The Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Avon held a *Special Meeting* at the Avon Town Hall on Tuesday June 11, 2019. Present were Thomas Armstrong, Vice Chair, Peter Mahoney, Mary Harrop, Brian Ladouceur, Jr., and Alternates Elaine Primeau (sat) and Linda Preysner. Not present were Linda Keith, Chair, Lisa Levin, Joseph Gentile, and Alternate Jill Coppola. Also present was Hiram Peck, Director of Planning and Community Development.

Mr. Armstrong called the meeting to order at 7pm.

**INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS**

Avon Mill Apartments – 75 Avonwood Road – Tim Lee

Present were Attorney Robert Meyers, David Whitney, PE, Consulting Engineers, LLC, and Timothy Lee.

Mr. Meyers explained that any changes to the prior informal presentation to the Commission (September 2018) will be noted.

Timothy Lee addressed questions from the prior informal presentation:

1. *Will the construction be done in stages? Would existing buildings be renovated first?* The answer to both is yes. The existing buildings have been neglected and are in desperate need of repair and renovation. He noted that Phase One would be the renovation of three existing buildings, a positive improvement to the site. Phase Two would involve the construction of the new first building with a swimming pool and Phase Three would involve construction of a road leading to another new building. Phase Four involves the construction of a road that goes around the proposed 25, two-story duplexes.
2. *Will soil from grading remain on the site?*  As much soil as possible will remain on the site. Mr. Lee explained that minimal trucking is in everyone’s best interest. A berm with plantings is proposed at the entrance and existing holes on site will be filled. Some material will need to be taken offsite from the cuts and fills for the roads.
3. *Will the affordable units only be in the new construction?* The answer is yes; 20% of the units in the new buildings will be affordable. He explained that while 270 new units are proposed, there will likely be closer to 250 units, due to the topography. (20% of 250 units equals 50 affordable units). He clarified that 20% of the one bedrooms, 20% of the two bedrooms, 20% of the three bedrooms, and 20% of the duplexes would be affordable. There are 189 units in the existing buildings. All units on the site are rentals, including the aforementioned 25 duplexes; the original plan showed 35 duplexes.

In response to Mr. Mahoney’s question, Mr. Peck explained that deed restrictions would apply to the designated units for the length of the restriction (30 years) regardless of change of tenant occupancy.

1. *Is the duplex topography an issue with the number of units?* The answer is yes, some of the topography is steeper and that is why the total number of units has been changed from 270 to 250-255..
2. *Will there be runoff into the Farmington River.* The answer is no, there will be no additional runoff into the River.
3. *Will there be clearcutting of trees?* The answer is we will do everything necessary for the buildings and roads such that some trees will be removed but in return flowering trees are proposed with an arboretum to be part of a walking path around the property, for both the residents of the site as well as all Avon residents.
4. *Will there be a site walk?* The answer is yes if the Commission wishes and a site walk map can be prepared by Mr. Whitney. Mr. Lee noted that both he and Mr. Whitney could be available to show the Commission around the property.
5. *Will there be four stories?* The answer is yes but the design would be only slightly higher and very close to the height of the existing buildings, which are 40 feet, 6 inches. The new four-story buildings are designed to be 44.8 feet high, only four feet higher than the existing buildings.
6. *Will the duplexes all be the same?* The answer is no, all the duplexes will be different with slightly different designs, styles, and colors; there are four design styles currently. Traditional clapboard siding is proposed. The duplexes are 1,600 to 1,700 square feet in size with three bedrooms; there are no four bedroom units. Mr. Lee explained that he is open to creating more diversity if need be.

In response to Ms. Preysner’s question, Mr. Lee reiterated that no units are for sale. He explained that the unit rentals that are designated as affordable are based on a mean income calculation.

In response to Ms. Preysner’s questions, Mr. Peck further explained that every year HUD publishes figures that are allowable relative to affordability requirements based on the area median income. Every year there could be a slight adjustment to the rent for the affordable units but it would not be significant; this is all covered by HUD Regulations. He further explained that the affordability limit for each unit (duplex or apartment) is determined at the outset. Since it is very hard to evict people, should a person’s circumstances change typically the next available unit will become an affordable unit. The affordable units are documented on an annual basis and the developer is required to submit information to the Town noting which units are in compliance and which units are not.

Mr. Ladouceur asked for the projected market rate for the duplexes as well as the projected monthly affordable rent.

Mr. Lee explained that he doesn’t have that information currently but noted he could get back to the Commission.

In response to Mr. Mahoney’s questions, Mr. Peck explained that the site was originally developed as a cluster development (current zone is RU2A). The proposal is to change part of the property to the AHOZ zone. While there is no open space requirement the development will have a significant amount of open space and recreation areas.

David Whitney, PE, explained that the existing development is approximately 16 acres; the proposed development is another 16 acres. The remaining wooded area is about 14.5 acres, or 31% of the site. There are two small wetland areas on the site as well. The entire site is 46 acres and located in the RU2A zone; land in the RU2A zone would be reduced to 22 acres and contain the three existing buildings on the site. A zone change is proposed for the remaining portion of the site (24 acres) which would become the AHOZ zone; all new proposed buildings would be located in the AHOZ zone.

Mr. Lee continued his presentation by answering the following questions:

1. *Will the duplexes having parking for guests and children.* The answer is yes, there will be extra parking along the roads.
2. *Will the duplexes be leased and not sold.* The answer is yes, the units are rentals, as just discussed.
3. *Will there be a utility building for maintenance equipment on the site.* The answer is yes, there will be but the location is not yet known.
4. *Will parking be outside.* The answer is yes. There will be garbage chutes, as suggested at the last meeting, and also recycling garbage chutes.
5. *Will there be a fire hose on every floor.* The answer is we’re leaving that up to the Fire Department for code compliance. There will be sprinklers on every floor in the new buildings.
6. *How far apart are the duplexes.*  The answer is the duplexes are 25 to 35 feet apart.
7. *Will there be transom windows over doors.* The answer is yes the front doors of the duplexes will have transom windows.
8. *What is the count of bedrooms in the new buildings.* The answer is the new buildings will have 81 bedrooms; 82 bedrooms; and 43 bedrooms.
9. *Will there be bedrooms on the first floor for the elderly.* The answer is yes the first floor of the new buildings will have one, two, and three bedrooms.
10. *What is the count (bedroom) in the existing buildings.* The answer is the existing buildings have 102 one bedrooms; 78 two bedrooms; and 9 three bedrooms. Mr. Lee indicated that there will be a community room with a gym and a kitchen and yes there will be rules to follow (cleaning, etc.).
11. *Will the new buildings have vinyl siding.* The answer is no, the new buildings will be hardy board or some other type of low maintenance siding.
12. *Will the flat roofs be pitched.*  The answer is yes the roofs will be pitched for drainage with backup overflow on flat roofs. Solar panels will be put on top of the new buildings; the panels will be pitched to allow snow to fall off. There will also be heat tracers to melt snow.
13. *Not enough windows on the side of the duplex.* The answer is while we don’t want low windows that would look into the next duplex, more windows are shown on new drawings.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur’s question, Mr. Lee explained that the new buildings will have 80 one bedrooms; 80 two bedrooms; and 40 three bedrooms; plus 50 duplexes. Messrs. Ladouceur and Mahoney commented that that is a lot of three bedrooms. Mr. Lee indicated that the number of three bedrooms could certainly be adjusted. All the roads on the site are private.

Mr. Lee explained that his intent is to build something traditional that looks good and gives back to the Town of Avon. He noted that he would like to build an arboretum that all Town residents could enjoy. Currently the site does not look good; there is no playground or barbeque area for the existing tenants. A garden area is also proposed to allow residents of the site to plant vegetables and create a community environment. Tennis courts are also proposed in the open space area on the site along with a lap pool to encourage athletics. There is an existing trail that leads to the River but the hope is to create a trail that goes around the entire property with flowering trees. The wooded area that exists near where the duplexes are proposed would be nice to leave untouched and preserved as is.

In response to Mrs. Harrop’s question, Mr. Lee explained that the existing buildings do not have sprinklers and there is no plan to install them, as the Fire Department is not requiring that. There are fire escapes.

Mr. Lee explained that he wants to create a nice entrance into the site with columns on both sides and nice plantings. The exteriors of the existing buildings will be renovated; the brick will be cleaned and the railings painted white. He displayed renderings of both the existing buildings (with proposed renovations) and the new buildings.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur’s question, Mr. Lee confirmed that the entire site (land in both RU2A and AHOZ zones) will be owned and managed by one entity. All proposed amenities will be shared by all the residents of the site (both existing buildings and proposed new buildings).

In response to Mr. Mahoney’s question, Mr. Meyers explained that Fuss & O’Neill has been contacted regarding a traffic study adding that a State OSTA permit is also required.

Mr. Armstrong commented that other than the zoning table showing a maximum of three stories, it appears that all the AHOZ requirements are met.

Mr. Meyers noted that the zoning table could be fixed and agreed that all the AHOZ requirements are met.

In response to Mr. Armstrong’s question, Mr. Lee explained that two retention basins exist on the site.

Mr. Whitney explained that Retention Area Basin #1 receives flow from the Avon Place Apartments via a 42-inch pipe and there is a 30-inch pipe that goes out and all the way down to the River. He noted that he has been to the area during rains and the pipe is perfectly dry. He further explained that the 100-year storm will be infiltrated into the site at numerous locations because the soil is very well drained. No additional water will be put into the aforementioned basin and aforementioned pipe.

In response to Mr. Armstrong’s question, Mr. Meyers explained/confirmed that the site was originally developed with septic systems but sewers were installed some years ago. He indicated that the applicant has already received what is needed from the Avon Water Pollution Control Authority (AWPCA).

Mr. Whitney explained that at the time this site was originally developed no “developable land calculation” existed requiring that wetlands, floodplain, and steep slopes be subtracted from the total land area. Development was based on 4 units per acre and allowable density (46.44 acres x 4 units per acre = 189 units).

In response to Mr. Mahoney’s question, Mr. Meyers noted that the only work to take place in the existing RU2A zone is renovation to the existing buildings. Tennis courts do not impact/burden the septic system.

Mr. Armstrong questioned whether the proposed construction, along with the existing construction, is holistically compliant because the original development was based on

46 acres and now we have AHOZ.

Mrs. Primeau commented that she would like to see more continuity between the old and the new and the duplexes such that the architecture that exists can be modified to comply and be similar to the proposed buildings.

Mr. Lee noted his understanding and Mr. Meyers indicated that the applicant will work with Mr. Peck. Mr. Lee pointed out that he proposes Porte-Cocheres in front of the existing buildings as well as in front of the new buildings so that each building has a similar entrance. New buildings will have brick on the lower portion to match as closely as possible to the brick on the existing buildings. He explained that he feels the new buildings should be more of a traditional New England style with clapboard; the existing buildings are all brick. Mr. Lee noted his agreement about the importance of making the entire site reflect a consistency tying everything together.

Mr. Ladouceur noted his concerns with the overall number of three bedroom units proposed.

Mr. Lee acknowledged his understanding noting that the quantities of each type of unit (one, two, three bedrooms) can be shifted if need be.

In response to Mrs. Harrop’s question, Mr. Lee explained that currently no first floor bedrooms are proposed for the duplexes but noted that he would look into making some changes to the designs.

In response to Mr. Mahoney’s question, Mr. Meyers stated that the Inland Wetlands Commission has heard the application and a ruling is expected at their next meeting; there were no controversies. He added that the Water Company has indicated that there is adequate pressure and volume on the site.

Mr. Whitney stated that the wetlands application is relatively minor as there is only a very small amount of proposed activities within the upland review area from one of the two retention basins.

Proposed Self Storage Facility - 275/279 West Main – J.R. Clisham

Present were Attorney Robert Meyers, on behalf of the property owners (Rotondo); J.R. Clisham, CT Self Storage, and James Sakonchick, PE, Kratzert, Jones & Associates.

J.R. Clisham explained that he presented his application to the Inland Wetlands Commission (IWC) at their June 4 meeting, adding that he will be making amendments to his application and plans to also attend the July 2 IWC meeting. He stated that he owns CT Self Storage (trade name CT Self Stor) and explained that he has worked in the self-storage industry full time since 2001 noting that he has developed 11 storage facilities in CT and MA and currently oversees the operation of 7 storage facilities totaling 350K rentable square feet. Mr. Clisham explained that he finished a Class A facility in Milford noting that he intends to produce a first-class facility in Avon as well. The exterior would be made of brick and glass and hardy board, trying to create and accomplish the next generation of self-storage. Mr. Clisham stated that he has lived in Avon for the past three years and intends to be here for the long term.

Mr. Clisham displayed drawings of the proposed facility noting that the site is 9.8 acres; the proposed building has a 34,000 SF footprint and is appropriate relative to size and coverage. He pointed out an area on the site explaining that he intends to work with the Town to place a conservation easement over the land to preserve it as undeveloped. There will be other green spaces on the site with plantings. The proposed building is not that much larger than what currently exists on the site. The shape of the proposed building is long and narrow to match the shape of the parcel, working with the land. The face of the building would be visible from the road but not the length extending back due to landscaping and screening to be installed. Self storage is a low traffic generator such that this business would not be adding any traffic to Route 44 and is a good fit for the site. If the proposed business had 50 cars in a day that would be a lot (Dunkin Donuts in CT can have 900 cars in a day). Mr. Clisham explained that the front of the proposed building has a glass system with a metal canopy (brushed nickel); all storefront glass with windows on the sides of the building. The building will be climate controlled. He explained that the back of the building would have a thick-gauged whitish material that is a dull galvanized standing seam metal panel, similar to what is used on many barn roofs. He noted that the entire base of the building is brick with hardy board located above the brick in the front of the building with lots of windows. The rear half of the building is the aforementioned metal panel system instead of hardy board. Mr. Clisham pointed out exterior rollup doors located behind the gate for exterior access to the storage units; there are plenty of access points. There is a lot of tree cover existing on the side of the property shared with Nod Brook Mall and the plan calls for more plantings such that the entire side of the building would be screened from Nod Brook Mall.

In response to Mr. Armstrong’s question, Mr. Clisham explained that the roof of the proposed building would sit 21 feet higher than the parking lot.

Mr. Clisham continued his presentation noting that a 30-foot by 16-foot high glass wall that separates the loading area from the office area. There will be custom furniture and custom mill work with a nice seating setup; no plastic chairs. There is also a Wi-Fi bar. He concluded his presentation by reiterating that his plan is to be a longtime resident of this community and plans to build a first class facility.

In response to Ms. Preysner’s questions about areas of the building without any windows, Mr. Clisham explained that you don’t want windows in the storage units but further explained that where the hallways dead end into the wall is where the windows will be. Ms. Preysner commented that the proposed building looks like it belongs in an office park and not on Route 44. Mr. Clisham noted his understanding adding that is why he is here to get feedback. She commented that the first rendering displayed has more of a country feel and looks more like it belongs in Avon but may need some modifications.

Mrs. Primeau commented that while there are different types of buildings along Route 44, you will not see a building like what was just presented (metal, brick, and wood). She noted that she would like to see a building with more architectural details. In response to Mrs. Primeau’s questions, Mr. Clisham explained that the proposed driveway location is close but not exactly where the current driveway exists. He further explained that cuts and fills will be necessary to raise some parts of the site to be more even with the driveway grade creating a more level entrance. He noted that the retention pond is proposed to be located where the restaurant building currently exists; the house to the rear would be taken down. He noted that there are wetlands on the site (beginning about half way back to the end of the site) that would likely prohibit an access easement with Nod Brook Mall. In addition, he explained that in the rear a gate is proposed for security with fencing that would wrap around the entire site for security. Mr. Clisham noted that while he doesn’t necessarily want it, he noted he would be open to the idea/possibility of an easement with Nod Brook Mall at the front of the site.

Ms. Preysner commented that if the roof wasn’t flat and if there were more windows rather than just a wall of glass, maybe some arches or transoms that would help. The large solid area that is visible from the road could have trim or pillars.

Mr. Mahoney commented that if the building was constructed as just presented it would be the best looking building on Route 44. Mr. Clisham confirmed that the individual doors are for exterior access and are non-climate controlled.

In response to Mrs. Harrop’s question, Mr. Clisham explained that 641 units are proposed averaging 109 SF ranging in size from 5 x 5 to 10 x 30.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur’s question, Mr. Clisham confirmed that the first floor units are buried into the hillside. The exterior door opens to an area 10 x 30; if you proceed to the loading dock you would enter a hallway with a 10 x 10 unit that backs up to a 10 x 30 unit and a hallway that runs all the way down the building. The bottom level has two hallways and the top level has three hallways that span the entire length of the building; there are units on either side of the hallways. There is elevator service providing access from the first floor to the second floor.

In response to Mr. Mahoney’s question, Mr. Clisham confirmed that a car could be stored in the 10 x 40 unit; there will be no storage outside the building.

In response to Ms. Preysner’s question, Mr. Clisham explained that two elevators are proposed in the middle of the building; one adjacent to the loading area and one next to the secondary loading area. Access could be from the first floor or from the other side on the second floor. There will be a stacked hallway on each floor providing access to the elevators.

In response to Mr. Ladouceur’s question, Mr. Peck explained that the Commission will need to determine whether a self-storage use is appropriate on Route 44 in the CR zone or whether it belongs in an industrial area/zone where it is allowed by right. If the applicant moves forward a special exception application will be required because this use is not permitted by right in the CR zone. He pointed out the constraints on the subject site adding that there have been a couple of applications before the Commission in recent years. The building design will be a big part of the discussion if the proposal moves forward from tonight’s informal discussion.

Mr. Clisham acknowledged that he has heard all the comments adding that he has tried to make this building attractive and not look like a traditional storage facility. He noted that he doesn’t want to produce an industrial-looking building and would much rather be located in a retail area with an upscale look.

In response to Mr. Armstrong’s questions, Mr. Clisham explained that the driveway design (45 feet wide with two-way traffic and island) allows people to drive up right in front of their unit (if external) park, and empty. If the unit is internal (90% of the site) people stop at either the main entrance or three of the other points of entry/access; there are four points of access in total. There are two access points into the building on the second level, which faces the Nod Brook Mall elevation. He explained that the Nod Brook Mall side of the building is like a true basement (located below ground) while the Walmart side is like the walkout basement area. He added that he has built many split-level buildings such as the one proposed.

Mr. Ladouceur asked if we’re going to be able to see storage unit doors. Mr. Clisham explained that the hallway will be functional. Mr. Ladouceur commented that he finds it one of the most tacky things out there adding that he sees these facilities and they have windows that are lit up like a Christmas tree 24/7 and the doors are the brightest orange you’ve ever seen and have a fake construction-moving looking guy in the window all the time. Plainville is a perfect example and it’s tacky.

Mr. Clisham indicated that the comments have been noted. He added that he thinks the proposed building is great looking but noted his understanding. The best features of the building are being placed on the road, then extending the rest back. There won’t be a lot of doors visible from the road and they won’t be lit up. The lights in the hallways will be on a timer, 15 minutes, typically, and access hours are 6am to 10pm; no one is in the building after 10pm. He explained that none of his facility locations are open 24 hours.

Mr. Armstrong commented that the applicant should wait on submitting a formal application until the Commission has had time to think things over.

Mr. Peck suggested that all comments from the Commission be forwarded to him so he can compile everything and provide the information to the applicant.

Mr. Clisham concluded by reiterating that his intention and goal is to build a first-class storage facility.

James Sakonchick, PE, indicated that he protests the idea of connecting the site to the Mall next door for the following reasons – he said go visit our site at Rocky Hill, located literally next to District 1 of the State DOT. The site is similar size with a traffic light on the site and the DOT allowed the facility to have their driveway 100 feet away from the aforementioned traffic light. Had a “T” been created it would have created more interference with the traffic flow as a dedicated light may have been needed to allow left-hand turns. The traffic generation is so low that the DOT was happy to have the facility not use the traffic light bur rather have a driveway 100 feet away dedicated for the use of the facility. He further explained that any connection to the Mall would be a two-way street and would most likely end up with more traffic on the subject site than there would be if there was no connection to the Mall.

Mrs. Primeau noted her understanding of the proposed fence and that it can be closed when the business is not operating but added that if it’s a possibility for the motorists leaving the site heading westbound that it would be safer for them to exit via the traffic light at the Mall.

Mr. Ladouceur commented that he could see an east-bound only entrance and exit at the subject site. He said he doesn’t think you can exit left out of the site onto Route 44 being right next to Walmart Plaza.

Mr. Clisham communicated that he would rather the option of right turn only, east-bound only entrance and exit than a connection to the Mall. He explained that parking is not an issue because if there’s more than four cars on the site it’s a miracle. He thanked everyone.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Discussion of wine and beer permit issues for Dom’s Coffee – 20 West Main Street

Present was Attorney Cheryl Rice, on behalf of Dom’s Coffee, who explained that she was before the Commission last year who approved wine, beer, and hard cider sales at Dom’s Coffee. She noted that she is still pursuing the permit for Dom’s Coffee with the State Liquor Control Commission; there is a problem due to the hours of operation for Dom’s Coffee (7am open Monday – Friday and 8am open Saturday and Sunday). A Tavern permit under CT State law does not allow a business to open before 8am, Monday - Saturday and before 10am on Sunday, regardless of the sale of wine or beer. The business does not qualify for a restaurant wine and beer permit because no commercial kitchen exists. A café permit by the State allows for full liquor license and allows for the type of food service at Dom’s Coffee; no commercial kitchen is required; however café permits are not permitted under Avon’s Zoning Regulations. Ms. Rice asked if there is any way to allow Dom’s Coffee to operate their business as they have been trying to for the past year. She explained that her research on “café permits” reveals that historically these were the types of places for drinking at a bar with only snacks offered being pretzels and peanuts. She noted her understanding of why café permits are not preferred due to drinking laws but noted that Dom’s Coffee wants to offer beer and wine to complement their food offerings. She explained that since the cost of the café permit is higher the owner would also like to be allowed to offer some liquors to enhance the coffee selections. Ms. Rice confirmed that while Dom’s Coffee is not asking to be a full-scale bar, that is not the intent; however, they are asking to increase their hours of operation to close at 9pm or 10pm (current closing time is 5 pm). They would like to expand upon the Euro-café style that has come to be known at Dom’s Coffee. Ms. Rice clarified that liquor permits are not transferrable to new businesses and permits are also site specific such that if a business moves they must reapply for a permit. If the owners of Dom’s Coffee were to leave the site, the next tenant would have to go through the same application process.

Mr. Peck commented that he doesn’t know if the Town can place limits on a State Café permit. He explained that since Dom’s Coffee does not own the building, the Town needs to find out if the property owner would be in agreement with whatever the Commission decides.

Ms. Rice communicated her thoughts that the Regulation is not being changed to allow café permits but rather the current situation is being reviewed and found that under the specific circumstances where Dom’s is not looking to have a full bar and plans to close at 10pm is not like a traditional bar that stays open until much later. She noted that her researched indicates that there are ways for the Town to limit certain things and added that she could speak with Liquor Commission to clarify. She clarified that while a State Café permit allows for the sale of liquors it does not require Dom’s to offer anything other than wine, beer, or hard cider for sale.

Mr. Ladouceur commented that probably the only item the Town may have a say in are the hours of operation. Since all the administrative appeals have not been exhausted he noted his concerns to change the Town’s long-standing regulation on Café permits.

Mr. Mahoney commented that he would like to know the history behind not allowing café permits.

Ms. Rice explained that she was told that in all likelihood the restaurant/Tavern permit would be denied (based on past experience and qualifications) and that is why they did not go before the Liquor Commission. If the application is denied there is a one year waiting period to apply for a different/new permit. She explained that the Tavern permit was withdrawn because it never went before the Liquor Commission allowing application for something else. Ms. Rice further explained that in her meeting with the State she was told that if the Town signed off on a café permit that the State would likely approve it.

In response to Mr. Armstrong’s question, Ms. Rice confirmed that Dom’s Coffee meets the separating distances and other criteria contained in the Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Peck clarified that there is no definition for a café permit in the Zoning Regulations. He suggested that he and Ms. Rice could meet with the Liquor Commission to find answers to the Commission’s questions and then provide that information to the Commission so a decision can be made.

Discussion for potential revisions to parking regulations

Mr. Peck explained that there have been issues with the Parking Regulations for a number of years. He indicated that he has reviewed national studies relating to parking standards all over the country in all size towns for just about every use. For example, Avon’s current parking requirements for a retail space up to 10K SF requires 10 spaces per 1,000 SF. He noted that his recommendation is to take this requirement down to 5 spaces per 1,000 SF. Developers only want to build as much parking as they need. He noted that for retail buildings between 10K and 20K SF our current requirement is 8 spaces per 1,000 SF; the national standard is 4.5 spaces per 1,000 SF. He further suggested that for certain uses that parking requirements be proposed as maximums, rather than minimums, to minimize storm water runoff through minimizing impervious surfaces.

Mr. Ladouceur asked if different types of permeable surfaces (grass) could be used and/or required for seasonal parking, in addition to the paved spaces. He referenced West Farms Mall.

Mr. Peck noted his understanding adding that he would take a look at overflow parking. West Farms Mall has enough room for the permeable overflow parking but in Avon a significant amount of land area is needed to be able to fit a small building, due to the language in the Regulations, which is causing problems for some sites along Route 44.

He explained that he wants to take the guess work out of the requirements in the Regulations to better assist applicants and has been working with the Town Attorney. He pointed out his concern for sites in Town that will remain vacant because they cannot meet the requirements of the Regulations.

In response to Ms. Preysner’s question, Mr. Peck explained that room for a snow shelf would always have to be provided.

Mr. Armstrong asked if the national standards could be used for parking maximums while allowing applicants the opportunity to request additional parking.

Mr. Peck noted his understanding adding that his suggestion is that applicants can either meet the standards in the schedule or provide parking information from other similar uses in nearby towns (i.e. reasons for parking requirement changes).

Mr. Peck concluded by indicating that he will have written draft regulations to provide to the Commission regarding parking for all uses within the next meeting or so.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:18pm.

Linda Sadlon

Planning and Community Development