

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
PLAINVILLE, CONNECTICUT**

**MINUTES  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
April 11, 2017**

**REGULAR MEETING AT 7:30 P.M.**

**MUNICIPAL CENTER  
ROOM 304**

**PRESENT:** M. Weimer, G. Petit, P. Saucier, J. Bartiss-Earley, D. Thompson

**STAFF PRESENT:** M. DeVoe, Garrett Daigle

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** W. Ricci (sat for A. Sarra)

**ABSENT:** A. Chapman, M. Weimer, A. Sarra, W. Davison

**I. ROLL CALL**

A. Chapman, M. Weimer, A. Sarra and W. Davison all have excused absences.

**II. PUBLIC HEARING**

None

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **PZ 03/17 #006 – 8-24 Referral – Town of Plainville – Robert E. Lee** - 2017-2023 Capital Improvements Projects

In accordance with Connecticut General Statute 8-24, the commission is being presented with the Town of Plainville 2017-2023 Capital improvements Projects for approval by the commission. It is the Commission's charge to ascertain if the CIP is in keeping with the Plan of Conservation and Development. Staff has reviewed the CIP and can find no conflicts within the Plan.

**A motion was made by:** P. Saucier to find that the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan is not in conflict with the 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development.

**Seconded by:** W. Ricci

**All in Favor 5 to 0**

**Motion Passes**

2. **PZ 03/17#007 – 8-24 Referral – Town of Plainville – Robert E. Lee – School Buildings Projects**

In accordance with Connecticut General Statute 8-24, The commission is being presented with the Town of Plainville School Building Projects for Plainville High School, Plainville Middle School, and Wheeler Elementary School. It is the Commission's charge to ascertain if the School is in keeping with the Plan of Conservation and Development. Staff has reviewed the CIP and can find no conflicts within the Plan.

**A motion was made by:** D. Thompson to find that the School Building Projects proposed are not in conflict with the 2009 Plan of Conservation and Development.

**Seconded by:** W. Ricci

**All in Favor 5 to 0**

**Motion Passes**

3. **PZ 03/17 #008 – Six Mile Holdings, LLC. – Site Plan – Propose to build two (2) 8,000 sf buildings and associated parking – 35 Robert Jackson Way (MBL 41-C-12) in a Restricted Industrial Zone (Decision required by June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017)**

Coincides with Application 03/17#0012.

4. **PZ 03/17 #0012 – Six Mile Holdings, LLC - Special Exception – Propose an educational facility as part of site plan in accordance with Section 2.02A 10.10. (Public Hearing must open by June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017, Staff recommends May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017)**

**A motion was made by:** G. Petit to set a public hearing to consider application PZ03/17 #012 for Six Mile Holdings, LLC requesting a special exception for educational use in an RI Zone on May 9, 2017.

**Seconded by:** P. Saucier

**All in Favor 5 to 0**

**Motion Passes**

5. **PZ 03/17 #011 – ROYal Realty LLC. – Site Plan Modification – Propose to build 22,500 sf addition – 50 Farmington Valley Drive (MBL 08-A-34.8) in a Restricted Industrial Zone (Decision required by June 16<sup>th</sup>, 2017)**

Mr. Roy is proposing a 22,500 square foot addition to his current building at 50 Farmington Valley Drive. It will be used to warehouse equipment and machines for his clients.

**A motion was made by:** G. Petit to approve application number PZ 03/17#011 for ROYal Realty LLC., requesting a site plan modification for the installation of a 22,500 square foot addition in a RI Zone as shown on a plan entitle "Modified Site Plan for proposed enclosure and building addition ROYal Realty, LLC. Owner and applicant Lot 8, Farmington Valley Drive Plainville CT dated March 27, 2017 and revised to March 31, 2017.

**Seconded by:** P. Saucier

**All in Favor 5 to 0**

**Motion Passes**

**6. Informal discussion – Geoff Sager – Farmington Valley Corporate Park**

Mr. Sager met with staff to discuss a development concept at his property on Northwest Drive. He provided a basic history of the site and the park with an emphasis on the problems he's had marketing land since the inception of the Aquifer Protection Act. The Aquifer Protection Act has left this property with limited development potential. After viewing the related uses allowed in the Restricted Industrial Zone (those that are not outright prohibited by the Aquifer Protection Act), there were found to be very few viable development alternatives for this land. After ruling out many of the remaining permitted uses as being far from the best and highest use, or lacking in viability, only several uses remain viable. One use that does present some promise is logistics. While not the major employer that a precision aerospace company could be, it is nonetheless permitted by the Aquifer Protection Act. Mr. Sager's request deals with a request that involves obtaining a conceptual approval that would allow him to better market his property to a targeted audience with a plan that had been vetted and approved by the PZC. The problem we experienced when taking this process to its conclusion was that there are other regulatory requirements that "lock" such a concept plan into place. This is largely because there are no zoning provisions for the PZC to approve conceptual plans (save the Redevelopment Design District). Your regulations do allow for concept plan approval under Section 7.07 of your regulations. The problem here is that no formal approval is granted, and that is what Mr. Sager seeks. Mr. Sager asked if the Commission wouldn't accept a site plan application without fully engineered drainage systems. His cost for that component is steep and it is extremely likely that he will have to return for a site plan modification and re-engineer the drainage system to meet the needs of any final tenant. He will provide basic calculations for the site coverage he is seeking approval for as well as calculated storage for those volumes, but would prefer not to have to engineer the entire system twice. Bulk Zoning requirements, basic landscaping and parking requirements will be addressed, but it is far easier to demonstrate compliance in these areas.

The commission listened to the presentation and are in favor of the applicant submitting a site plan. The plan should include all the necessary low impact development requirements, even if only partially engineered.

Mr. Sager thanked the Commission for their consideration. M. DeVoe indicated that he would fork with Mr. Sager on these, and other development issues affecting his property.

## V. BILLS AND COMMUNICATIONS

None

## VI. MINUTES

**A motion was made by:** G. Petit to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 28, 2017 with one change. Application 01/17#02 under conditions should read:  
**“Illuminated detached signage must be turned off by 10 pm daily.”**

**The motion was seconded by:** P. Saucier

**All in Favor 5 to 0**

**Minutes Approved**

## VII. REPORTS

Town Planner

## VIII. ADJOURNMENT

**A motion was made** to adjourn the meeting at 8:44 pm by: D. Thompson

**Seconded by:** G. Petit

**Vote: 5-0 in favor**

**Meeting adjourned at 8:44 pm**

Respectfully Submitted,

*Jennifer Dahlstrom*

Jennifer Dahlstrom

Recording Secretary