending the island slightly with the installation of a canopy tree. The Commission felt the proposed landscaping will adequately screen the loading docks. Mr. Geraghty noted the loading docks will be flush with the building. Mr. Bull asked if additional shrubs/trees could be added. Discussion followed at length with it being determined 20 Rhododendrons be planted five (5) feet on center on the inside of the island.

Section 21.2 – Parking tabulation does not include spaces for the proposed 30,000 square foot warehouse. Recommended Commission discuss anticipated parking demands for both employees and visitors and make a determination. Mr. Cassidy stated there isn't a specific requirement for the warehouse use; however, the majority of the 15 to 20 employees (some being part-time) are in the office. Mr. Cassidy stated he felt there was sufficient parking, but if additional parking is needed it can be added to the front. Mr. Polke stated there are two employees at the warehouse.

Mr. Polke asked the Commission to comment about the placement of a small sign on the road side of the island. Mr. Puska stated it would need to meet the sign criteria; and requested that it be added to the plan.

Mr. Rosa voiced concern over the aesthetics of the building and the applicant should come back with a revised elevation plan. Mr. Laurenza stated he didn't see a need based on the structure sitting back from the road, tree screening, and addition of windows. Mr. Rosa noted the town's engineer brought the matter up himself. Mr. Laurenza reviewed Mr. Jacobson's first comment. Discussion followed in regard to different façades that can be placed on a metal building and associated costs; and the placement of additional shrubs along the length of the warehouse (agreed to a row of boxwoods).

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to close the public hearing at 8:15 p.m. Chip Frey second. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Meeting: Mr. Laurenza opened the public meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Discussion followed in regard to the look of the warehouse. Mr. Laurenza stated the tree line in the island will screen the building sufficiently. Mr. Bull stated if the Commission wants to stunt industrial growth in town, than make them put a façade on every industrial building; and that he didn't see a reason for it. Mr. Laurenza stated cost isn't the Commission's concern. Mr. Bull agreed; noting there's sufficient screening. Mr. Frey stated he agreed with Mr. Bull in that cost is not the Commission's issue; however, the Commission can't be discouraging. Mr. Frey also stated he respected Mr. Rosa's trained eye as an architect. Mr. Bull asked if there's concern about the building straddling two lots. Mr. Laurenza stated he thought a lot line revision had been done. A brief discussion followed with it being noted the lot line revision has not yet been completed.

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to approve development of a new 30,000 square foot warehouse building, a 4,900 square foot office building, construction of 16 spaces of parking area, loading area, and related site improvements at Map 34, Lots 004-1 and 004-2. **Conditions:** 1. All of Town Engineer's conditions to be met. 2. Twenty (20) Rhododendrons across front island to be planted. 3. Hedge row planted north side of warehouse. 4. Proposed north driveway to accommodate tractor trailer. Art Kohs second. Motion carried unanimously.

6. Approval/Correction of the Minutes

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to approve the 16 February 2017 public hearing/meeting minutes as submitted. Chip Frey second. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Chairman's Report

Mr. Laurenza stated the Commission got a business to stay in town.

8. Scheduling of Hearings

MOTION: Jamin Laurenza moved to cancel the 16 March 2017 meeting (no applications pending). Wayne LePard second. Motion carried unanimously.

9. Zoning Enforcement Officer's (ZEO's) Report

None.

10. Adjournment

MOTION: Steve Bull moved to adjourn. Wayne LePard second. Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Bunny Hall Batzner

Bunny Hall Batzner
Recording Clerk

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, 6 April 2017.