

Wallingford Planning & Zoning Commission

SPECIAL MEETING

Monday, October 2, 2017

7:00 p.m.

Collins Room – Wallingford Public Library

200 North Main Street

MINUTES

PRESENT: Chair Jim Seichter; Vice-Chair J.P. Venoit; Commissioners James Fitzsimmons; Gina Morgenstein and Steve Allinson(alternates); Kacie Hand, Town Planner; Public: Jessica Wysocki; Hank Baum, Economic Development Commission (EDC); Joe Mirra, EDC Chair; Tim Ryan, EDC; Patricia Cymbala, EDC; Jon Wolworth; Vincenzo DiNatale; Cynthia Kleist, Recording Secretary.

Chair Seichter called the Meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

This Meeting was a discussion/workshop – No Action was taken.

1. Town Center Zoning Regulations – Discussion
 - a. Uses
 - b. Lot/Bulk Requirements
 - c. Building Form/Site Layout Standards

Ms. Hand presented an overview and noted that in some point of the process, the PZC will conduct a Public Input Workshop involving all the property owners in the area, prior to a Public Hearing. She said what is being discussed this evening is a recommendation from the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), which is the concept of developing zoning regulations specific to the Town Center. Ms. Hand said in the POCD, there was a section devoted to downtown and there is also the Transit Oriented Development, (TOD), Plan. Ms. Hand said once the Town Center Zoning Regulations are created, she will link a TOD in the station area to the Town Center Zoning.

Ms. Hand noted the Parking Regulations have recently been modified for the area and are now looking to create a sense of place in the Town Center and build off the current sense of place. Ms. Hand spoke about her working document which she presented to the PZC, outlining certain components of zoning, i.e., Uses, Lot/Bulk Requirements and Site Designing Building Form Standards.

Ms. Hand explained that currently the Town Center is zoned CA-6, Commercial Type-A. She said what should be considered is what should be Site Plan or Zoning Permit allowed, vs. what should be a Special Permit. Ms. Hand said she wants to make the things that are wanted in this area, the easiest to do. She said this is why she leaned towards putting a lot of things in the by right uses and if there are the appropriate parking and building form standards, there can be appropriate development with most uses that are on her list. She said she recommended Special Permit uses, but noted the PZC may want to consider this on a case by case basis for the Town Center area dependent upon how they function.

Ms. Hand said the first by-right use she recommended was residential use which is currently a Special Permit in the CA-6 zone. She recommended the PZC allow residential use by-right, and that this use either not be allowed at ground level or that residential use not be allowed on the street side of the building on the first floor, but be facing into the lot. She suggested there be a maximum percentage of the floor area that it can occupy so as to not end up with a tiny strip of retail. Ms. Hand said the PZC should choose the maximum density, which would be the by-right density. She pointed out the Incentive Housing Zone (IHZ), allow 20 to 26 units per acre. Ms. Hand said the IHZ was intended to allow a high density because of the affordable housing component. Ms. Hand pointed out other by-right uses such as brew pubs, microbreweries with a tasting room, with a recommendation that a minimum percentage of the floor area dedicated to a tasting room so that only so much is the manufacturing component.

Ms. Hand said with medical/dental offices, the question would be whether the PZC would allow these businesses on ground level. She said it is common to restrict these businesses to upper stories. Ms. Hand mentioned that real estate sales and financial institutions are appropriate on the first floor level.

Ms. Hand spoke about indoor recreation and noted she included instruction of recreational activities noting over the past few years, her office has been receiving inquiries regarding dance instruction and yoga studios, which she said was put under the indoor recreation category. She said her office has also received inquiries from everything including baking, cake decorating, gaming and all sort of classes that people want to incorporate as part of their business model. Ms. Hand said the PZC may or may not want to move Entertainment Venues and Banquet Halls into Special Permits because of the level of traffic generation. She said the other option would be to keep these categories under Site Plan and include the standard 100-peak hour vehicle trip generation category under Special Permits so that once the high level of trip generation is reached; a Special Permit would be triggered. She noted there would be no Special Permit if the number of vehicle trips was under 100-peak hour.

Ms. Hand noted that she included Parking Garages under Permitted Uses which she said the PZC may want to consider putting this category under Special Permit. She said she included this as its own use because this could be something that ends up on an individual piece of property. Ms. Hand spoke about production or repair of goods sold on premises, not to occupy more

square footage than the area of the business used for sales. She cited an example of someone selling clocks and repairing clocks on site or creating an item that they sell. Ms. Hand spoke about Special Permit, outside display of merchandise. She noted that on the one hand, she hears from many businesses in the Town Center which desire to display merchandise outside when they are having a sale. She said there is some value to this, but pointed out she has run into issues, even when it is not permitted, this has been abused to the point where it looks unsightly, crowds the sidewalk and creates safety issues. She said if this were under Special Permits, it could be limited in terms of frequency. She said this would also be limited to be conducted on the private property.

Ms. Hand discussed hotels/motels with not less than six units. She said a hotel or motel with less than six units would probably not be considered. Ms. Hand also discussed live/work units noting this was a new zoning concept. She said this would be an artist type use or an office where part of each unit or part of each building is devoted to the business component and the people who run these buildings would reside in the same building. Ms. Hand said she put this under Special Permit because this would be new in Town. Ms. Hand spoke about accessory uses and off-street parking. She said parking in the CA-6 zone has been discussed and said she presumes the parking regulations will be carried over into the new Town Center regulations because they were designed with this in mind. She spoke about first-floor parking in a building but said the PZC may want to limit this to a percentage on the first-floor. Ms. Hand spoke about outdoor/indoor events. She said people with restaurants have told her they want to have a tent outside, a tent or a display. She said this is being considered because it would bring people into Town Center.

Ms. Hand said the PZC may want to put restrictions on this. She spoke about Farmer's Market which she said the PZC allows this as an accessory use under the general definition. Ms. Hand went over what is currently allowed in the CA zone such as adult uses as per Section 6-10; public utility buildings and facilities; uses generating 100-peak hour vehicle trips or more; adaptive re-use to multi-family. Ms. Hand explained that zoning regulations are permissive in nature, i.e., if we don't say you can, then you can't. She went over prohibited uses such as pawn shops, vape shops and drive-through windows which she said she felt the strongest. Ms. Hand said she put two questions to the PZC for consideration: all must be within a building vs. some outdoor display/sales and mobile food vendors. Ms. Hand reminded the PZC they already have mobile food vendor regulations which allow for mobile food vendors on private property which permission of the private property owner but cannot use required parking and cannot be hooked up to utilities and can only remain on the site for a certain amount of hours. Ms. Hand said the PZC may want to consider making other allowances for mobile food vendors for events. She said there is not a lot of unused land in Town Center so to ask the vendors to not use up parking may be unrealistic. She said the PZC requires the vendors to be on private property and said this may be an ordinance related issue to allow the vendors to be on public property and said the PZC may want her to pursue this.

Ms. Morgenstein spoke about an additional prohibit. She said a friend went into a gas station with a child and noticed drug paraphernalia at eye level. She said she didn't believe there were specific drug paraphernalia stores anymore. Ms. Hand said this will have to be looked into. She said the Health Dept. has discussed the vape shops with her a few times. She said she would look into how this could be defined. Ms. Morgenstein said the public was interested in this. Mr. Venoit spoke about the density of the units, i.e., 20 to 26 not being enough. Ms. Hand said she believed this was appropriate for a by-right residential use in the Town Center zone. She said the PZC could allow someone to go higher by a Special Permit. Ms. Hand said she has heard from some developers this is not permissive enough to make a development work. She said there are a lot of factors with this, i.e., the sale price of the property, the ability to combine different properties, so it is not just a matter of the number of units. Ms. Hand said she believes this is something that is appropriate for the Town Center as a whole.

Ms. Morgenstein asked what size of a unit the 20 to 26 entails. Ms. Hand said there are no unit size requirements. Ms. Morgenstein said there may be people we are not attracting to this town who would like to have a small studio unit, looking towards creative newer ideas than the traditional must-have 950 sq. ft. Ms. Hand noted that at the Parker Place development has approximately 650 sq. ft. and the one bedrooms approximately 750-800 sq. ft. She said people seem interested in constructing one and two-bedroom apartments. Chair Seichter said if we are looking to raise the number of units, go up to 20 and have 22 in the Incentive Housing Zone, this has to be looked at. He said it would make no sense to have an IHZ saying 22 units and have to have a certain percentage of affordable and have 20 units in another section of town.

Mr. Allinson spoke about the brew pub, microbrewery and noted there are tasting rooms off-site from breweries and noted that if there was a brewery in town that wanted to have a tasting room on Center Street, it would be a different use. He asked if this would be something the PZC could encompass into the definition. Ms. Hand said if it would be just a tasting room, this would be called a tavern. She said this could be incorporated into the definition, but the biggest concern would be if the business didn't want to have a public component on Center Street. Mr. Allinson asked about the outside display of merchandise with a Special Permit, the question about mobile food vendor usage, the accessory use for indoor events, fairs and farm markets and said it seems this is all under a very similar category. He asked if this could be addressed in an encompassing way to make it a broader aspect of use.

Ms. Hand said suggested incorporating this into some sort of limited use category; event related uses and people could propose different combinations. Mr. Allinson said this could be limited to the time of day, day of the week. Chair Seichter said he had a little issue with the mobile food vendors, noting there are a fair amount of restaurants in town which have overhead and expenses and to have a mobile food vendor come in and be there for a week or two weeks is an issue for him. He said he wants to ensure the restaurants in Town especially when there are events. Mr. Fitzsimmons asked about funeral homes not making the cut from the CA list, noting there used to be funeral homes downtown and on Church Street. Ms. Hand said funeral homes

can be included. Mr. Fitzsimmons pointed out that most churches are located downtown and in most cities, the funeral homes are located downtown. He said he was in favor of putting this back in. He said he didn't disagree with Mr. Allinson in coming up with something for the Special Permit with the food trucks and said he was also in favor of the idea with the residential. Mr. Fitzsimmons said he wants people living downtown. Ms. Hand said she would add funeral homes as a Permitted Use and doesn't need to be a Special Permit. She said the regulation should probably be left as is regarding mobile food vendors which she said allows the food vendors to be at a fair for five days, maxed out. Ms. Morgenstein noted there are towns that do First Fridays, and said the food trucks add to this type of event. She asked if a food truck falls into a different category. Ms. Hand wondered if this would be different for an event. Ms. Hand said she would combine some of the uses that have to do with shorter term events and accessory type uses into one category.

Chair Seichter said he would prefer general business offices and conference facilities to not be located on the ground floor. He said entertainment venues and banquet halls to be moved down to a Special Permit. Chair Seichter spoke about outside displays having time limits and how to regulate them. The PZC discussed the ground level location for offices and whether they agreed to this arrangement. Ms. Morgenstein said she is looking for people to shop door to door. She said there needs to be a definition of what is a walk-in public business as opposed to a business where no one is dropping in. She said there are some places on Center Street that are not walk-in businesses. Ms. Hand said the same way one differentiates between medical/dental offices vs. general of business offices; she believed a travel agency is often used as its own land use category. Mr. Fitzsimmons pointed out that medical offices are huge parking generators and noted this is his opposition to a first floor location vs. a travel agency pointing out that most people aren't picking up their tickets at the same time.

Ms. Hand said a part of this is how much activity this generates and how much activity it generates that builds other activities for other businesses in the area. Mr. Allinson noted there are people that walk into law offices. Mr. Allinson wondered if theaters should be under a Special Permit especially because of the parking. Ms. Hand went over the 100 peak hour trip generation regulation noting that currently in all of the zones, if it is a permitted use but generates more than a 100 peak hour vehicle trips, it automatically triggers a Special Permit which involves a traffic study.

She said this could involve making improvements to roadways, etc. Ms. Hand said Center St. and RT 5 are State roads and are already built out as infrastructure. She said generating more activity in the downtown generates more traffic. She said if some of the uses are being bumped to Special Permit and noted if the 100 peak hour trip Special Permit is kept, this would address all of this and would be anything the high traffic generator automatically bumps to a Special Permit and could be kept as a permitted by-right use. Ms. Hand if this is not wanted to be kept in there, then some of these higher traffic generators possibly/should be Special Permits with a traffic study possibly required.

Public Comments

Jim Wolfe, Economic Development Commission member, asked Ms. Hand to define Town Center Zoning, where it begins and ends. Ms. Hand said this has not as of yet been defined. She said the CA-6 zone is the general area being considered and the POCD made recommendations regarding boundaries for the Town Center. She said once the regulation is developed, then it can be decided where it best applies. She said that generally, it would be consistent with the CA-6 zone.

Mr. Wolfe said if existing properties are being looked at, how does one match what is there vs. what the regulations are. Ms. Hand said it didn't matter, because what is there is grandfathered in. She said what we are zoning for is what we would like to have there, the best use and what would be most appropriate. Mr. Wolfe asked about banks and financial institutions and under prohibited, drive-through windows. He said he didn't know of any bank that would want to do business without a drive-through window today. Ms. Hand said this is done in the downtown area because this is their only option. She said she has a strong aversity to drive-through windows is because of the number of curb cuts required, the amount of space it takes up on the property and doesn't do anything for the town center; people just come to the drive-through and leave.

Mr. Wolfe asked about hotels and motels under Special Permits with not less than six units. He said he believed the number of units was small and how would a hotel be created with less than six units. Ms. Morgenstein said this could be a bed and breakfast or it just doesn't get created. Mr. Wolfe said he was fine with this condition for bed and breakfasts but wondered why this condition would apply to a motel. Chair Seichter explained this means not less than six units, one must have a minimum of six units. Mr. Wolfe said that realistically, no hotel will come to town to put in eight bedrooms. He said he wasn't opposed to this, but not hotel will want to build downtown with this regulation. Ms. Hand spoke about "boutique" hotels, which are like a bed and breakfast in size, but function as a hotel. She said maybe this should be added. Ms. Morgenstein gave Mystic as an example and noted there are a lot of people who want to stay in the six rooms above a nice restaurant. She said if we make a vibrant enough downtown, there will be people who will want to stay in a small hotel in downtown Wallingford. Chair Seichter noted that if someone wanted to construct a hotel with 30 rooms, this regulation wouldn't prohibit this. He said if there is going to be a hotel or motel, there has to be at least six rooms. Mr. Wolfe said he believed this was too small and didn't see someone investing to construct several rooms. Chair Seichter said he didn't see how this regulation prohibits from putting in more rooms from doing this.

Ms. Hand said the intention of this regulation is what the comfortable minimum would be. She said the intention is that one can't go smaller than six rooms and this is an attempt to regulate someone who planned on turning their three-family house into a hotel/motel. Mr. Wolfe noted that if someone takes a three-family and puts two rooms in each family, one can create a six

room hotel. Ms. Hand said if the PZC wants a higher minimum number, this can be done. She said someone probably won't go this low and doesn't see this as a concern. She said it is more of what minimum number of rooms would be acceptable.

Vincenzo DiNatale, 8 Taylor Lane, spoken about the development of specific parking regulations based upon the guidelines of the PZC. He said one could take a parking regulation that was approved and calculate the number of units that can be built. He said this could be taken further by doing public parking, bike racks and other variances. He said if the PZC comes up with a parking density for residential, then the public parking, the bike racks, and other variances, won't be provided. He said a parking requirement that controls the number of units already pre-exists. Mr. DiNatale said one is looking at a mixed-use development and restrictions are put in, it becomes restrictive. He said there should be flexibility and noted shared parking will become a Special Permit. He said a Special Permit could control a development that would become too much office or too much residential. Mr. DiNatale said density doesn't need to be discussed because it is already in the parking requirements. He urged the PZC to be careful what is put in the variety of uses.

Jessica Wysocki, 352 Grieb Road, asked why there would be a requirement for a minimum amount of rooms for a motel downtown. Chair Seichter said he wouldn't want a one or two room motel because it wouldn't be beneficial. Mr. Allinson said this type of set up would not attract clientele that would utilize the downtown area, it would be someone looking for a room for a few nights, being transient, and this is what we are trying to avoid.

Jon Wolworth, 28 Laurelwood Drive, said he challenged the number of units of residential per acre. He spoke about the typical downtown lots which are 20,000 to 30,000 sq. ft. He said now that the PZC is considering increasing the number of stories; one could easily go to 20 units on a 21,000 sq. ft. lot. He asked if the PZC was suggesting that if the lot was a ½ acres, only 10 units could be developed. He said this was counter to the Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD), which is proposing more residential to complement all the other uses downtown. He said this seems like a hypothetical number and should be looked at again.

Ms. Hand said the POCD and the TOD plan recommend is there be a heavier emphasis on higher density residential in the immediate vicinity of the train station and there be some emphasis on real mixed-use and commercial uses in the town center. She said the numbers can go higher. She pointed out because the parking regulations were designed to be permissive, there may need to be other ways the residential density is capped because there could be a lot of small units crammed in together and one property oversaturate the market. Ms. Hand said she chose 20 was because the IHZ is at 20 to 26 units. She said so much of how density is perceived has to do with building form. She said if the PZC is inclined to go higher, this number of units could be revisited and the density in the IHZ could be revisited. She said she could provide more concrete examples of density.

Chair Seichter asked Ms. Hand to research what other communities have done. Mr. Wolworth spoke about vet hospitals and said he didn't believe this would be a good allowed use in downtown. He spoke about the underneath parking. He said he would hope the PZC doesn't limit this and would be so restrictive to allow only two cars to park underneath.

Tim Ryan, of the EDC said he liked the idea of the PZC allowing themselves latitude and flexibility. He said the town center is unique and their components are unique. He said he is struggling with regulations that are one size fits all. He said he likes the concept to come before the PZC with a Special Permit if there is an opportunity in particular part of the downtown. He said a building height that may work nicely on the top of a hill, may not work on the corner of N. Orchard Street and Meadow Street which would block the view of the hill. He said he would not like to see a regulation established that would prohibit something that would complement the top of the hill, but not be a good fit on the lower part of the hill. He said he would like to see a list of permitted uses drawn up.

Mr. Ryan spoke about density and said he has spoken to Ms. Hand numerous times. He said he has challenged the Fitzgerald Halliday study to come up with absorption rates for Wallingford so as to come up with an idea of how many housing units are ideal. He said there should be enough units to satisfy the high demand, but not too many that in 10 years the demographic profile changes and there are too many units. He said each developer spoken to have stated the densities are too tight. Mr. Ryan said the EDC has worked with DOT and their Contractor. He said the cost of the properties was neutralized, noting that the contribution to cost on any particular development came out to \$25,000 to \$35,000 per housing unit. He encouraged the PZC to not lock in on densities purely as a function of the cost of the property.

Ms. Hand said from a land use and zoning perspective, the most appropriate density is the highest density that still seems appropriate to the Wallingford Town Center and how this visually fits on a property and parking generation. She said this was a big part of the IHZ discussion. Ms. Hand said if we can zero in on the highest density the PZC and the Town is comfortable with, that may be the direction to pursue. Mr. Ryan spoke about the IHZ tax abatement program brought forward by the EDC, which he said was very aggressive and is for five years. He said if we want what we want, we have to bring skin into the game with the developers who want more density. He said the tax abatement program is 100% abatement in year one and two, 75% in year three, and 50% in year four and five.

Joe Gouveia, 1339 Whirlwind Hill Road, asked what triggers the 100 peak hours to have a study done. Ms. Hand said this calculated number is based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers trip generation book which breaks down the use categories and sq. footage. She said based upon this or if the business owner provides better information, this can be used. She said a trip is an in or out and there has to be 100 of these within one hour. Mr. Gouveia asked if someone wanted to open a business in town now, would they have to wait until the summer. Ms. Hand explained that the way it is decided if the 100 peak hour is triggered, isn't necessarily based on

the particular restaurant. She said it is based on different sub categories and on a particular square footage. She said this number is used unless the business provides other information. Ms. Hand said if the traffic study is necessary, they look at the maps and do counts on existing traffic and other traffic studies done in the area and give recommendations on how to improve the traffic generation. She said the business would not have to do a traffic count for one year and then tell the town the highest traffic count figure. She said it would not hold the business back in that way. Mr. Gouveia said he was confused, noting that when he was going to expand his winery, he was told by the Town to wait until October at the busiest time. He said he is now being told at this meeting, a business owner can put a food truck on his property, but when he asked for a food truck at his winery, he said he wasn't allowed to do this. Mr. Gouveia asked the PZC to think out of the box. He said the government is stretching things too far. He said there are a lot of empty stores and if people are stopped from renting the buildings, there might be more empty stores.

Mr. DiNatale said in the CA-6 zone, one would need density to justify building an elevator. He said for ADA compliant there would have to be an elevator and this can't be done for four or five units.

END OF PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Hand spoke about Lot & Bulk requirements and minimum lot sizes. She said because this is the Town Center, the town is looking to promote more development and more use of the property. He said in residential zones, we are looking to limit what people do so as to not impose on their neighbors. She said a lot of development and not a lot of asphalt is desired in the Town Center. Ms. Hand said she thought about having no minimum lot sizes, but then wondered if people would break up their lots into small sizes. She noted the current minimum lot size in the CA-6 zone is 6, 250 sq. ft. which she said is small. She said the IHZ requires 25,000 sq. ft. Ms. Hand said the size is still grandfathered in no matter what. She said if someone has less than 25,000 sq. ft. they couldn't develop their property, because it is grandfathered in. She said the type of development promoted, is based upon the 25, 000 sq. ft. minimum, which cannot be broken down into smaller pieces.

Ms. Hand noted that with minimum lot frontage, the minimum 50 ft. will remain. She spoke about minimum setbacks which she said is zero and moved the minimum rear yard requirement to zero. Ms. Hand spoke about the maximum setbacks which she said was used more often in town centers. She said there is currently a front yard maximum setback, but noted she made them more specific or that they require more. She said her recommendations for maximum side yards are 5 feet except for where a driveway is located. She said this recommendation will ensure that most of the frontage has building on it. She said the PZC may want to move this up to 10 ft.

Regarding maximum front yard, Ms. Hand recommended there be a maximum front yard for the first and second stories. She said if someone was building three or four stories and they wanted to set the upper story back, she didn't believe there would be an objection and noted this might be preferable because it might decrease the intensity of the look. She said if the first and second stories are near the street, there is still the street wall. Ms. Hand said for the first and second stories she recommended a build-to line of 5 ft. unless someone wanted to create public space, i.e, a park, outdoor dining, a green space, she would allow 20 ft.

Ms. Hand said for corner lots, said she put this in question marks because the PZC has to think of all situations. She said with corner lots, someone has the requirement on both streets which she believed was still appropriate. Ms. Hand discussed minimum floor to area ratio and explained this is when the total floor area of the building; it is the ratio of that floor area to the area of the lot. Ms. Hand said she is suggesting a minimum floor area ratio (FAR) of .5 which she said is about right, but noted the PZC could make this lower. She said if someone had a one-story building, it would have to cover half the lot; if someone had a two-story building, it would have to cover a quarter of the lot. She said she looked at this with the current parking requirements, and this number seemed to work well. Ms. Hand said people want to do multiple stories and we want to see buildings. She said the reason for the minimum FAR is so we don't end up with a lot with a tiny building and underuse of the property. She said she didn't include a maximum coverage because she believed the PZC wasn't looking for this.

As far as building height was concerned, Ms. Hand there are three options: one is the current restriction, which is 30 ft. She noted for three-stories, this number should be 35 ft. because the first story needs more room when commercial; she noted the IHZ allows four stories at 45 ft. She said she and Mr. Ryan have discussed a case by case consideration in the town center, to allow 35 ft. by right and 45 ft. by Special Permit. Ms. Hand said she is a proponent of four-story buildings. She said possibly the Special Permit is the perfect middle ground. Under Lot and Bulk requirements, Ms. Hand said what was required in this other municipalities' town center, which she had written these regulations for, was separate and distinct entrances for the first floor, and upper story uses, so every business has its own street entrance. Ms. Morgenstein said she was in favor of four stories and if this is made into a Special Permit, the developers can be consulted. She said she is in favor of surveying. Mr. Venoit said he preferred four stories as well as Mr. Fitzsimmons. Chair Seichter said he likes the four stories in some areas. He said he wasn't so sure about locating the four stories in the mid-section of Center Street. He said there should be more discussion on this.

Ms. Hand said the height issue presents itself the most in the middle on the hill. She pointed out that because of the topography, the four stories may look awkward and at the bottom and the top, it's not a problem. Mr. Fitzsimmons said this has to be proportional and noted the hill presents a challenge but the height makes sense when one looks at this topography wise. Mr. Venoit asked about floor area ratio. Ms. Hand said if one takes the lot area, how much floor area one has to have in relation to the lot. She noted this is different from coverage, because

that is just the footprint. She said the intention of the floor area ratio is to ensure the one is getting a certain amount of building constructed. She said with the .5, with every sq. foot of lot, there has to be half a square foot of building. She said this is to avoid having an underutilized site. Ms. Hand said she would provide examples to the PZC in the future. Chair Seichter asked Ms. Hand about maximum side yards and what is normally seen. Ms. Hand said there is a different way this could be done which would make more sense and gives people more flexibility by stating that a maximum percentage of the frontage has to be occupied by building. She said she has seen this around 65% to 70%. She said the positive part of this would be a building would have to be constructed all around the lot except for five feet on each side. She also suggested requirements for that sight. Mr. Venoit said he preferred the percentage.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Jon Wolworth, Laurelwood Drive, asked a hypothetical question on the minimum lot size. He said he would like to see if underutilized properties could be improved in the town center. She said legally a non-conformity can be improved. Mr. Wolworth spoke about building height and pointed out one would a lower building height at three stories because they typically are stick-built. He suggested tweaking the 45 ft. to 46. ft. or 47 ft. to typically hide HVAC units on top of the building. Mr. DiNatale spoke about the minimum floor to area ration and noted this is a minimum not a maximum.

Mr. Ryan said he liked the minimum floor to area ratio because it supports density and reminded everyone that the highest tax yield per square foot in town is in the downtown. He said this density will not allow gaps in space. Mr. Wolfe agreed with the four stories and noted the actual footage may have to increase because of commercial space and how it is constructed.

Ms. Hand spoke about building form/site layout standards. She said in Connecticut, a town can't have full-blown building design standards unless it is in and IHZ or a Village District. She said this will be re-visited. She said in Connecticut, a town can have building form and site layout standards, on low the lot gets designed, landscaping, etc. She said these are the recommendations she has made. She noted that with every 20 ft. or less, there has to be a jog so as to not end up with a giant wall and will be less intensive to the eye. She said this can also include balconies. Regarding building fenestration (windows), Ms. Hand said her recommendation on the first floor, is that 50% of the first floor between 2 ft. and 10 ft. be windows to create a pedestrian friendly experience. She discussed the maximum of 1 walkway/alleyway per lot which she said must be to the rear parking lot, have ample lighting, wayfinding signage and the entire front yard must include landscaping, a public green/gathering space, outdoor dining with possible landscaping. She discussed solid waste/recycling receptacles noting they should be limited to 1 sold waste and 1 recycling receptacle per property and shall not be located in the front yard, and shall be screened from view from other properties and public Right-Of-Ways by an enclosure and/or landscaping. She said she also

doesn't want important space to be taken up by dumpsters. Ms. Hand discussed mechanical equipment, HVAC equipment, metal chimneys and elevator shafts on a roof which she said should be screened from view.

Ms. Hand noted for future discussion: parking/parking garages signage, energy efficiency and existing building renovation/addition.

Mr. DiNatale said these are all good ideas, but suggested giving professional architects and designers some flexibilities and not be too restrictive. Mr. Wolworth said DEEP may require a third dumpster for restaurants for recycling. Ms. Hand said she will put this portion into a draft regulation and provide the PZC with the information discussed and do a list. She suggested scheduling another workshop. She said she could schedule another workshop for November.

Adjournment

Mr. Venoit made a motion to adjourn the Meeting at 9 p.m. Mr. Fitzsimmons seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia A. Kleist

Recording Secretary