

**BRISTOL ZONING COMMISSION
MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING OF MONDAY JULY 25, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER:**By:** Chairman Provenzano**Time:** 7:00 P.M.Place: Bristol Central High School
Auditorium, 480 Wolcott Street**ROLL CALL:**

MEMBERS	NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Louise Provenzano (Chair)	X	
	Richard Harlow	X	
	David White (Secretary)	X	
	Thomas Marra	X	
	Brian Skinner	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS:	Marc Gagnon	X	
	Richard Goodwin		X
	Aileen Abrams (arrived 7:03 P.M.)	X	
STAFF:	Robert Flanagan, City Planner	X	
	Andrew Armstrong, Assistant City Planner	X	
	Edward Spyros, Zoning Enforcement Officer		X
	Nancy Levesque, P.E., City Engineer	X	

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS:**

1. Approval of Minutes – June 20, 2022

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the June 20, 2022, special meeting.

Chair Provenzano designated regular Commissioners Harlow, Marra, White and Provenzano to vote on the June 20, 2022, special minutes. She also designated alternate Commissioner Gagnon to vote on the June 20, 2022, special minutes.

By: White

Seconded: Marra.

For: White, Harlow, Marra, Gagnon and Provenzano.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

2. Application #2434 – Special Permit for housing for the elderly (85 units) at 560, Lot 9B-1, 594 & 644 Redstone Hill Road; Assessor's Map 1, Lots 9B-1, 9B-2, 11+11-2+11-3, & 10-B-1; Laurel Meadows, LLC, applicant – Public Hearing continued from June 20, 2022.
3. Application #2435 – Site Plan for housing for the elderly (85 units) at 560, Lot 9B-1, 594 & 644 Redstone Hill Road; Assessor's Map 1, Lots 9B-1, 9B-2, 11+11-2+11-3, & 10-B-1; Laurel Meadows, LLC, applicant – Public Hearing continued from June 20, 2022.

Chair Provenzano reminded the Commission that the next Regular Meeting of the Zoning Commission is Monday, August 8, 2022. She designated regular Commissioners White, Harlow, Marra and Provenzano to vote on Applications #2434 and #2435. She also designated alternate Commissioner Gagnon to vote on Applications #2434 and #2435.

The Commission acknowledged receipt of the following items in their electronic packets: the second set of Site Plan Review Committee comments for Plans Dated: March 18, 2022; Date of Committee Review: 4/20/22 (first review); 7/21/22 (second review) and reference materials received previously dated from March 23, 2022, to June 20, 2022.

Commissioner Abrams arrived at this time.

Mr. Flanagan gave a brief overview of the application timelines and related dates: the applications were filed on March 28, 2022; applications accepted on April 13, 2022; he reviewed the public hearing dates, regular meeting dates, current scheduling of public hearings, CT Gen. Statute time limits and the extension process. The applicant would likely grant an extension this evening to continue the Zoning applications to the August 15, 2022 meeting.

The IWWC applications were filed on March 28, 2022 and accepted on April 6, 2022. He explained that the current IWWC public hearing was continued to August 1, 2022.

Commission inquiries: Mr. Flanagan explained that the Commission needed a report from the IWWC Commission before the Zoning Commission can vote on the applications. If the IWWC Commission denies the application, the Zoning Commission would still need to make a decision on the Zoning applications regardless of the IWWC report.

The Chair explained that the Commission cannot vote on the applications this evening, but they received Staff comments, which would be reviewed with the Commission, Staff, the applicant's representatives and the public this evening. The Chair stated that she would limit the public audience comments to three minutes. If they speak on a topic, speakers should limit their comments to the new materials presented this evening.

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave., representing the applicant, reviewed the applicant's representatives that were in attendance this evening: the applicant's traffic engineer, Scott Hesketh, P.E.; the applicant's engineer, Bryan Panico; P.E., and Joseph and Kathleen Naples, Principals, Laurel Meadows, LLC.

Attorney Furey explained revised plans were submitted, which were under Staff review since their last meeting. He agreed on behalf of the applicant to an extension until their next meeting. He would submit a letter to Mr. Flanagan, but technically an extension was not required until the IWWC Commission has issued a report.

Mr. Flanagan prefers the attorney grant an extension for the applications.

Attorney Furey reviewed the Staff responses and comments:

Regarding #2 – the Fire Marshal was satisfied with this change, but the applicant has decided to increase the curvature 5 degrees on the radius in question.

Regarding #10 – the 10% driveway grade would be adjusted with the foundation heights for acceptable grades that will conform to the Regulations.

Regarding #16 – Along the proposed entrance is a decorative wall and a stone wall that did not meet height requirements and needed details. If and of the walls are over 3 ft. needed permits, and an engineered plan is required. The applicant wants an attractive entrance, and the applicant is working on a compliant design, but would consider the Commission's preference.

Regarding #18 – the sizing of the detention basins was adjusted for water retention. The CN numbers had to line up, which was being worked on for zero increase. The applicant is working with Carol Noble, P.E. and Ms. Levesque, P.E.

Regarding #19 – the CN number and water quality – the State Regulations required different basins and the applicant has worked with Engineer Staff to have dry bottom basin; the applicant now needs to design a wet bottom basins (near industrial property and condominiums). This comment asks that the report conditions match the site conditions.

Regarding #21 – This comment is to ensure that no water was discharging toward the condominium or industrial property to the southwest.

Regarding #22 – the phasing plan for the utilities was awaiting a response so it could be incorporated into the final plans.

Ms. Levesque, P.E., explained with respect to phasing that staff would work with the applicant to make sure each phase was able to operate on its own prior to the next phase beginning, making sure that erosion and sediment control in one phase do not affect other phases. Ms. Levesque, P.E., also explained that if a phase was insufficient or not complete, the ZEO would be contacted. This comment ensures that the storm drainage, sanitary sewers, when constructed, do not get destroyed when the next phase is constructed.

Attorney Furey explained the building elevations were part of the building set, which the public safety officials needed for ingress and egress review of the Site Plan. The Building Official needed the building plans for the building permits when they get to that point. The dumpster locations were not a Building Department concern, but they commented. There are two dumpsters in convenient locations, but they do not want a lot of dumpsters. If there is a concern with excessive trash or residents cannot bring it to the dumpsters, the owners would schedule additional pick-ups or schedule the units' for individual pick-ups.

City Planner Comments:

Regarding #1 – Attorney Furey explained the labeling would be on the final set of plans.

Regarding #2 – a narrative would be prepared.

Regarding #7 – there would be no pack or spot lighting; the rear and front of building would have residential lighting. He would submit some examples for the files. The interior pole heights for the driveway would have full shields and cuts offs for zero trespass.

Regarding #14 – if the plan is approved, the buildings would be renumbered. Building #8 and #9 were not mislabeled to have the buildings away from the redesigned IWWC ponds, buildings reduced and relocated, and neighbor buffers, which would be renumbered in the final process.

Regarding #16 – the details would be provided to Staff. Regarding the 16 ft. fountain, it would not be designed until the plan is approved with additional approvals required.

Regarding #19 – Attorney Furey requested the Commission review the listed facilities because this facility would have lower density except for Jennings School.

Chair inquiries: Regarding City Planner comment #19, dated July 21, 2022, Attorney Furey noted they reduced one unit for a total of 84 units. The units were dense, and the parking was restricted, but he encouraged the Commission to review the Janic development near Stafford Avenue and the Apple Hollow development on Lake Avenue because this proposal has 100% more parking than those units. The garage spaces and the space behind will provide two parking spaces.

The Chair had concerns if the tenants both drive is there sufficient parking for two or more children to visit, additional visitors, or with tenants that have more than 2 visitors on specific days/any day.

Commissioner Abrams had concerns of guests parking on the street. Commissioner Marra's view was the parking was adequate for senior housing and 20 visitors would not be there a long time because the rooms are small.

Attorney Furey explained they went from zero extra parking spaces to four areas with additional 18 visitor parking spaces. This was the only facility with garages in Bristol. There is not one facility in Bristol that is not working appropriately.

Commission inquiries: Attorney Furey explained the 18 spaces were not required to be handicapped parking. There were no fines for parking on the private street and that would be a landlord enforcement issue, but there would be signage to not park on the street. If the tenants parked on the street, the vehicle may be towed and it would be a lease violation.

Regarding #22, Attorney Furey explained they were working with Staff on a phasing plan.

Regarding #23, he would appreciate any preference from the Commission.

City Planner's meeting responses:

Regarding #2 –The narrative was requested on April 20, 2022.

Regarding #7 – The lighting quantities on the photometric plan had to be amended.

Regarding #17 – The applicant was repurposing the stone walls.

Regarding #18 – There would be a 1,100 ft. sidewalk fronting the property, if this proposal is approved.

Regarding #19 – The City Planner agreed with the Chair that the density should be reviewed and that parking has been improved.

Commission inquiries: Attorney Furey explained they would place landscaping around the perimeter of the two properties the applicant owned. Attorney Furey mentioned that for two neighbors on Silo Rd. they would retain the wooded buffer, but if that was insufficient they may plant a row of white pine trees, but fences were not in the plans.

Commission inquiries: Attorney Furey explained there is no proposed electrified crossing, but a 1,100 ft. sidewalk on Redstone Hill Rd., which was required. He noted Mr. Hesketh stated the driveway was ideal with substantial site lines for vehicle safety exiting and entering. The condition of Redstone Hill Rd., as the neighbors have mentioned, was not the applicant's responsibility. The applicant would do some utility work within the right of way and patch that area. The width of the roadway in the development curb to curb is 25 ft., but part of that is a walkway.

Mr. Flanagan explained he spoke with the Fire Marshal and Ms. Levesque. The Fire Marshal stated the 10 ft. radius was sufficient, but 15 ft. was better. Also, Ms. Levesque agreed. The Fire Department also needed to get ladder trucks on sites with their tools.

Regarding Fire Marshal comment #1, Attorney Furey explained they requested the radius be increased to 15 ft. on the entryway. is satisfied with the plan. The Fire Marshal would check the radius for their trucks. The ladder truck would fit on this site.

Regarding the Sewer Department and Water Department comments, Attorney Furey explained the sewer plans were redesigned for the effluent to go down Redstone Hill Road to Middle St. but the applicant wants to have an additional meeting with Staff to discuss additional ideas.

The proposed work on-site would not affect the wells in the neighborhood because the applicant is not drilling wells. Two wells would be abandoned and used for irrigation purposes. Unless he is provided data, he cannot address a non-issue for the wells. He would have Mr. Panico review the neighbor, Peter Blauvelt's (19 Donna Ln.), concerns with the Water Department.

Commission inquiries: Bryan Panico, P.E., of H.E. Cole & Son, 876 South Main St., Plantsville, explained regarding the May 16, 2022, meeting, for the neighbor, Peter Blauvelt (19 Donna Ln.), PSI (52 to 120) - the Water Department did not have any specific concerns. They try to make loops to minimize pressure losses. This plan would connect Redstone Hill Rd. and Silo Rd. for a larger loop, which may improve water pressure.

Ms. Levesque, P.E., explained she would have to review the addresses, but there are wells and City water systems in this area.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.

The following person spoke against the applications: Thomas Bentivengo, 5 Village St. Mr. Benivengo's view was the Special Permit was a clear violation of why this Zoning Commission was created in the first place. They cannot put multi-family housing in a single-family area. By calling this elderly housing, the age starts at 55 years old. At this age you are not eligible for social security, no senior discounts.

This is not senior housing with constant care or hospital care. Most of the neighbors are in their 70's and are independent. These numbers were disingenuous to try to sneak in this private for-profit business. People are buying houses for more than they are selling for because of desirability. Desirability gives a neighborhood value and people want to live in these areas.

There will be a large parking concern with visitors parking on both sides of the street, particularly on holidays, and firetruck access with this plan will be difficult. His view was this was not a good idea. There were good ideas this evening and the questions were very good, but the answers were trivial.

Attorney Furey explained the Regulations were in effect 1990 in residential zones subject to Special Permits. There is a letter in the files that under Federal law states that cannot discriminate against anybody in any type of housing, but the law allows for age designations. This is not a guideline, but a law with severe penalties. The property owner will verify the tenants of the facilities every year. On average there were many people over 55 years old, but there were some ages 55.

Regarding the water concerns, Attorney Furey reviewed the standards of approval for special permits that included water and that was reviewed by the Water Department, Fire Department, Fire Marshal, and his team's engineers. The Fire Marshal requested 3 additional fire hydrants on site. Regarding fire engine accessibility, the radius was increased because the Fire Department must get the ladder trucks on site. They also widened the entry driveways and altered the radiuses on the entry driveway.

Ms. Levesque deferred to the Water Department, but typically if a loop is installed the water pressure is increased. The Water Department would be responsible for reviewing these concerns, which they typically perform.

MOTION: move to accept the granting of an extension to the August 15, 2022, Special Meeting of the Bristol Zoning Commission at the Bristol Central High School Auditorium at 7:00 P.M., in order to keep the current public hearing open for Applications #2434 & #2435. The extension is for 21-days.

By: White

Seconded: Harlow.

For: White, Harlow, Gagnon, Marra and Provenzano.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Application #2434 and Application #2435 are continued.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 8:50 P.M.

By: White

Seconded: Harlow.

For: White, Harlow, Gagnon, Marra and Provenzano.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

This meeting was taped.

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy King
Recording Secretary

Louise Provenzano, Chair

David White, Secretary