

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
JUNE 21, 2005**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public hearing on Tuesday, June 21, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Stillman Building Meeting Room, 127 Hartford Avenue, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman
Margaret Wagner
Earle Munroe
David Edwards III
Richard Roberts

Members absent:

Joseph Hammer, Chairman
Philip Knecht, Clerk
Peter Leombruni
John Adamian
George Oickle
Robert P. Jurasin
John Hallisey

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner

Commissioner Forsdick opened the public hearing and explained the format.

APPLICATION NO. 1466-05-Z. Mr. Manuel Pine seeking a Special Permit to allow the demolition of the present building and construction of a new building for retail use, located on the east side of the road in a General Business District Zone at 416 Silas Deane Highway.

Commissioner Forsdick read the following correspondence into the record:

- Letter dated 6/16/05 to Manny Pine from Peter Gillespie stating that the Design Review Committee had approved his application with three conditions. The letter states the conditions.
- Memo dated 6/2/05 to Don Moisa, Inland Wetlands Agent and Peter Gillespie, from Michael J. Turner, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer. The memo states that Mr. Turner has reviewed the application and lists six comments that he has regarding the application.
- Letter dated 6/16/05 to Manny Pine from Frederick Clark, Chairman of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission. This letter states that the application was approved as a declaratory ruling citing no wetlands impacts and therefore no jurisdiction. The Erosion and Sedimentation Plan was certified as submitted.
- Letter dated 6/21/05 to the Planning and Zoning Commission from Laura Saunders and Ozlem Camli. This letter states that the authors are neighbors to the project and they oppose the Dunkin Donuts at that site.

Attorney John Harvey presented the application. He introduced Manny Pine, owner and applicant and Corey Garro from Close, Jensen and Miller. Mr. Harvey said that it was his understanding that there was no technical problem with the notice. The proposal is to demolish the existing Suny's restaurant and construct a new Dunkin' Donuts restaurant with an attached retail space. There would be a drive-thru with the traffic entering the south side of the lot. A special permit is required for the removal of the building. The current lot is 99% paved. The area in the rear of the lot is owned by Helco and is not needed for the parking requirements; therefore the applicant is not going to seek permission to use the land for parking. It would require too much time to get the permission, they don't need the space and would have trouble getting financing for the project based upon use of that property. The PZC was made aware of this during

the pre-application process. There are 14 spaces required and the applicant would provide 18 spots.

Mr. Harvey then addressed the pieces of correspondence that had been submitted for the record.

- The Design Review Committee had suggested slant parking on the south side of the parking lot, among other things. This cannot be done because it would reduce the number of spaces below the required 14 parking spaces. Mr. Harvey went on to describe the buildings adjacent to the property along the Silas Deane Highway.
- The letter that had been submitted for the record opposing the project was discussed next. Mr. Harvey said that the letter claims that Hillcrest is perpendicular in front of Suny's. Hillcrest comes out at Manousos liquors, so that is a misstatement.
- The Inland Wetlands Commission's letter had been submitted approving the project. Mr. Harvey then said that a letter regarding the landscaping on the project had been submitted by Kevin Johnson from Close, Jensen and Miller. The new regulations required 15% green in the parking lot and they are short by 329 square feet, however the overall 25% green is being exceeded on the property. Therefore, they are proposing to be ahead in the totality of the site. The applicant requests a modification of the requirements on this basis. A calculation sheet has been submitted.
- Mr. Turner's letter comments on drainage, pavement and lighting. Mr. Harvey said that on June 8, 2005 the following information was provided in response to his comments in a letter provided to Mr. Gillespie for the record:
 - The DOT will look at the drainage after approval.
 - The grease/oil trap detail has been provided
 - The applicant talked with Mr. Turner about the paving issue.
 - The Siamese connection has been located.

Mr. Harvey said that the architect was not present but they did have a rendering of the proposed structure. He explained that they went to the Design Review Committee with the colonial structure shown and the dumpster located in the corner of the lot and landscaped. Dunkin' Donuts came to them and said that they were looking for the applicant to use the corporate model for the design of the structure. Mr. Harvey showed the PZC a picture of this rendering. Mr. Harvey explained that they then were required to go back to the Design Review Committee with that design which was rejected and the colonial design was then approved by the DRC and also approved by corporate Dunkin' Donuts.

Corey Garro from Close, Jensen and Miller then presented the engineering aspects of the proposal. He said that the existing site is pretty much entirely paved, and described the new site plan which shows a lot more green. Sheet flow is planned for the drainage to the east. The drainage would be picked up in a closed system and run into a vortex grease/oil trap. This complies with the 2002 DEP regulations. The plans would be submitted to the State who will review the computations and wait for their blessing. Outside of the property, the Helco area drains the same way. They are providing 18 spaces even though only 14 are required and they have looked at slanted parking as requested by the Design Review Committee, but they would lose 5 spaces if they adopted slanted parking.

Commissioner Roberts asked if the lost spaces were due to the aisle width. Mr. Garro said that they were, slanting the parking spaces decreases them by 4 feet.

Mr. Garro addressed the other concerns of the Design Review Commission and Mr. Turner:

- A revised site plan now shows the access to the Silas Deane via a sidewalk and walkway.
- The lighting engineer has placed three pole lights and four wall mounts on the site. There would be no light above the plane of the luminaries. The revised lighting plan with the almost undetected spillage of light has been handed to all members. The average light over the property line would be 1/2 foot-candle and cannot be read without meters. All lights would be cutoff type and therefore no spillage over the top. The applicant could also use house cutoff type fixtures if required, however these may not be necessary.
- The zoning requirements are met for impervious surfaces and the overall green on the site is more than required even though the parking lot landscaping would be less than required. They would be planting 15 trees.

Commissioner Forsdick asked if the walpak style lights without shields are needed if there are recessed lights. Mr. Garro said that the soffit with recessed lights would not give enough light for security reasons, therefore the walpak

lights are required.

Commissioner Edwards asked what type of retail would be located in the building. Mr. Pine said that he is looking for a mobile phone retailer. Commissioner Wagner said that she is concerned about the retail portion of the building and where the employees would park. Mr. Pine said that there would be 4 spaces available for employees, and that the retail space only needs 1 space. Commissioner Wagner went on to say that she thinks that the Helco area in the rear is an eyesore. She is not sure that she agrees with the commissioner who suggested that it be used for parking. She does agree with Mr. Turner's comment that Helco needs to be contacted.

Mr. Harvey replied that he did call their lawyer who sent all of the forms. However, the applicant cannot finance this part of the project, plus if they did get a lease the area is governed by a siting council in another part of the state. He would like to wait until that council deals with their timeline. He added that even if they did get a lease for that part of the property, the reality is that they do not own it and it could be cancelled at will. Mr. Harvey is not even sure if they can take out the blacktop from that part of the property to put in more landscaping.

Commissioner Wagner asked how Helco accesses the property. Mr. Gillespie said that Helco monitors the property by helicopter and that at a couple of other points the right-of-way crosses town roads. Finally they may knock on doors to get access through other properties. Commissioner Wagner asked if they needed a curbcut there or if it was just suggested by the commission. She added that one of the submitted pieces of information shows a shortage of 550 feet of landscaping. Mr. Harvey answered that the landscaping has been recalculated since March and the correct shortage is 329 s.f. Commissioner Wagner asked if there is no curb opening to the Helco property can enough grass area be added to get to the requirement. Mr. Garro said that he would look at that. Mr. Harvey said that the rear area is not really visible therefore it may not matter whether there is landscaping or not. Commissioner Wagner asked if there were trees on the other side of the Helco property. Mr. Harvey said that it was like a jungle with 25 foot high heavy growth. Commissioner Wagner asked if there was undergrowth as well. Commissioner Forsdick confirmed that there were both trees and undergrowth in the rear of the property. Commissioner Wagner wanted to make sure that other properties could no see the Dunkin' Donuts. Commissioner Forsdick said that they couldn't.

Commissioner Wagner said that she could see that there were some locations with more than .5 foot-candles. Mr. Garro said that the average was .5 foot-candles over the property line. Commissioner Wagner said that she is concerned about some of the light being extended behind the property where the residential homes were located in the rear of the yard. Mr. Garro said that they could put a cut off fixture on the lights.

Commissioner Munroe expressed his concern about the parking on the site. He wondered if it really was adequate. He wants to know what the turnover rate for a parking space may be, and if it is based on the area of the restaurant. He also asked how the parking lot would handle peak periods. Mr. Harvey said that it was a self-correcting situation. If someone sees a crowd at the Dunkin' Donuts they won't go in. Commissioner Munroe described his observations from some other Dunkin' Donuts locations. He is particularly concerned about the cars entering the site from such a high volume road. He wondered if a marketing study had been done to determine the need for the site. Mr. Harvey said that this site is designed to take a way the other two heavily used sites. Mr. Pine said that it would reduce traffic.

Mr. Pine, 10 Mullingham Drive Cromwell, CT, is the owner of the property. He said that he would like to put this Dunkin' Donuts in to reduce traffic. He expects to do mostly drive-thru business. Commissioner Munroe asked him what his turnover time per customer was. Mr. Pine said that he did not know. It is not something that he calculated. He does know that the drive-thru customers take one minute and 30 seconds from the speaker to the drive thru. Commissioner Forsdick commented that he does move the cars through the line. Mr. Harvey asked if the location was approved by corporate Dunkin' Donuts. Mr. Pine said that it was approved. Commissioner Munroe repeated that he has had concerns about the turnover rates and traffic and that these concerns have not been addressed. Mr. Harvey said that corporate Dunkin' Donuts would not have approved it if it wouldn't work. Mr. Pine said that corporate Dunkin' Donuts gave a very strong approval for this location.

Commissioner Munroe asked if all of the questions raised by the Design Review Commission had been answered. Mr. Harvey said that the sign is not a problem, it can be changed from a pylon to a monument. The sidewalk is now shown on the modified site plan.

Mr. Gillespie addressed the issue of notice. He said that they were out of the metal public hearing signs at the time the application was filed, therefore the applicant was instructed to post a paper sign. This paper sign had the incorrect date and commission listed. Within a day, the standard metal sign was issued and posted. In addition, the proper legal notice was posted in the Hartford Courant and all of the neighbors within three hundred feet were sent notice. The town attorney felt that there was no defect and that the public was given adequate notice.

Commissioner Roberts asked how many cars can be stacked. Mr. Garro said that seven cars can stack without blocking anyone coming in. Commissioner Roberts confirmed that the speaker was located at the top of the site plan in the middle.

Mr. Harvey said that the architect did a significant description of the materials. There would be a cooler in the rear, two exits in the rear and a concrete walk.

Commissioner Wagner asked why they chose slanted parking on the north side of the site. Mr. Garro said that there was no room to do it any other way. Commissioner Wagner then asked about Mr. Turner's first comment regarding tie-in to the DOT drainage system. Mr. Gillespie said that they would have to wait for that and that the review would be done before building permit was issued. Commissioner Wagner asked where the DOT drainage goes. Mr. Garro said that the drainage goes to the Helco right of way in the rear and then to Beaver Brook.

Mr. Harvey concluded that even though there is a letter opposing the need for another Dunkin' Donuts, it is Mr. Pine's business judgment that there is a need for it. The building would be a tremendous improvement to the existing Suny's and may improve what is around the building as well.

Commissioner Wagner made a motion to close the public hearing

Commissioner Munroe seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of closing the public hearing. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

APPLICATION NO. 1467-05-Z. Carol Kober Narciss seeking a Special Permit to allow the construction of a second accessory building, located on the east side of the road in an A-1 Residence Zone at 34 Griswold Road.

Ms. Narciss presented her application to add a second shed approximately 18' x 9'. It would be used to store her sons motorcross bikes so that she can reclaim her garage. The first shed on their property contains a lawnmower and other lawn equipment. She submitted pictures for the commission to review. It is a steel encased temporary structure. They do not plan to have it on the property more than 4-5 years. Since it is proposed to be temporary they did not realize that a building permit would be needed. The building inspector saw it and said that they may need to modify it to fit within the regulations. She said that it cannot be seen from the street because it would be in back of the other shed and painted the same color to blend in. They have a large property approximately 2/3 of an acre with three big trees and bushes to hide it.

Commissioner Forsdick said that she could see a portion of it if from the street. Commissioner Edwards asked if there would be doors on the structure. Ms. Narciss said that there would be. The building is currently under construction and stopped when they found that they needed a permit.

Commissioner Roberts asked if they had given any thought to expand the existing shed and if the boat was still there. Ms. Narciss said that her husband had brought this existing steel structure home from work and that they had sold the boat.

Commissioner Wagner asked how the neighbor to the north felt about the shed. Ms. Narciss said that they had asked what they were doing, but didn't know otherwise. She is not sure which neighbor called the building inspector.

Commissioner Munroe asked about the design. Ms. Narciss said that first they constructed a straight roof, but she wanted a pitch, then their other shed has tongue and groove wooden siding, so if required they would do that with this shed also.

Commissioner Edwards asked if the neighbors were notified. Mr. Gillespie said that they were. Commissioner Munroe asked about the setback from the side yard. Mr. Gillespie said that it had to be 5' from the property line. Since it wasn't cited as a violation, it must be compliant.

Commissioner Forsdick asked if there was anyone present to speak in favor of the proposal. Seeing none, she asked if there was anyone present to speak against the proposal.

Mr. Peter Gardo from 60 Griswold Road spoke against the proposal. He said that he is two houses to the south of the subject property. Last year he attended two meetings where he spoke in favor of one neighbor's addition and another neighbor's pool. He felt that both of these proposals were well planned and made sense, and they spent the time to go through the process. He is concerned about this structure because it is not well planned out. It is being built ad hoc with no engineered drawings. He said that it is not very pleasant to look at and is glad to hear that the boat is gone. He said that he doesn't think that buildings should be made out of discarded things from work and he is hoping that the Planning and Zoning Commission does not allow this zoning change.

Commissioner Wagner made a motion to close the public hearing.

Commissioner Edwards seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of closing the public hearing. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

APPLICATION NO. 1458-05-Z. Bellsite Development LLC seeking a Change of Zone from Office District Zone to Special Residential Development Zone at the southwest corner of Folly Brook boulevard and Spruce Street (Hearing left open from May 3, 2005 pending Inland Wetlands Commission decision).

This application was withdrawn. Mr. Gillespie said that there was a letter submitting requesting it is withdrawn. The application is still pending before Inland Wetlands and they can't keep the hearing open. The applicant intends to reapply after the decision from Inland Wetlands. The application would probably be on the August agenda.

**WETHERSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING
June 21, 2005**

The Wethersfield Planning and Zoning Commission held a public meeting immediately following the public hearing on Tuesday, June 21, 2005 at 7:00 p.m. in the Stillman Building Meeting Room, 127 Hartford Avenue, Wethersfield, Connecticut.

Members present:

Theresa Forsdick, Vice-Chairman
Margaret Wagner
Earle Munroe
David Edwards III
Richard Roberts

Members absent:

Joseph Hammer, Chairman
Philip Knecht, Clerk
Peter Leombruni
John Adamian
George Oickle
Robert P. Jurasin
John Hallisey

Also present:

Peter Gillespie, Economic Development Manager/Town Planner

APPLICATION NO. 1466-05-Z. Mr. Manuel Pine seeking a Special Permit to allow the demolition of the present building and construction of a new building for retail use, located on the east side of the road in a General Business District Zone at 416 Silas Deane Highway.

Commissioner Roberts made a motion to approve application 1466-05-Z with the following conditions:

- The freestanding sign be changed from the proposed 8' pylon sign to a 4' monument sign. Additionally, the applicant shall consider providing space on the freestanding sign for a future retail tenant.
- The remaining conditions listed in the memo from Mr. Turner to Mr. Gillespie dated June 2, 2005 are addressed to the satisfaction of staff.

Commissioner Wagner seconded the motion. Four of the commissioners voted in favor of the application. (Aye: Wagner, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards) (Nay: Munroe)

Mr. Gillespie asked Commissioner Roberts whether a vote of the majority of the quorum of five people would pass the application. Commissioner Roberts said that the rules require five affirmative votes to do anything. However, a discussion regarding an alternative motion may be acceptable.

Commissioner Munroe said that he voted no on the basis that this site is not the proper place for a Dunkin' Donuts. He does not think that there is enough room for the facility and that it is bad planning. Commissioner Forsdick asked if there was an alternative that would enable him to vote yes. Commissioner Munroe said that he would like to be able to see answers to the marketing questions. He wants to see the numbers expected at the site. He said that although this is a small venture, the impact is greater than what they are being told.

Commissioner Roberts asked Mr. Gillespie if there is a motion to approve that fails is that the equivalent of a motion to deny. Mr. Gillespie said that the vote can be revisited tonight, only as the meeting goes on. Commissioner Roberts mentioned that Commissioner Munroe could make a motion to reconsider to get answers to his questions.

Commissioner Munroe said that he has asked the same questions at previous meetings and doesn't see how the site is going to handle the projected traffic in and out. He hasn't heard any mention of specific numbers which are easy to find in publications like the one published by the Institute for Traffic Engineers. He would consider tabling this matter until these questions are answered.

Commissioner Munroe made a motion to reconsider the vote.

Commissioner Roberts seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of reconsidering the vote. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

Commissioner Roberts made a motion to reconsider closing the public hearing.

Commissioner Munroe seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of re-opening the public hearing. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

Commissioner Roberts made a motion to continue the public hearing. Commissioner Munroe seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of continuing the public hearing. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

The public hearing was continued to the next meeting.

APPLICATION NO. 1467-05-Z. Carol Kober Narciss seeking a Special Permit to allow the construction of a second accessory building, located on the east side of the road in an A-1 Residence Zone at 34 Griswold Road.

Commissioner Forsdick said that unless structures like this are done correctly, she doesn't think that they should be approved. The commission requires other people to do it correctly with plans and an application and just because something is there doesn't mean that it should be approved. It is still something that the neighbors can see and it is bad looking. She said that although it could be approved with conditions that the commission comes up with to make it

look better, it is not their job to do that. It is up to the applicant to come in with a nice shed.

Commissioner Edwards said that he would like to see something presented that showed how the building would handle snow loads and drainage. Anyone else would be required to show this in their application.

Commissioner Munroe agreed.

Commissioner Roberts made a motion to deny the application without prejudice. Commissioner Edwards seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of denying the application without prejudice. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

Commissioner Munroe asked Commissioner Roberts to explain why it was without prejudice. Commissioner Roberts explained that the applicant can come back with plans and that this discussion cannot be used against them.

APPLICATION NO. 1468-05-Z. Town of Wethersfield seeking Façade Review for the Municipal Building/Library located at 505 Silas Deane Highway.

Commissioner Forsdick introduced the Design Review Committee members who were present to comment on the application:

- Mr. Joseph Hickey
- Ms. Andrea Boyle
- Mr. Steve Hyne

Mr. Hickey asked as a point of order when the committee could participate. Commissioner Forsdick clarified that the committee would be participating with the commission.

Joseph Coombs, 8 Cedar Street, introduced himself as the Chairman of the Town Hall and Library Renovation Committee and Mr. Peter Wells, from Tutter and Wells, Avon, CT, the architect. He explained that they are hoping for a favorable approval on the proposed façade design. The town council asked the renovation committee to expedite the process for the façade review and present them with three schemes. The renovation committee then recommended that scheme I be approved by the town council. The town council then reviewed all three schemes and also approved scheme I.

Mr. Wells then explained that the current façade is reaching the end of its useful life. There are problems with energy conservation and maintenance. The materials used in the original construction are a curtain wall system that has deteriorated over the years. His firm was asked to come up with options. Mr. Wells then discussed the materials:

- **GLAZING** - The glazing would be required to both be energy efficient and reduce the glare on the computer screens. The windows would be lightly tinted insulated glass, but not mirrored. The lower portion of the windows would be operable.
- **INFILL PANELS** - Metal, glass reinforced concrete and a stone veneer were investigated as alternatives for the panels. Finally, the stone veneer panels were chosen as the material to be used in a limestone color. Mr. Coombs went to two different locations in Connecticut where these panels are used and showed the commissioners. Mr. Wells described this material as the most appropriate because it is low maintenance and lightweight. It doesn't require any sophisticated structural changes. It is constructed on light gage steel framing in sections and it is manageable.

Mr. Wells then described the three schemes. He described scheme I as the 'corporate scheme'. The stone panels would be used. The two town vaults do not comply with the regulations, therefore scheme III shows building area around them. Scheme I shows windows in front of the vaults but behind these windows would be solid wall. The windows would look uninterrupted.

Scheme II was an attempt to get shadow lines with small projections. A standing seam metal roof was shown with the same amount of glazing. Scheme III was similar to scheme II without the 'hats'. This scheme shows a change in plane

and interest.

Mr. Coombs said that after some discussion the various bodies decided that scheme I was the most appropriate. He explained that there are also issues about the signage but they are not asking for a vote at this time.

Mr. Joseph Hickey commented that he is unhappy that the building looks away from the Silas Deane Highway. There should be a doorway on the Silas Deane welcoming people in from the sidewalk. Mr. Wells responded that this was not possible for a number of reasons including the location of the new elevator and security. He also reminded the committee and commission that they were only asked to replace the windows and were working on a very limited budget. Mr. Turner, town engineer, said that they had discussed repaving the rear parking lot under phase I there was no desire to change the entrance. The lower lot is to be used by employees and social services clients. Commissioner Forsdick pointed out that there are doors on that side. Mr. Wells said that one of the doors went directly to the food bank.

There was then some discussion about the lower lot. Mr. Coombs explained that the former sally port area was now to be used as storage by the entire building and that the only access was by this lower lot. He added that it is difficult to break up the function without redesigning the whole building which is cost prohibitive.

Commissioner Wagner asked what color was planned for the stone panels. Mr. Wells responded that he would like to use a medium tone.

Mr. Coombs said that the town council is recommending scheme I through the renovation committee to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Commissioner Wagner asked about the \$40,000-\$140,000 mentioned and whether the façade design could be carried over to the brick side of the building. She also mentioned that she loved scheme I. Mr. Wells said that was the budget for the entire project, so that there is not enough money to carry over the façade design.

Ms. Andrea Boyle said that she liked scheme III the best. She can see the progression in the design. She thinks that scheme I is too generic. The town hall should stand out and scheme III responds to the existing curtain wall system and incorporates new materials. Commissioner Edwards said that he is appointed on the renovation committee and has done some research on the stone panels. He asked about this material in snow areas because he wants to be sure that it stands the test of time.

Mr. Coombs added that another goal of the renovation is creating an energy efficient building. Most of the money is going to upgrading systems in the building as well as adding insulation. Ms. Boyle asked if the interior was scheduled to be upgraded. Mr. Wells said that the library and town hall are going to have some changes, ceilings, lighting etc. Commissioner Wagner asked if the entrance canopies could be the same. Mr. Wells said they will be similar in style and material and all will be low pitch, not flat. Commissioner Wagner agrees with Mr. Hickey that the Silas Deane entrance needs to be beautified even if it is just a welcoming canopy and not an entrance. Mr. Wells is concerned that it would encourage people to think that it is an entrance. Ms. Boyle said that the response to her answers furthers her support for scheme III. It doesn't make sense to do the outside without the inside. Mr. Coombs said that all existing masonry will be washed and reapointed because the existing masonry is very sound.

Commissioner Forsdick asked if there were any other questions or comments.

Commissioner Wagner asked if they needed to make a motion to accept a certain scheme. Mr. Gillespie said that only scheme I is being presented. The other schemes were presented for background.

Commissioner Wagner made a motion to approve scheme I as recommended by the Town Council for the window replacement project. Commissioner Munroe seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the application. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

APPLICATION NO. 1469-05-Z. Leonardo Gugliotti seeking Façade Review for property located at 626-632 Silas Deane Highway.

Mr. Gugliotti, 8 Monticello Drive, presented the application. He explained that he and his father purchased the

building. Their school has taken over the vacant spot and the former Flower Box. They have the same goals as the town to beautify the Silas Deane Highway. That is why they are asking to renovate the façade of the building with dryvit on the façade. Mr. Gugliotti passed around a sample of the dryvit material and the proposed colors. He said that two colors (Wedding White and Contemporary White) would be used as well as an awning because the sun hits the building all of the time.

Commissioner Edwards asked if the glass would be tinted. Mr. Gugliotti said that they would be using the existing glass, just changing the façade. The proposed awnings would be maroon. Mr. Carmine Gugliotti, 8 Monticello Drive, said that the existing awning is not up to date and the new one will look better. He is trying to do business with class and do their part to make the Silas Deane Highway look better. They have done everything that they were asked to do including reassigning parking in the rear. Their architect says that dryvit is a good material and they would use stone at the base so that there would be no damage.

Commissioner Edwards asked if the façade will turn the corner like the existing does. Mr. Gugliotti said that it would and that the existing building is strong. Commissioner Edwards also asked if the awning would be canvas or metal. Mr. Gugliotti said that it would be canvas.

Commissioner Forsdick said that she thinks that the proposed façade looks a lot better. On a personal note, she lives very close to him and she commented that he keeps his lawn and house perfect. She said that she knows that this will look nicer because this is the way that he lives.

Mr. Gillespie read the letter from the Design Review Committee dated June 1, 2005 with the following suggestions:

- The lower portion of the dryvit should be reinforced to minimize damage that might be caused by pedestrians and vehicles.
- Provide more details on the proposed signage plan so that staff can determine compliance with the zoning regulations.
- The utility panel located on the south side of the building should be screened from view as part of the façade improvements.

Mr. Carmine Gugliotti said that it would not be a problem to comply with all of the suggestions. Commissioner Munroe asked how far back the proposed planters would be. Mr. Gugliotti said that there is 5 feet of space from the curb stops to the building. Commissioner Munroe said that often his car will hang over a curb stop and he is concerned about cars hitting the pots. Mr. Gugliotti said that the location of the pots can vary and they can determine the best location. They were added to beautify the façade. Commissioner Edwards added that 3 feet of clearance would be needed for compliance with ADA.

Commissioner Wagner asked how long the shops are together. Mr. Gugliotti said that the signage would be within the 125 feet. Mr. Gillespie said that the whole building is 80 feet long. Mr. Carmine Gugliotti said that the school is internationally recognized and will be bringing not only another business to Wethersfield but also status.

Commissioner Roberts made a motion to approve application 1469-05-Z with the following conditions:

- The applicant is required to comply with the three recommendations of the Design Review Committee.
 - The lower portion of the dryvit should be reinforced to minimize damage that might be caused by pedestrians and vehicles.
 - Provide more details on the proposed signage plan so that staff can determine compliance with the zoning regulations.
 - The utility panel located on the south side of the building should be screened from view as part of the façade improvements.
- The colors of the façade are to be substantially the same as Wedding White and Contemporary White as shown on the sample distributed to the commission.

Commissioner Munroe seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of the application. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

APPLICATION NO. 1459-05-Z. Bellsite Development LLC seeking Site Plan and Design Review approval under Article XXXI to allow for development of twelve (12) age restricted Condominium units at the southwest corner of Spruce Street and Folly Brook Boulevard (Tabled from May 3, 2005 & May 17, 2005).

This application was withdrawn.

APPLICATION NO. 1458-05-Z. Bellsite Development LLC seeking Site Plan and Design Review approval under Article XXXI to allow for development of twelve (12) age restricted condominium units located at the southwest corner of Folly Brook Boulevard and Spruce Street (Tabled from May 3, 2005, May 17, 2005)

This application was withdrawn.

Staff Reports

Mr. Gillespie had a few issues to discuss:

- *225 Spring Street* - The owner would like to fix a door on the rear of the building facing the railroad tracks. He wants to build an overhang to keep the rain and ice out of the steps. It won't be seen from the highway and Mr. Gillespie is inclined not to send it to the PZC. Commissioner Roberts asked if it was the west side stairs to the basement. Mr. Gillespie said yes and it can't be seen. The commissioners agreed that it is not a major issue.
- *Silas Deane Middle School Landscaping* - The landscaping was brought up at the last meeting. Mr. Gillespie explained that the school had hired someone to develop the landscaping scheme which involved a perennial garden. However, it was not run by the public works department who would be responsible for its maintenance. Therefore some guidance is needed on what should be done with the plantings. Commissioner Forsdick said that the perennial garden at town hall may be able to use it. Commissioner Wagner said that may be possible to speak to PAC liaison to maintain it rather than the town. Commissioner Forsdick said that the rose garden at town hall was donated but the men's club takes care of the garden since it was established in the 1970's. Mr. Gillespie said that it sounded like the commission did not want just grass there. Commissioner Forsdick suggested maybe evergreen bushes. She also asked who maintains the grass strip between the sidewalk and Silas Deane Highway. Mr. Gillespie said that it is state right of way but usually maintained by the property owners.

Commissioner Munroe asked if the school had a public works crew. Mr. Gillespie said that the school has a maintenance crew for the inside, but that the town's public works crew is responsible for the outside. Commissioner Roberts remembered that this was a big issue when this was approved and there was a tremendous public outcry when trees were cut down. The resulting approved garden was a compromise. Mr. Gillespie said that he will let them know that they will have to come back to the PZC or else find someone to maintain it properly. Commissioner Wagner added that gardens at all of the elementary schools are maintained by the PTA.

- *Silas Deane Highway* - Price Rite Liquors/Junior's Pizza Plaza - Mr. Gillespie said that behind the property there are contractors and landscapers offices. Some of these are approved and some are not. Mr. Gillespie said that one contractor was wondering if it was worth pursuing to require permission to put in an office trailer. Mr. Gillespie told this applicant that it was not likely to be approved. The commissioners agreed. Commissioner Roberts remembered temporary parking as the only thing approved in the rear of that building. Mr. Gillespie said that many of these businesses should probably be investigated.

Commissioner Munroe said that it was his last meeting as well as Commissioner Roberts and Commissioner Oickle. He wanted to thank everyone and wish good luck to those staying. Commissioner Forsdick thanked them for all of their years of service. Commissioner Roberts said that it has been an honor and privilege to serve for the last 14-17 years. He has learned so many things. He is amazed that everyone gets a long in a civil and collegial way to figure out what works for Wethersfield. He added that the town is in an infinitely better position now than a decade ago and hopes that the momentum continues.

Approval of Minutes of: [June 7, 2005](#).

This item was tabled as there were not enough members present to vote on the minutes

Public comments on general matters of planning and zoning.

None

Correspondence

None

Other Business

None

Adjournment

Commissioner Forsdick asked if there was any other correspondence or other business. Seeing none, Commissioner Forsdick asked if there was motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Munroe made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Roberts seconded the motion. All members present voted in favor of adjourning the meeting. (Aye: Wagner, Munroe, Roberts, Forsdick, Edwards)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Philip Knecht, Clerk