

DRAFT MINUTES
MANSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
Special Meeting
Monday, June 29, 2015 ■ 7:00 PM
Council Chamber, Audrey P. Beck Municipal Building

Members present: Chairman Goodwin, B. Chandy, R. Hall, B. Pociask, K. Rawn, B. Ryan, V. Ward
Members absent: G. Lewis, P. Plante
Alternates present: P. Aho, K. Holt, S. Westa
Staff present: Linda Painter, Director of Planning and Development
Jennifer Kaufman, Natural Resources and Sustainability Coordinator

Due to an error on the Agenda stating that the meeting was to be held in the MCC Community Room, the meeting was not called to order until Kaufman returned from placing a sign on the door of the MCC Community Room stating that the meeting was being held in Council Chambers at the Town Hall.

Chairman Goodwin called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Aho and HOLT were seated in place of absent members.

Mansfield Tomorrow | Our Plan ▶ Our Future:

Members discussed the comments received through the public hearing process on the December 2014 Draft Mansfield Tomorrow Plan of Conservation and Development. The matrix of comments, dated June 24, 2015, organized by chapter, with recommended actions prepared by staff, was used as the basis for Commission discussion. As noted in Painter's memo, the matrix is a compilation of the two matrices previously distributed to the Commission as part of the public hearing. With the exception of the changes identified below, the Commission by consensus concurred with the recommended actions in the matrix. Where specific language was not provided as part of the recommended action, the Commission requested that language be provided for their review and approval.

General

- Page 2 of 7 – Comments from Meg Reich – Members concurred that the use of hyperlinks in an electronic document would be the best approach to indexing and referencing the Plan.
- Page 5 of 7 – Comments from Pat Suprenant, Alison Hilding and Betty Wassmundt regarding environmental protection – Members discussed the concerns raised and concurred that the Plan does comprehensively address protection of natural resources.
- Page 6 of 7 – Comment from Arthur Smith – Goodwin questioned whether the merger of the POCD and Strategic Plan created the potential for conflicts, particularly with regard to economic development activities which have traditionally been more of a Council responsibility. Painter noted that the statutes specifically state that the POCD is also an economic development plan for the municipality and noted that while actions such as tax abatements etc. are the jurisdiction of the Council, decisions on where and how businesses are developed lie with the Commission through both the future land use plan and zoning regulations. However, the Commission believed it necessary to include language in the plan to the effect that, many goals and strategies were the province of other elected officials, such as the Town Council and Board

of Education, and that inclusion of action plans in the POCD supported by these bodies does not necessarily imply approval by the PZC of specific projects or plans which may someday be formally presented to the PZC in an application.

- Page 6 of 7 – Comments from Alison Hilding, Pat Suprenant, Arthur Smith and Virginia Raymond – Chandy requested that staff try to identify additional performance measures; however, members concurred that the suggested metrics of target population, carbon footprint, energy/water usage, etc. were too specific for this type of planning document.

Chapter 2

- Page 3 of 11 – Comment from Joan Buck regarding Eagleville Brook Innovative Watershed Management Plan – Make title bold and all caps
- Page 4 of 11 – Comment from Joan Buck regarding town landfill – In addition to edits proposed by staff, add “former” to subtitles for Town landfill and UConn landfill.
- Page 4 of 11 – Comment from Conservation Commission on Map 2.4 Dams - Add all dams to map with note, if applicable, that they are not presently included in the 2014 DEEP listing
- Chandy noted that the reference in Goal 2.1, Strategy A, Action 4, needed to be corrected to read “See Goal 3.3, Strategy A, Action 2”
- Page 5 of 11 – Comment from Charles Galgowski on Goal 2.1, Strategy B, Action 2: Revise staff proposed language to delete “increase community resilience”
- Page 5 of 11 – Comment from Sustainability Committee on Goal 2.3, Strategy A to add an action on discouraging lawns and highly maintained landscapes – Add action that balances the desire for natural landscapes with the need to have more highly manicured areas to help control the tick population
- Page 6 of 11 – Comment from Joan Buck on Climate Action Plan – provide full comment to Commission for review (cut off in matrix)
- Page 6 of 11 – Comment from Sustainability Committee on Goal 2.4, Strategy A, Action 1 – Confirm that recommended scope of work for task force is consistent with actual scope assigned by the Town Council as part of recent action.
- Page 8 of 11 – Comment from Charles Galgowski – No changes recommended to existing language in Plan
- Page 9 of 11 – Comment from Alison Hilding regarding Chapter 4, Goal 4.2, Strategy B, Actions 1 and 3 – Add the WPCA (Water Pollution Control Authority) to WHO for Action 3
- Page 10 of 11 – Comment from Quentin Kessel regarding new action on forest preservation under Goal 2.4, Add language as recommended by staff.
- Page 11 of 11 – Comment from Roberta Coughlin on new action for Goal 2.3 – this was addressed in the Commission’s recommendation to the Sustainability Committee’s comment on page 5 of 11.

Chapter 3

- Page 2 of 14 – Comment from Agriculture Committee on allowing restoration of land with prime ag soils –This comment conflicted with comments from the Sustainability Committee on Goal 3.2, Strategy A, Action 4 and Strategy B, Action 4 (listed on page 8 of 14). The Commission concurred with the suggested edits to these actions provided by Vicki Wetherell as noted on page 13 of 14.

- Page 11 of 14 – Comment from Quentin Kessel regarding conservation easements – Members concurred that the proposed new action recommended by staff should be added to Goal 3.1, Strategy E.

Chapter 4

- Page 2 of 7 – Comment from Conservation Commission regarding mapping of historic sites – Members concurred that an action should be added to reevaluate historic village boundaries.
- Page 3 of 7 – Comment from Open Space Preservation Committee regarding common driveways – After discussion, members concurred that the current language of Goal 3.4, Strategy A, Action 4 provides the flexibility to identify limitations on common driveway use through revisions to zoning and subdivision regulations without listing specific alternatives.
- Page 5 of 7 – Comment from Conservation Commission regarding scenic roads – Members concurred with the comments of the Conservation Commission and requested that the language regarding conflicts between scenic road designations and expanding the bicycle/pedestrian network be removed. Painter noted that similar changes will also need to be made in Chapter 9.
- Page 7 of 7 – Comment from Conservation Commission regarding Storrs Center Special Design District – After discussion, members concurred on retaining the existing language of Goal 4.2, Strategy E, Action 3 but suggested adding a focus map to Chapter 8 that would specify any extension of the Special Design District to parcels south of Route 275 would need to transition down in scale and massing.

Pociask left the meeting at 8:45 p.m. Westa was seated in his place.

Chapter 5

- In discussing this Chapter, members requested that language be added to the introductory chapter that makes it clear that nothing in this plan would compel the Commission to approve a particular action, be it a specific project or an 8-24 referral from the Town Council. As stated above in general comments.

Chapter 6

- Page 5 of 9 – Comment from Town Council regarding farm worker housing – Members questioned the proposed deletion of this item. Painter noted that this action involved a more active approach to developing farm worker housing and that Goal 6.5, Strategy B, Action 1 addressed changes to regulations to allow for farm worker housing. Members concurred with the deletion of this action and suggested that the action related to regulations be amended to specify farm worker housing instead of housing for seasonal workers.
- Page 7 of 9 – Comments from Virginia Raymond, Betty Wassmundt and Pat Suprenant regarding administrative permit approvals – After discussion, members concurred that the language in Goal 6.5, Strategy A, Action 2 and Strategy C, Action 1 should be retained as they suggest that the Zoning Regulations be revised to identify thresholds for various types of review. Regulations can be drafted to address the need for site plan/special permit approvals and when staff review and/or Commission approval may be appropriate. Members requested that use of the word “streamline” be removed from these actions and other locations and noted that as the regulations are revised to identify thresholds for Commission review, the need for public input on various project types will be considered.

Chapter 7

- Page 2 of 3 – Comment from UConn USG External Affairs Committee – Members questioned the comment regarding the regulations concerning unrelated individuals; specifically that the number of unrelated individuals housed in one location be increased. Painter noted that Goal 7.4, Strategy B, Action 2 recommends changes only as it pertains to multi-family residential developments such as apartment complexes; no changes to limits for condos, single-family, two-family and small multi-family buildings are proposed. No changes were recommended to this action.

Members agreed to review the matrix for the remaining chapters prior to the July 6th PZC meeting. Time permitting, the discussion will be continued at that meeting.

Goodwin adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Linda M. Painter, AICP
Director of Planning and Development