MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MANSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

AUDREY P. BECK MUNICIPAL BUILDING ▪ 4 SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD ▪ COUNCIL CHAMBER

MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2016 ▪ 6:45 PM
OR UPON COMPLETION OF INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY MEETING

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. JULY 18, 2016 – REGULAR MEETING
   B. JULY 20, 2016 – FIELD TRIP NOTES
3. ZONING AGENT'S REPORT
4. PUBLIC HEARING
   A. 6:45 PM ▪ SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION, EFFICIENCY UNIT, D. HEMPLE, 11 SUMMIT ROAD (FILE 1342)
   Memo from Assistant Planner/Zoning Agent
5. OLD BUSINESS
   A. SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION, EFFICIENCY UNIT, D. HEMPLE, 11 SUMMIT ROAD (FILE 1342)
   B. AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS RELATED TO STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, WATER SERVICE CONNECTIONS, ALCOHOL, AND LIVE MUSIC; AND AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS AND MAP TO CREATE A WATER PIPELINE OVERLAY DISTRICT (FILE 907-41)
   C. ZONING REGULATION REVISIONS – MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING
   Memo from Director of Planning and Development
   D. OTHER
6. NEW BUSINESS
   A. CANCELLATION OF AUGUST 15, 2016 MEETING
   Memo from Director of Planning and Development
   B. NOVEMBER MEETING SCHEDULE
   Memo from Director of Planning and Development
   C. PLIMPTON SUBDIVISION BOND (FILE 1298)
   Memo from Director of Planning and Development
   D. OTHER
7. REPORTS FROM OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES
   A. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
   B. REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
   C. REGULATORY REVIEW COMMITTEE
   D. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S REPORT
   E. OTHER
8. COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS
   A. OTHER
9. ADJOURNMENT

Charles Ausburger ▪ Binu Chandy ▪ JoAnn Goodwin ▪ Roswell Hall III ▪ Gregory Lewis ▪ Kenneth Rawn ▪ Bonnie Ryan
Vera Stearns Ward ▪ Susan Westa ▪ Paul Aho (A) ▪ Terry Berthelot (A) ▪ Katie Fratoni (A)

DRAFT MINUTES

MANSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

AUDREY P. BECK MUNICIPAL BUILDING ▪ 4 SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD ▪ COUNCIL CHAMBER

MONDAY, JULY 18, 2016 ▪ REGULAR MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT:	J. Goodwin, C. Ausburger, G. Lewis, K. Rawn, B. Ryan, V. Ward
MEMBERS ABSENT:	B. Chandy, R. Hall, S. Westa
ALTERNATES PRESENT:	P. Aho, T. Berthelot
ALTERNATES ABSENT:	K. Fratoni
STAFF PRESENT:	Linda Painter, Director of Planning and Development Jennifer Kaufman, Inland Wetlands Agent

Chairman Goodwin called the meeting to order at 7:34 p.m. and appointed Aho and Berthelot to act.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. JUNE 20, 2016 – REGULAR MEETING

Ward MOVED, Rawn seconded, to approve the 06-20-2016 minutes as presented. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY. Ward noted that she listened to the recording of the meeting.

ZONING AGENT'S REPORT:

Noted.

PUBLIC HEARING:

A. AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS RELATED TO STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, WATER SERVICE CONNECTIONS, ALCOHOL, AND LIVE MUSIC; AND AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS AND MAP TO CREATE A WATER PIPELINE OVERLAY DISTRICT (PZC FILE 907-41)

Chairman Goodwin opened the Continued Public Hearing at 7:37 p.m. Members present were Goodwin, Ausburger, Lewis, Rawn, Ryan, Ward and alternates Aho and Berthelot both of whom were appointed to act. Linda Painter, Director of Planning and Development noted the following communications received and distributed to members of the Commission since the Public Hearing on 6/20/16: a 7/18/16 memo from L. Painter, Director of Planning and Development and a 7/12/16 memo from Attorney Deneen.

Chairman Goodwin suggested either defining "full service" from the alcohol regulations and using the term consistently throughout the regulation or removing it from the proposed regulation entirely.

Alison Hilding, 17 Southwood Road, stated that not enough information was provided to the public regarding the meaning and purpose of the proposed revisions and the potential long-term effect(s) on the Town that might result.

The Chairman noted there were no further comments or questions from the public or Commission. Rawn MOVED, Ward seconded, to close the Public Hearing at 7:44 p.m. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

OLD BUSINESS:

A. AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS RELATED TO STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, WATER SERVICE CONNECTIONS, ALCOHOL, AND LIVE MUSIC; AND AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS AND MAP TO CREATE A WATER PIPELINE OVERLAY DISTRICT (PZC FILE 907-41)
Discussion of the proposed amendments focused on the proposed regulations for brewpubs, brewpubs/restaurants and breweries, particularly with regard to potential water usage and appropriate locations for uses that include manufacturing for the purpose of wholesale distribution. Rawn volunteered to draft a motion for consideration at the next meeting.

B. ZONING REGULATION REVISIONS – MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING
Item was tabled pending responses from Advisory Committees.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. UNITED SERVICES REQUEST FOR EXTENSION (PZC FILE 1302)
Lewis MOVED, Ryan seconded, that the PZC approve a one-year extension, until September 19, 2017, of the special permit granted to United Services, Inc., for the construction of an office building and associated site development on North Frontage Road. MOTION PASED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. REFERRAL FROM COUNCIL RE: OUTDOOR WOOD BURNING FURNACES
After discussion, members concurred that anyone who proposes a revision to the zoning regulations or a new regulation must submit a formal application for the Commission's consideration after public hearing and appropriate referrals.

C. SPECIAL PERMIT APPLICATION, EFFICIENCY UNIT, D. HEMPLE, 11 SUMMIT ROAD (PZC FILE 1342)
Ward MOVED, Ryan seconded, to receive the Special Permit Application (File #1342) submitted by David Hempel for an efficiency unit within a single family dwelling on property located at 11 Summit Road as shown on plans dated July 2016, as shown and described in application submissions, and to refer said application to staff and committees for review and comments and to set a Public Hearing for 8-1-16. MOTION PASED UNANIMOUSLY.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES:

- Linda Painter noted an Ad Hoc Committee on Rental Regulations and Enforcement on 8/10/16 at 5pm at the Mansfield Community Center.
- Chairman Goodwin noted a 7/20/16 Field Trip set for 2pm.

COMMUNICATIONS AND BILLS:

Noted.

ADJOURNMENT:

The Chair declared the meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Vera S. Ward, Secretary

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

MANSFIELD INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
CONSERVATION COMMISSION

SPECIAL JOINT MEETING ▪ FIELD TRIP

FIELD TRIP NOTES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 20, 2016

IWA Members present:	P. Aho, J. Goodwin (items 4 & 6), B. Ryan, V. Ward (item 1 only)
Conservation Commission:	S. Lehman (items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6)
Staff present:	Jennifer Kaufman, Environmental Planner/Inland Wetlands Agent

Field trip began at approximately 2:05 pm.

W1573 – G. SOTZING, 144 HILLYNDALE ROAD, ABOVE GROUND HOT TUB

Members were met on site by M. Sotzing. Current conditions and site characteristics were observed. No decisions were made.

P1342 – D. HEMPEL, 11 SUMMIT ROAD, EFFICIENCY UNIT

Members were met on site by D. Hempel. Current conditions and site characteristics were observed. No decisions were made.

W1572 – R. BOBB, 840 WORMWOOD HILL ROAD, AQUATICS MANAGEMENT

Members observed current conditions and site characteristics. No decisions were made.

W1558 – K. MEHRENS, 214 WORMWOOD HILL ROAD, GARAGE

Members were met on site by K. Mehrens. Current conditions and site characteristics were observed. No decisions were made.

W1570 – FUNK AND LITTLE, 30 CENTRE STREET, GEOTHERMAL WELLS AND SITE WORK

Members were met on site by D. Little. Current conditions and site characteristics were observed. No decisions were made.

W1571 – C. LOUKAS, 46 JONATHAN LANE, INGROUND POOL

Members were met on site by J. Loukas. Current conditions and site characteristics were observed. No decisions were made.

W1568 – T. AINSWORTH, WOODLAND ROAD (PARCEL ID 18.67.3), SINGLE FAMILY HOME

Members were met on site by Tom Ainsworth, John Monticello, Jo and Allen Barstow. Current conditions and site characteristics were observed. No decisions were made.

Field Trip adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Charles Ausburger ▪ Binu Chandy ▪ JoAnn Goodwin ▪ Roswell Hall III ▪ Gregory Lewis ▪ Kenneth Rawn ▪ Bonnie Ryan
Vera Stearns Ward ▪ Susan Westa ▪ Paul Aho (A) ▪ Terry Berthelot (A) ▪ Katie Fratoni (A)

TOWN OF MANSFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 21, 2016

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Janell M. Mullen, Assistant Planner/ZEO

Subject: Special Permit Application-Efficiency Unit
11 Summit Road
PZC File #1342

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The following comments are based on a review of submitted information (Statement of Purpose, Site Plan and Floor Plan dated July, 2016, and other application submissions), and a review of pertinent zoning regulations, particularly Article X, Section L and Article V, Section B.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting special permit approval for an efficiency unit in association with an existing single-family home on property located at 11 Summit Road. No site work or exterior building alterations are proposed.

As the applicant is not proposing to make any site improvements or exterior changes to the existing house, most of the site plan information required pursuant to Article V, Section 5.A.3.d has not been provided.

COMPLIANCE WITH ZONING REGULATIONS

The following list summarizes the requirements that must be met before the Commission can approve a special permit pursuant to Article X, Section L.2.a. Compliance with these criteria is indicated by a ☒ and a narrative description. If a requirement has not been met, it is preceded by a ☐.

☒ Unit Size. *The unit must contain at least 400 square feet and cannot exceed 35% of the floor area of the single family home in which it is located.*

The proposed efficiency unit is approximately 600 square feet, which equates to ±36% of the floor area of the home, which is currently 2,166 square feet.

☒ Facilities. *The unit must include independent living quarters, a distinct kitchen area, and a bathroom with sanitary and bathing facilities.*

The proposed efficiency unit has a bathroom, bedroom with a closet, and open floor plan kitchen/living/dining room.

☒ Occupancy. *Either the single-family home or the efficiency unit must be owner-occupied. An affidavit certifying owner occupancy and a statement that the provisions of Article X, Section L have been met must be submitted as part of the application.*

The applicant indicated in the Statement of Use that the home is owner-occupied. An affidavit certifying owner occupancy has been provided.

☒ Access. *Interior access between the single-family residence and the efficiency unit is required.*

According to the statement of use, access to the efficiency apartment is provided from both inside the home and direct access to the exterior as it was developed as a walkout basement.

☒ Off-Street Parking. *A minimum of 3 spaces with unobstructed access must be provided.*

The property currently has two parking spaces in the driveway to accommodate the vehicles used by the residents and two parking spaces within the existing garage to accommodate the homeowners.

☒ Maximum Occupancy. *Occupancy of the efficiency unit is limited to 2 people.*

Pursuant to the statement of use submitted, the unit will be occupied by no more than two people.

☒ Use and Dimensional Requirements. *The single-family home must comply with use and dimensional requirements (height, area, yards) for the district in which it is located. No efficiency units are permitted on a lot with less than 40,000 square feet.*

The lot on which the home is located contains 2.07 acres in Mansfield or 90,169 square feet according to the Town Assessor records. The front and rear setbacks conform to current standards.

☒ Character. *The home in which the unit is located must retain its character as a single-family residence.*

Based on our observations from the field trip on July 20, 2016, the house appears to be a single-family home.

☒ **Sanitary System.** *The applicant must demonstrate adequate sewage disposal prior to Commission approval of the special permit.*

The Eastern Highlands Health District has approved the B100A application for the addition of a kitchen to the finished basement in order to convert the space to an approved efficiency-unit.

☒ **Flood Hazards.** *Efficiency units are not permitted within Flood Hazard Areas as defined in Article X, Section E of the Zoning Regulations.*

Based on available maps, there are no flood hazard areas in the vicinity of the house.

☒ **Street Frontage.** *All efficiency units must be located on a lot with street frontage as defined in the Zoning Regulations.*

The property has about 285 feet of frontage on Summit Lane. Pursuant to Article VIII, Section B.4.a., the minimum required 200 foot frontage for the RAR-90 zone has been met.

☒ **Inland Wetlands Agency.** *IWA approval is required for any proposed improvements within regulated wetland/watercourse areas prior to approval of the special permit.*

No site improvements were proposed as part of the application.

APPROVAL CONSIDERATIONS

Pursuant to Article V, Section B.5, the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Commission that the proposed development will not detrimentally affect the public's health, welfare and safety and that the development meets the following approval criteria for special permit applications:

a. That all approval criteria in Article V, Section A.5 (Site Plan Approval Criteria) of these regulations have been met.
b. That the proposed use is compatible with the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development and Article I of the Zoning Regulations I(Intent and Purpose)
c. That the location and size of the proposed use and the nature and intensity of use in relation to the size of the lot will be in harmony with the orderly development of the Town and compatible with other existing uses.
d. That proper consideration has been given to the aesthetic quality of the proposal, including architectural design, landscaping, and proper use of the site's natural features. The kind, size, location and height of structures, and the nature and extent of site work, and the nature and intensity of the use, shall not hinder or discourage the use of neighboring properties or diminish the value thereof. All applicable standards contained in Article X, Section R shall be incorporated into the plans.

The subject efficiency unit is not expected to detract from the house's overall appearance as a single-family home and it is not expected that the efficiency unit will result in detrimental neighborhood impacts. Public Hearing testimony may provide more information regarding this issue.

SUMMARY/RECOMMENDATION

Subject to any testimony received during the public hearing, the proposal is considered to be in compliance with regulatory provisions and is not expected to cause any detrimental neighborhood impacts. Any approval motion should include a waiver of the site plan information required in Article V, Section A.3 as the information is not needed to determine compliance with the regulations.

If deemed appropriate, the following motion has been prepared for the Commission's consideration:

MOVE, to approve the July 8, 2016 application of David Hempel to allow an efficiency dwelling unit at 11 Summit Lane in an RAR-90 zone, as shown on submitted plans and described in other application submissions and as presented at Public Hearing on August 1, 2016.

Pursuant to Article V, Section B.4 of the Mansfield Zoning Regulations, the site plan requirements contained in Section B.3.d are hereby waived as there is no proposed expansion of the building and the information is not needed to determine compliance with the zoning regulations.

This approval is granted because the application is not expected to result in any detrimental neighborhood impacts and is considered to be in compliance with Article X, Section L; Article V, Section B; and other provisions of the Mansfield Zoning Regulations, and is granted with the following conditions:

1. This approval has been granted for a one-bedroom efficiency in association with a single-family home having up to four additional bedrooms. Any increase in the number of bedrooms on this property shall necessitate subsequent review and approval from the Eastern Highlands Health District and the Planning and Zoning Commission.

2. This approval is conditioned upon continued compliance with Mansfield's Zoning Regulations for efficiency units, which include owner-occupancy requirements, limitations on the number of residents in an efficiency unit and limitations on the number of unrelated individuals that may live in a dwelling unit pursuant to the definition of Family contained in the Zoning Regulations. These limitations apply regardless of the number of bedrooms present in the home. Pursuant to Article X, Section L.2, the applicant shall submit a notarized affidavit certifying owner occupancy and a written statement regarding compliance with efficiency unit regulations every two years, starting on January 1, 2018.

3. This special permit shall not become valid until filed upon the Land Records by the applicant.

NOTES

- The analysis and recommendations contained in this report are based on the following information submitted by the applicants:
  - Application submitted July 7, 2016 and received by the PZC on July 18, 2016 including:
    - Statement of Use/Consistency with Efficiency Unit Requirements
    - Floor plan of proposed efficiency unit
    - Site plan
    - Site Plan Checklist and associated waiver requests
    - B100A approval dated July 15, 2016
- The following correspondence regarding the proposed development has been received:
  -
- Neighborhood Notification Forms were required to be sent to property owners within 500 feet of the subject property in accordance with Article V, Section B(3)(c) of the Mansfield Zoning Regulations. A copy of the notice and certified mail receipts have been provided.
- The Public Hearing on this item will be opened on August 1, 2016 and must be closed by September 5, 2016 unless a written extension is granted by the applicants.
- Before rendering a decision, the Planning and Zoning Commission must consider other referral reports and public hearing testimony. A decision must be made within 65 days of the close of the Public Hearing unless the applicants grant a written extension.

TOWN OF MANSFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 28, 2016

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Linda M. Painter, AICP

Subject: Zoning Regulations: Proposed Approach to Multi-Family Housing Regulation Updates

OVERVIEW

In June, the Commission referred the attached draft approach to Multi-Family Housing Regulation Updates to several town advisory committees for review and comment. The minutes of various committees are attached for the Commission's review, with the exception of the Economic Development Commission which was scheduled to discuss the approach subsequent to the preparation of this memo. The EDC's comments will be distributed to the Commission at the August 1st meeting. It should also be noted that the Transportation Advisory Committee did not meet; however, the Chair did review the proposed approach and did not have any recommended changes.

The draft approach has also been forwarded to the Town Attorney for review. We will be discussing questions raised by the Zoning Focus Group with regard to the definition of family with him in addition to the overall approach.

Prior to referring this item to the Regulatory Review Committee for the purpose of drafting regulations, the Commission should review the comments received and identify any changes to the approach based on the feedback. If the Town Attorney identifies any significant issues with the proposed approach, staff will work with the Regulatory Review Committee, and if needed, the Commission as a whole to modify the approach accordingly.

DRAFT MINUTES

MANSFIELD TOMORROW ZONING FOCUS GROUP

AUDREY P. BECK MUNICIPAL BUILDING ▪ 4 SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD

THURSDAY, JULY 21, 2016 ▪ SPECIAL MEETING

MEMBERS PRESENT:	A. Booth; A. Hilding
MEMBERS ABSENT:	G. Padick; E. Pelletier
STAFF PRESENT:	L. Painter, Director of Planning and Development; J. Mullen, Assistant Planner; J. Kaufman, Inland Wetlands Agent

Painter opened the meeting at 9:03 am.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A. MARCH 16, 2016 – SPECIAL MEETING

As two members were absent, no action was taken with regard to the March 16, 2016 minutes.

DRAFT APPROACH TO MULTI-FAMILY HOUSING REGULATIONS

Painter provided an overview of the draft approach to updating regulations related to multi-family housing and distributed copies of written comments provided by members Padick and Pelletier. The following comments/issues were raised by Hilding and Booth regarding the proposed approach:

- *Definition of Family.* Booth and Hilding disagreed with the recommendation that the definition of family be amended to allow for more than 3 unrelated adults to be authorized in managed multi-family apartment complexes. In particular, they expressed the following concerns:
  - A change from 3 to 4 adults would result in a 25% increase in population density, which could have significant impacts on traffic generation, parking, impervious surface, water and sewer usage/capacity.
  - The proposed change would draw more students into the neighborhoods by accommodating off-campus housing, which is contrary to the national trend of universities providing more housing on campus.
  - There is less oversight of students living off-campus, resulting in behavioral issues, public safety concerns and property damage.
  - The proposed change would not guarantee any change to affordability of units.
  - Change would have a negative impact on the character of the community and the natural environment.
  - Concerned with potential impact if court determines that a municipality cannot establish different regulations for different areas/types of development.
- *Minimum Unit Size.* Hilding questioned whether minimum floor area requirements for units would be included in the regulations.

- *Affordable Housing.* Hilding did not support inclusion of a fee-in-lieu option for the affordable housing component, concerned with the potential of such an option to create segregated housing that create disparate impacts on schools and neighborhoods.
- *Flexibility.* Questions were raised as to why flexibility in regulations was suggested/needed.
- *Management Plans.* Hilding expressed concern that the proposed requirement for management plans would be unenforceable and therefore not achieve the desired goal.
- *Compact Residential Districts.* The following concerns were expressed with regard to the proposed approach to creating Compact Residential (CR) Zones:
    - The approach is predicated on having appropriate land use designations. Hilding indicated that some of the areas designated for Compact Residential use in the current plan are inappropriate and questioned how the POCD would be updated as conditions change.
    - Members were concerned that the approach would limit public involvement in the process.
    - Impervious surface maximums need to be identified based on the subject watershed and take into account existing conditions.
    - Town should start evaluating air quality in addition to other environmental concerns.
    - Resulting traffic patterns and impacts on neighborhoods.
    - Approach and regulations should encourage design and marketing of units to families and professionals, not students.
    - Water use should be prioritized for business zones; a cost/benefit analysis should be conducted with regard to proposed water use for individual projects
    - Concern that a preliminary plan will not provide sufficient detail and could result in problems when a more detailed plan is provided.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

- Charles Vidick, Ashford. Questioned the legality of establishing different standards for what constitutes a family in different zones/development types; indicated that communities do not have the ability to regulate minimum unit size pursuant to a CT Supreme Court decision; supported updating open space requirements and identified a need to define the purpose of open space (passive, recreation, etc.); and suggested that the Town may not want to use a 3rd party sustainability verification system such as LEED as some of the standards raise the cost of housing.
- Tom Fahey, Fahey & Landolina, Attorneys LLC. Confirmed that East Hampton case eliminated minimum floor area requirements; supported proposed fee-in-lieu option for affordable housing;

indicated that many towns allow more than 3 unrelated adults to be considered a family, such as Glastonbury which allows 6.

- Anthony Giorgio, Keystone Properties. Supported a holistic approach to updating regulations; indicated that when done consistent with an overall vision, development can enhance the quality of the community; identified need for a balance between nature and man; referenced the Simsbury Design Development District as a similar approach; indicated that the uniqueness of Mansfield needs to be taken into account as regulations are drafted; and expressed interest in working with the Town to update the regulations.
- Rebecca Shafer, Echo Road. Identified need for any increase in students in managed apartments needs to be evaluated with regard to neighborhood impacts, particularly in certain neighborhoods; indicated that the Oaks on the Square were not necessarily well-managed given the private security now being employed; requested that any increase in the number of unrelated individuals in apartment complexes be considered concurrently with a reduction in the number of unrelated individuals in other housing types and that an amended definition of dormitory also be added to limit student housing in neighborhoods; suggested that additional multi-family development on Hunting Lodge Road would be a disaster and encouraged new development to focus on the addition of single-family homes to diversify the neighborhood; and expressed a desire for the town/university to implement buy back/conversion programs.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda M. Painter, AICP

Director of Planning and Development

Linda M. Painter

From: Gregory Padick <padickgj@snet.net>
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2016 6:00 PM
To: Jessie Richard; allison Hilding (aahilding@gmail.com); e.pelletier@datumengr.com; Aline Booth
Cc: Linda M. Painter; Janell M. Mullen; Jennifer S. Kaufman
Subject: Re: Zoning Focus Group Meeting: Thursday 7/21 @ 9am

Greeting all;
Unfortunately, I will not be present at Thursday's Zoning Focus Group meeting. I have reviewed the meeting packet and offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. I support the elimination of existing multi-family regulations and the establishment of new "Compact Residential" special design district provisions that would link a zone change to a site specific development plan. This approach, similar to the Storrs Center regulatory provisions, will allow PZC members maximum flexibility to take into account and address site and neighborhood characteristics, infrastructure capacity, architectural design and sustainability criteria and flexible setback and dimensional provisions. This approach will not be easy to implement but the results will justify the effort. Developers will still need to address site and neighborhood issues but this approach will encourage creative designs and compatibility with Plan of Conservation and Development recommendations. Eliminating a subsequent special Permit requirement will provide more certainty for financing appropriately designed multi-family developments.

2. The staff identified requirements for establishing a "Compact Residential" special design district (starting on Page 7 of the packet) appear to be comprehensive and appropriate and serve as a good starting point for drafting implementation regulations. As was the case with the Storrs Center Special Design District Regulations, the drafting will need to be carefully coordinated with the Town Attorney.

3. I strongly endorse increasing the maximum number of unrelated persons per dwelling unit. The current limit of 3 is inappropriate for a well designed multi-family project that is within a area designated for higher density development. Due to a limited area served by public sewer and water systems, allowing increased density in these areas will promote public transit opportunities, enhance commercial viability and help reduce pressure on single family conversions from owner occupancy to rental occupancy.

4. The new regulations need to carefully incorporate overall density provisions. Perhaps a range can be provided with incentives for higher densities based on locational factors and design merit.

5. Allowing increased building heights for sites within or in close proximity to commercial areas should be considered

6. I support flexible setbacks between buildings to allow for more creative design. The current setbacks between building were enacted based on Fire Marshal recommendations which will need to be reviewed.

7. I strongly support the incorporation of stringent property management requirements, particularly for projects designed for student occupancy. All managements requirements will need to be legally documented and binding.

8. The current affordable housing provisions (tied to unit size) were adopted after determining that the PZC and staff would have a very difficult time addressing, on an ongoing basis, income verification. If the Housing Authority is willing to assume this responsibility, incorporating an income approach would be preferable due to State affordable housing appeal and exemption provisions.

9. Authorizing limited accessory commercial uses in conjunction with a multi-family development is not considered a design or management problem. I do question whether such a limited commercial use would be economically viable.

I look forward to the ongoing challenge to update Mansfield's regulation of multi-family housing

Greg Padick

On Tuesday, July 19, 2016 8:37 AM, Jessie Richard <RichardJL@mansfieldct.org> wrote:

Just a reminder that there is a Zoning Focus Group Meeting Thursday 7/21 at 9am. Please use the link below.

From: Jessie Richard
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2016 11:14 AM
To: allison Hilding (aahilding@gmail.com) <aahilding@gmail.com>; e.pelletier@datumengr.com; Gregory Padick <padickgj@snet.net>; aline.booth@gmail.com
Cc: Linda M. Painter <PainterLM@mansfieldct.org>; Janell M. Mullen <MullenJM@mansfieldct.org>; Jennifer S. Kaufman (KaufmanJS@MANSFIELDCT.ORG) <KaufmanJS@MANSFIELDCT.ORG>
Subject: Zoning Focus Group Meeting: 7-21-16 @ 9am

Members,

Please use the link below to view the Zoning Focus Group Meeting Agenda and packet material for the July 21st meeting at 9am.
http://www.mansfieldct.gov/filestorage/1904/5335/23389/34374/20160721_packet.pdf

Jessie L. Richard
Town of Mansfield
Planning and Community Development
4 South Eagleville Road
Storrs, CT 06268
(860)429-3330

Linda M. Painter

From: e.pelletier@datumengr.com
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2016 6:25 AM
To: Jessie Richard
Cc: Linda M. Painter; Jennifer S. Kaufman; Janell M. Mullen
Subject: RE: Zoning Focus Group Meeting: Thursday 7/21 @ 9am

Good morning Jessie:

Due to my work schedule and commitments I will not be able to make the meeting today. I have reviewed the packet along with Greg Padick's comments. I concur with Greg's comments and sorry that I can not attend.

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: Zoning Focus Group Meeting: Thursday 7/21 @ 9am
From: Jessie Richard <RichardJL@mansfieldct.org>
Date: Tue, July 19, 2016 8:37 am
To: "allison Hilding (aahilding@gmail.com)" <aahilding@gmail.com>, "e.pelletier@datumengr.com" <e.pelletier@datumengr.com>, Greg Padick <padickgj@snet.net>, Aline Booth <aline.booth@att.net>
Cc: "Linda M. Painter" <PainterLM@mansfieldct.org>, "Janell M. Mullen" <MullenJM@mansfieldct.org>, "Jennifer S. Kaufman" <KaufmanJS@MANSFIELDCT.ORG>

Just a reminder that there is a Zoning Focus Group Meeting Thursday 7/21 at 9am. Please use the link below.

From: Jessie Richard
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2016 11:14 AM
To: allison Hilding (aahilding@gmail.com) <aahilding@gmail.com>; e.pelletier@datumengr.com; Gregory Padick <padickgj@snet.net>; aline.booth@gmail.com
Cc: Linda M. Painter <PainterLM@mansfieldct.org>; Janell M. Mullen <MullenJM@mansfieldct.org>; Jennifer S. Kaufman (KaufmanJS@MANSFIELDCT.ORG) <KaufmanJS@MANSFIELDCT.ORG>
Subject: Zoning Focus Group Meeting: 7-21-16 @ 9am

Members,

Please use the link below to view the Zoning Focus Group Meeting Agenda and packet material for the July 21st meeting at 9am.
http://www.mansfieldct.gov/filestorage/1904/5335/23389/34374/20160721_packet.pdf

Jessie L. Richard
Town of Mansfield
Planning and Community Development
4 South Eagleville Road
Storrs, CT 06268
(860)429-3330

Town of Mansfield
CONSERVATION COMMISSION
Meeting of 20 July 2016
Conference B, Audrey P. Beck Building
(draft) MINUTES

Members present: Neil Facchinetti, Quentin Kessel, Mary Harper (Alt.), Scott Lehmann, Grant Meitzler, John Silander. *Members absent*: Aline Booth (Alt.), Robert Dahn, Michael Soares. *Others present*: Jennifer Kaufman (Wetlands Agent).

1. The meeting was **called to order** at 7:34p by Chair Quentin Kessel. In the absence of two members, Alternate Mary Harper was entitled to participate fully in the business of the meeting.

2. The **draft minutes** of the 15 June 2016 meeting were approved as written.

3. IWA referrals. {Lehmann participated in the IWA Field Trip to these sites earlier on 20 July.}

a. **W1570 (Funk & Little, 30 Center St).** The applicant seeks a permit for work already done within the regulated area: installation of a new geothermal heating/cooling system behind the house and replacement of a water line to the house from a well-house at the edge of Echo Lake. According to Kaufman's memo of 11 July, an inspection of the site on 13 May (pursuant to a query from a neighbor) revealed "approximately 15 cubic yards of soil ... stockpiled approximately 40 feet from the edge of Echo Lake and disturbed soil approximately 20 feet from the edge of the lake," apparently without any silt fencing in place to contain erosion. After some discussion, the Commission unanimously agreed (**motion:** Kessel, Silander) to comment as follows:

> The Commission is disappointed to learn that a project involving stockpiling 15 cubic yards of fill within 40 feet of Echo Lake and work within 20 feet of the lake, both without proper erosion controls, has been carried out without the required wetlands permit. The Commission urges the Town to explore options for penalties to discourage flouting wetlands regulations.

b. **W1571 (Loukas, 46 Jonathan La).** An 18x36 in-ground swimming pool is proposed at the edge of the development envelope behind the house. The site slopes slightly east of north and parallel to the back of the house; it would need some leveling. Wetlands lie to the east, 83 feet across a flat area from the proposed pool. The Commission unanimously agreed (**motion:** Silander, Harper) that no significant wetlands impact is to be expected from this project as long as standard erosion controls are employed during construction.

c. **W1572 (Bobb, 840 Wormwood Hill Rd).** The applicant proposes to control invasive water chestnut in Leander Pond by mechanical harvesting, repeated annually (as needed) for the life of the permit. Harvested material would be piled on shore behind hay bales at two locations to dewater and then be moved for composting. A permeable curtain at the pond's outlet would prevent plant fragments from migrating downstream. A similar application for water chestnut removal in the Ashford portion of Leander Pond is being made to the Ashford IWA by Dennis Heffley. Kaufman indicated that approval would be conditioned on a satisfactory protocol for cleaning equipment, lest water chestnut fragments from Leander Pond be transported elsewhere (or invasives from elsewhere introduced to Leander Pond). Silander & Meitzler suggested piling harvested material away from the shore for dewatering to avoid nutrient loading of the pond as it decays. After some discussion, the Commission agreed unanimously (**motion:** Silander, Lehmann) to (1) commend the landowners for their

coordinated effort to deal with this invasive aquatic plant in an environmentally sensitive way and to (2) recommend stockpiling harvested material farther from shore to minimize the risk of nutrients leaching into the pond.

d. **W1753 (Sotzing, 144 Hillyndale Rd).** The applicant proposes to install a hot tub on the W side of his house. The land there slopes gradually and then more steeply to Eagleville Brook, 110 ft away to the north. The application claims at C(1)(b) that "little ground should [have to] be regraded", but no details about the installation are provided. {C(3) mentions using "concrete"; Kaufman's 15 July memo says the tub will be installed "on top of an 11'x11' wooden deck platform"; the filled weight of the tub, not including occupants, is given as 4,508 lbs.} Nonetheless, the Commission decided unanimously (**motion:** Silander, Facchinetti) that no significant impact on wetlands is to be expected from this project, provided appropriate measures are taken to prevent erosion during and after construction.

e. **W1558 (Mehrens, 214 Wormwood Hill Rd).** The applicant asks for a modification of an existing wetlands permit: instead of a shed, a 24'x36' garage is proposed for a site now used for parking just off the driveway. The back of the garage would be close to a rough stone wall, beyond which lie wetlands; however, the land at the proposed garage site slopes slightly away from the wall towards Wormwood Hill Rd. The Commission agreed unanimously (**motion:** Kessel, Harper) that the proposed modification is unlikely to have a significant wetlands impact, provided standard measures are taken to keep sediment out of the wetland.

4. Storrs Center oak. An e-mail to John Carrington (sender not identified) claims that the Storrs Center oak is dying and suggests that the cause is lack of water. The Commission unanimously agreed (**motion:** Kessel, Silander) to ask Kaufman to contact the Tree Warden and, should the tree is found to be in danger, to initiate steps to save it.

5. Proposed approach to updating multi-family zoning regulations. The Town's zoning regulations need to be updated to implement its new Plan of Conservation and Development (PoCD). A memo dated 01 June from Linda Painter to the PZC proposes (p.7) that (1) multi-family zoning regulations be revised to collapse the four current types of multi-family districts into one "Compact Residential" (CR) district and that (2) the definition of 'family' be revised to allow more than 3 unrelated individuals to occupy a unit in a CR development. Regulations governing such developments would be designed to further the objectives of the PoCD – see pp.7-10 for an outline. Kaufman urged Commission members to study the memo and to comment on the suggested approach; if accepted by the PZC, it will be the framework for revising the zoning regulations governing multi-family developments ranging from student apartments to assisted-living facilities.

6. Storrs Lodges. The wetlands application (W1564) for Storrs Lodges will be resubmitted on 01 August. The public hearing will be on 06 September – and probably continued to October or beyond. Kaufman suggested inviting the Town's consultant on W1564 to attend the Commission's September meeting, and it was agreed to do so. She noted that the IWA lacks statutory authority to deny a wetlands permit on the ground that development would negatively impact wetland plants or animals, except where the wetland's "physical characteristics" are altered (e.g., by sedimentation). That the Storrs Lodges development would reduce populations of wood frogs and salamanders that utilize the vernal pool by eliminating habitat in the area surrounding it is not a relevant consideration for the IWA. This kind of argument should be made to the PZC. Harper is concerned that storm-water infiltration basins proposed for the development will not function properly, given the soils on the property. Kaufman encouraged

her to address such questions to the consultant.

7. Conservation easement monitoring. Kaufman will advertise gatherings of more than one Commission member to monitor conservation easements as “meetings” of the Commission, which members of the public may attend.

8. Adjourned at 9:26p. Next meeting: 7:30p, Wednesday, 17 August 2016 – unless there is insufficient business.

Scott Lehmann, Secretary, 22 July 2016.

Open Space Preservation Committee
Tuesday, July 19, 2016
DRAFT Minutes
Mansfield Town Hall, Council Chamber
7:00p.m.

1. **Call to order**
   The meeting was called to order at 7:10 pm.

2. **Attendance**
   Members present: Jim Morrow (chair), Ken Feathers, Quentin Kessel, Vicky Wetherell, Michael Soares.

   Others present: Alison Hilding (Southwood Rd, Mansfield; spokesperson for Mansfield Environmental Trust, LLC)

3. **Review of Minutes**
   Minutes of the June 2016 meeting were approved.

4. **Opportunity for Public Comment**
   Alison Hilding came to express her support and encouragement for the OSPC to consider a privately-owned parcel for preservation by the town. The property is in the Eagleville Brook watershed and abuts the Brook for approximately 1000 feet. In her opinion, open space is lacking in the NW portion of town. Additionally, the Brook has a history of impairment, and so conservation efforts in the Brook's watershed should be a high priority (email correspondence with DEEP staff on this subject was shared with OSPC members and Jennifer Kaufman). The town's criteria for open space acquisition, updated in the new Plan of Conservation & Development, and the process that begins an evaluation for acquisition were also discussed.

5. **Old Business**
   Permanently Protect Open Space – At the August meeting, a draft version of an agenda item summary will be reviewed and discussed. Once finalized, this summary will be given to the Town Council and Town Manager.

6. **New Business**
   Draft Approach to Multi-Family Zoning – OSPC members received draft zoning regulations (in packet) and "Proposed Process for Rewrite of Mansfield Zoning and Subdivision Regulations" (handout). The latter describes the process by which changes to regulations will be proposed and made; in general, due to the scope of potential revisions it is suggested that initial discussions will focus on topics rather than reviewing draft text of specific regulations.

   Of note in the draft regulations in the packet are the Challenges/Issues on pages 2-3, the last of which recognizes that "While regulations require a certain amount of open space per unit, there is no guidance provided as to the types of open space or how open space should be integrated into the design."

   Different parts of the draft mention neighborhoods, both existing ones and those created by new developments. This led to a discussion about larger developments' influence on neighborhoods (both types) and the design and planning processes prior to construction. All members in attendance agreed that the some sort of neighborhood visioning strategy is needed. This could apply to all of Mansfield but would be especially important for those areas identified in the Future Land Use Map as Compact/Residential. The objectives of such a strategy would be to establish

a specific guiding vision for a neighborhood or group of neighborhoods; examples are Meadowbrook Lane and Hunting Lodge Rd.

7. **Executive Session**
   The committee voted to go into Executive Session at 8:26 and to come out of Executive Session at 9:25. Recommendations made at this time will forwarded to the Town Manager.

8. **Communications**
   Minutes
   - Conservation Commission
   - PZC
   - IWA

9. **Adjournment**
   The meeting was adjourned at 9:27.

DRAFT

Sustainability Committee
Minutes of Meeting

July 13, 2016

Present: Lynn Stoddard, Sarah Munro, Bill Lennon, Peter Millman, George Rawitscher, Margaret Rubega, Gary Bent, Matt Hart, John Carrington, Allen Corson, Janell Mullen, Joe Bernatowicz (EMG), Mary Endsley (EMG), Virginia Walton (staff)

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 pm by chairperson Stoddard. Introductions were made.

The approval of the June meeting minutes were deferred until there is a meeting quorum.

Hart introduced the facilities study which is an audit of the condition of the municipal buildings with an analysis of current and future facility needs. The schools, parking lots and open land are not included in the study, but the schools are interested in conducting a similar study. The consulting firm conducting the study, EMG, has assessed each site and will be finished analyzing their findings by the end of this month. Joe Bernatowicz and Mary Endsley from EMG were on hand to address questions. They are looking at building energy use (kWh & BTUs) and opportunities to introduce renewable energy. They are using current climatic conditions, rather than projected climate change conditions, to evaluate efficiencies of systems. Opportunities for water harvesting is not part of the study. After a staff review, the study will be available for resident comments by late summer or early fall.

Hart stated that the solar installations on the bus garage, public works garage and landfill are on hold. The Town is in the process of hiring a law firm that is versed in renewable energy contracts. Hart wants legal assistance to create a comprehensive plan for municipal solar installations.

Hart walked the committee through the modified climate action priorities spreadsheet. A progress update column was added identifying where the Town has been taking action. After reviewing the Town's actions, the task force asked Hart how they might be of further assistance. Hart suggested identification of a few immediate priorities, champion initiatives before the town council, help with research and finding funding. Mullen stated that the matrix is a useful tool and hopes that it is kept updated.

Mullen gave an overview of the proposed changes to the multi-family housing regulations. Where there are now fragmented districts and dimensional zoning, the changes are an attempt to encompass a comprehensive view. A developer would create a district in order to encourage design that reflects and responds to the unique characteristics of a neighborhood. The comments from the committee and task force included: (1) the importance of having current flood maps to avoid development in those areas; (2) Create incentives for developers who are innovative; (3) Refer to Hartford's revised zoning regulations for good examples; (4) Require designers to meet a BTU per square foot index that they have to guarantee performance; (5) Building performance targets should be net zero energy, zero waste and zero water use. It was decided that the minutes would serve as the Sustainability Committee feedback to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Sara Munro, welcomed as UConn's Sustainability Coordinator, will be the primary UConn representative to the committee; Miller will attend when he can. Rawitscher reported that UConn gave a grant to Julianna Barrett (task force member) and other professors to establish an UConn Climate Corps. This undergraduate program will assist Connecticut communities in adapting to climate change. The committee is interested in working with UConn on climate resilience.

Future agenda items include the facilities study and the future role of the climate action task force. The meeting in August was cancelled.

The meeting adjourned at 7:35 pm

DRAFT

Respectfully submitted,

Virginia Walton

DRAFT

wording for MF recycling

Tuesday, July 19, 2016 3:35 PM

Subject	**wording for MF recycling**
From	Virginia D. Walton
To	Linda M. Painter
Sent	Tuesday, July 19, 2016 1:20 PM

Linda,
Using the San Antonio ordinance that you e-mailed me, I have modified it to fit Mansfield. Instead of requiring certain sized enclosures, it seems better to have them work with me (and I in turn will check with Willi Waste) to make sure that what they want will work for the hauler. I highlighted in yellow what I wasn't certain about. Here's my suggestions:

REQUIREMENTS FOR OWNERS OR MANAGERS OF MULTI-FAMILY PROPERTIES

1) Owners or managers of multi-family properties shall provide for the collection and removal of recyclables in accordance with the Solid Waste Regulations A196-5 and A196-6.
2) Recycling and trash collection service shall be provided through the Town of Mansfield.
3) Owners or managers of multi-family properties must supply interior recycle containers for each unit with clear and visible signage.
4) Exterior recycle containers, with clear and visible signage, will be provided with the service through the Town of Mansfield.

a. Recycling containers shall be an appropriate size and number for anticipated recyclables generated at the property (30%-40% of the total waste)
b. Recycling collection service shall be as convenient to the tenant as garbage collection service.
    i. Should a complex offer door to door valet garbage collection service, so shall the recycling service.
    ii. Should a high rise complex have a designated chute for garbage collection service, then the recycling service should be of a similar nature or should be as convenient for the tenant.
    iii. Should a complex offer dumpster service, a complementary recycle dumpster shall be placed next to it.
    iv. Should a complex opt for a compactor, split compactors are available.
c. Figure ---, Multi-family Recycling Container Placement Example demonstrates in a graphical manner what is meant by the "appropriate number" of containers and the "convenient" placement of containers that will allow for equal access opportunities by tenants.

5) Owners or managers of multi-family properties much ensure that tenants are educated about recycling as follows:
    a. Information, provided by the Town on the type of recyclable materials accepted, and information on the locations of recycling containers must be distributed to all tenants upon the commencement of providing recycling services and upon move-in of a new tenant.
    b. All occupants must be given information and instructions upon any change in recycling services to the property.
    c. Annual reminders about recycling, provided by the Town, shall be distributed to all tenants.
6) Prior to the multi-family property owner or manager initiating the start of recycling and trash collection service in accordance with this ordinance, a "recycling plan" must be developed in cooperation with the Mansfield Recycling Coordinator and submitted to and approved by the planning department. The department will make forms for this plan available in both printed and electronic format.
    a. Owners or managers of new multi-family properties shall submit a recycling plan to the Department within 30 days of receiving a certificate of occupancy.
    b. If the recycling plan is rejected by the planning department, the owner or manager of the multi-family property has thirty (30) days from notification of the rejection to submit a revised plan of

approval. A rejected plan will not constitute an acceptable excuse to not start the service.

c. Owners or managers of new multi-family properties shall submit an update to their recycling plan to the planning department whenever a change in ownership or a change of management of the property.

Virginia Walton
Recycling Coordinator
4 South Eagleville Rd
Storrs, CT 06268
860-429-3333

TOWN OF MANSFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 28, 2016

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Linda M. Painter, AICP

Subject: Cancellation of August Meeting

As there are no pending business matters requiring immediate actinos and many members are not able to attend the August 15, 2016 meeting, staff recommends that the meeting be cancelled. If the Commission concurs, the following motion would be in order:

MOVE to cancel the August 15, 2016 meeting of the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission.

TOWN OF MANSFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 28, 2016

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Linda M. Painter, AICP

Subject: November Meeting Dates

The November 7th meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission falls on the evening before election day. As the Council Chambers is the site of Election Day Registration activities, the Registrars of Voters will need to have all of their equipment set up and tested in the room the day before the election. Rather than move to a room that does have appropriate audio/visual systems, staff recommends that the PZC meeting be rescheduled to another day.

Additionally, the second meeting in November is scheduled for November 21st, which is the same week as Thanksgiving. As this is a heavy travel week for many people, the Commission may also want to consider changing this meeting date.

Based on room availability, staff recommends that the regular meetings of the Planning and Zoning Commission in November be rescheduled to Wednesday, November 2nd and Wednesday, November 16th.

Provided the change in dates is approved by the Commission and submitted to the Town Clerk more than 30 days in advance of the meeting, the meetings will still be considered regular meetings.

MOVE to change the regular meetings of the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission in the month of November to Wednesday, November 2nd and Wednesday, November 16th.

TOWN OF MANSFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 28, 2016

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Linda M. Painter, AICP

Subject: Plimpton Subdivision Bond

On August 1, 2011 the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a four lot subdivision at the intersection of Wormwood Hill and Gurleyville Roads known as the Plimpton Land Subdivision. Section 7.9 of the Subdivision Regulations authorizes the Commission to require the subdivider to construct any driveway with a slope of 10% or greater and related drainage and sight line improvements Accordingly, the approval included a condition that certain improvements be completed or bonded prior to filing of the subdivision maps.

At the time the final subdivision maps were recorded, the State Statutes required towns to accept surety bonds as a financial guarantee for subdivision improvements. That requirement was in effect for less than a year, and was subsequently changed to be permissive rather than mandatory; the statutes now specifically allow municipalities to accept surety bonds but do not require their acceptance. Due to the statutes in effect at the time maps were recorded and the fact that the improvements were related to construction of driveways, the Town accepted a surety bond in association with a bonding agreement for completion of a common driveway to serve Lots 2 and 3, the driveway for Lot 4 due to the slope exceeding 10%, and associated improvements, which included related drainage improvements to Wormwood Hill Road associated with the driveway for Lot 4. The requirements for the subdivider to complete these improvements was clearly noticed in conditions of subdivision approval that were recorded on the land records. Since the subdivision was approved, Lots 2 and 3 were combined into one lot and developed with a single-family home.

On March 6, 2016, a contractor applied for and received a roadway permit for installation of a driveway to serve Lot 4. At that time, engineering staff questioned whether the contractor would be completing the associated drainage work as well. The contractor indicated that he had been retained by the purchasers of the property and that was not in his scope of work. Derek Dilaj, the Assistant Town Engineer, contacted the subdivider by telephone to remind him of his responsibilities with regard to completing the driveway and drainage work associated with the subdivision. In response, Mr. Plimpton verbally indicated that he had no intention of completing that work. While we have not received a zoning permit application for a new house at this point, it is important to note that no Certificate of Compliance can be issued until these improvements are completed.

After consulting with the Town Attorney, he has recommended that the Commission formally take action to call the bond to put the surety company on notice that they will need to complete the work. If the Commission concurs, the following motion would be in order:

MOVE to call the Bond (Number 601021690) issued by Liberty Mutual: The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company on February 1, 2012 to complete subdivision improvements related to the driveway for Lot 4 required as part of the Plimpton Land Subdivision (PZC File 1298) in accordance with Bond Agreement dated February 1, 2012. This action is being taken in response to the subdivider's verbal indication that he has no intention of completing the required improvements.

Certified Mail Return Receipt
#91 7108 2133 3935 7788 1428

TOWN OF MANSFIELD
MANSFIELD PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

AUDREY P. BECK BUILDING
FOUR SOUTH EAGLEVILLE ROAD
STORRS, CT 06268
(860) 429-3330

Tuesday, August 02, 2011

FILE

Scott Plimpton
627 Wormwood Hill Road
Mansfield Center, CT 06250

Conservation Easement V. 720, Pg 421
Driveway Ease + Maint. V. 720, Pg 421.

Re: Mansfield's PZC Approval
PZC file #1298

Dear Mr. Plimpton,

At a meeting held on 8/1/11, the Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission adopted the following motion:

"to approve with conditions the subdivision application (File #1298), of Scott Plimpton, for four lots, on property owned by the applicant, located on Gurleyville Road and Wormwood Hill Road, in an RAR-90 zone, as submitted to the Commission and shown on a twenty-one page set of plans dated 2/9/11 as revised to 7/12/11, as described in other application submissions, and as presented at public hearings held on May 2, June 6, July 5, and July 18, 2011.

This approval is granted because the application, as hereby approved, is considered to be in compliance with the Mansfield Subdivision Regulations. Approval is granted with the following conditions:

1. Final plans shall be signed and sealed by the responsible surveyor, engineer, landscape architect and soil scientist.

2. Pursuant to subdivision regulations, particularly Sections 7.5 and 7.6, this action specifically approves, subject to revisions noted below in condition 7, the depicted Building Area and Development Area Envelopes, setback waivers and frontage waivers for lots 2, 3 and 4. Unless the Commission specifically authorizes revisions, the approved envelopes shall serve as the setback lines for all future structures and site improvements, pursuant to Article VIII of the Zoning Regulations. This condition shall be specifically noticed on the Land Records and the deeds for the subject lots. This condition also shall be incorporated onto the final plans replacing Notes 7 and 19 on Sheet #C2.

3. The approved plans include specific notes regarding stone wall and tree preservation. Pursuant to Section 7.7 of the Mansfield Subdivision Regulations, no existing stone walls shall be altered except for site work depicted on the approved plans. No stones from existing walls shall be removed from the site. Furthermore, a number of specimen trees on Lots 2 and 3 have been identified to be saved. No Zoning Permits shall be issued on these lots until a protective barrier has been placed around the specimen trees identified to be saved and the barrier has been found acceptable by the Zoning Agent. In conjunction with the filing of final maps, notice of this condition shall be filed on the Land Records and referenced in the deeds of the subject lots.

4. This approval accepts the applicant's proposed dedication of conservation easements as appropriate to address the open space dedication requirements of Section 13 for the subject 4-lot subdivision subject to revisions in condition 7(b), below. Conservation easements based on the Town's model format shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Town Attorney and filed on the Land Records. Easements shall be incorporated into notes on the final plan, noticed in the Land Records and referenced in the deeds for the subject lots.

Certified Mail Return Receipt
#91 7108 2133 3935 7788 1428

5. This approval authorizes the proposed common driveway for lots 2 and 3 in accordance with Section 7.10(a) of the Mansfield Subdivision Regulations. A common driveway easement that addresses maintenance and liability issues, including the maintenance of depicted driveway sightlines, shall be submitted to the Planning Office for approval by the PZC Chairman, with staff assistance, and the Town Attorney. This easement shall be depicted on the final subdivision plan, incorporated into notes on the final plan, referenced in the deeds of the subject lots and filed on the Land Records. Pursuant to Section 7.10(j) of the Mansfield Subdivision Regulations, the common driveway work shall be completed or bonded in an amount and form acceptable to the PZC Chairman, with staff assistance, before the filing of the subdivision plan. This condition shall be noted on the final plan.

6. In accordance with Section 7.9 of the Mansfield Subdivision Regulations, the driveway on Lot 4 shall be completed or bonded in an amount and form acceptable to the PZC chairman, with staff assistance, before the filing of the subdivision plan. This condition shall be noted on the final plan.

7. In addition to final plan notes referenced in conditions 2 through 6, the following map revisions shall be incorporated onto final plans to facilitate identification and enforcement of easement and envelope boundaries:
   A. The Development Area Envelope on Lot 2 shall be extended to the Lot 4 property line.

   B. The Conservation Easement on Lot 3 shall be extended to share a common boundary with the Development Area Envelope.

8. The Commission, for good cause, shall have the right to declare this approval null and void if the following deadlines are not met (unless a ninety (90) or one hundred and eighty (180) day filing extension has been granted):

   A. All final maps, including submittal in digital format, right-of-way deeds for land along Wormwood Hill Road and Gurleyville Road, a common driveway easement for lots 2 and 3, conservation easements, drainage easement for Lots 1 and 4, and a Notice on the Land Records to address conditions 2, and 3 (with any associated mortgage releases) shall be submitted to the Planning Office no later than fifteen days after the appeal period provided for in Section 8-8 of the State Statutes, or, in the case of an appeal, no later than fifteen days of any judgment in favor of the applicant;

   B. All monumentation (including delineation of the conservation easement with Town markers every 50 to 100 feet on perimeter trees or on cedar posts) with Surveyor's Certificate, shall be completed or bonded pursuant to the Commission's approval action and Section 14 of the Subdivision Regulations no later than fifteen days after the appeal period provided for in Section 8-8 of the State Statutes, or, in the case of an appeal, no later than fifteen days of any judgment in favor of the applicant."

If you have any questions regarding this action, please call the Planning Office at 429-3330.

Very truly yours,

Katherine K. Holt, Secretary
Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission

BONDING AGREEMENT

This Agreement entered into on February 1, 2012, between the Town of Mansfield, acting by the Chairman of its Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), duly authorized, and Scott R. Plimpton, his successors and/or assigns (Property Owner), regarding premises at 627 Wormwood Hill Road, at Wormwood Hill Road & Gurleyville Road, Mansfield Center, CT (the Property).

Recitalss:

A. On August 1, 2011, the PZC approved with conditions, a four-lot subdivision on the Property (the Approval). Condition numbers 5 and 6 of the Approval require driveway work for lots 2, 3, and 4 to be completed or bonded prior to the signing of final maps for filing on the Land Records.

B. The Property Owner has submitted a cost estimate of $145,000 for said driveway work (common driveway for Lots 2 & 3, and Lot 4 driveway). Town of Mansfield staff has determined that this bond amount of $145,000.00 is adequate to ensure completion of the required driveway work.

C. The Property Owner has agreed to post a surety bond in the amount of $145,000 to ensure that the construction of the common driveway servicing Lots 2 & 3, the Lot 4 driveway and the associated drainage and sediment and erosion work are implemented as per the approved plans.

The Parties Agree that:

1. Said $145,000 bond shall be delivered to the Town of Mansfield Director of Planning and Development forthwith upon execution of this Agreement, and for the purposes herein set forth.

2. Upon execution of this Agreement and fulfillment of its bonding requirement and other regulatory requirements, the PZC Chairman is authorized to sign final maps for filing on the Land Records and the Zoning Agent is authorized to issue Zoning Permits for construction on the subject lots.

3. The Property Owner, his successors and/or assigns shall complete, to the satisfaction of the PZC and in accordance with the conditions of the Approval, all remaining driveway work and associated drainage, sediment and erosion control work prior to the issuance of any Certificate of Compliance on the subject lots on or before February 1, 2017, unless additional time is authorized by the PZC Chairman with staff assistance. A written certification from the Property Owner's engineer must be submitted to substantiate that the driveways, associated improvements and monumentation work have been completed according to the approved plans.

4. The Property Owner or his agent onsite shall take immediate action to resolve any environmental damage or erosion or sediment control problems associated with the subject driveway work.

5. In the event any environmental damage or sediment and erosion control problems are not remedied within forty-eight (48) hours of notice to the Property Owner or his agent onsite, the Town shall have the right, without interference from the Property Owner, to retain the services of a contractor to complete the required sediment and erosion control work. In such event, the Town of Mansfield is hereby authorized by the Property Owner to place a lien on the Property covering the entire cost thereof to the Town. It is also agreed by the Property Owner that said lien process may be accomplished by the Town in a summary manner without further notice to the Property Owner.

6. When all of said work is completed to the satisfaction of the PZC, whether pursuant to paragraphs 3 or 5 above, or any other means, the Finance Director shall forthwith deliver to the Property Owner any bond or funds not utilized, or authorize release of said Bond, pursuant to this Agreement.

7. The Property Owner, for himself, his successors and assigns, now and forever, does hereby stipulate and agree to comply with the terms of this Bonding Agreement.

8. The Property Owner, and his successors and assigns shall indemnify and hold the Town of Mansfield, or any agency, subdivision or employees thereof, harmless from and against any and all claims and damages including, but not limited to claims by the Property Owner, his successors and assigns or any Third Party for damages, losses and expenses, which may arise now or in the future, incidental to or in any way connected with the performance of the work required under the terms of this Bonding Agreement.

9. The bond addressed in paragraph 1 of this Agreement is required for the purpose of trying to better ensure that certain private, rather than public improvements, i.e., said driveways and associated work described in paragraph 3, above, are completed by the Property Owner or his successors or assigns in accordance with the conditions of the Approval of this subdivision. Nothing in this Agreement shall be interpreted to mean that the Town of Mansfield has any legal obligation whatsoever to complete said improvements if the Property Owner or his successors or assigns fail to do so.

Town of Mansfield

by _____
JoAnn Goodwin, Chairman
Planning & Zoning Commission
Town of Mansfield

Property Owner

by _____
Scott R. Plimpton
Property Owner

By _____
Cherie A. Trahan,
Director of Finance
Town of Mansfield

Liberty Mutual.

The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company

9450 Seward Road, Fairfield, Ohio 45014

BOND

Bond # 601021690

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS: That we
Scott R. Plimpton

627 Wormwood Hill Road	Mansfield Center	CT	06250
Street Address	City	State	ZIP Code

(Full Name [top line] and Address [bottom line] of Principal)

(hereinafter called the Principal) as Principal, and, The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company with principal offices at Fairfield, Ohio (hereinafter called the Surety) as Surety, are held and firmly bound unto
Town of Mansfield

4 South Eagleville Road	Storrs	CT	06268
Street Address	City	State	ZIP Code

(Full Name [top line] and Address [bottom line] of Obligee)

(hereinafter called the Obligee), in the penal sum of

One Hundred Forty Five Thousand (Dollars) $ 145,000.00

for the payment of which well and truly to made, we do hereby bind ourselves, our heirs. executors, administrators, successors and assigns, jointly and severally, firmly by these presents.

WHEREAS, the Principal has made or is about to make application to the Obligee for a Permit for

Four lot subdivision driveways

for a term beginning on February 1, 2012 and ending on* xxxxxxxxxxx

(*strike out if license or permit is for an indefinite term)

NOW, THEREFORE, if the Principal shall indemnify the Obligee against any loss directly arising by reason of failure of said Principal to comply with the laws or ordinances under which said license or permit is granted, or any lawful rules or regulations pertaining thereto, then this obligation shall be void; otherwise to remain in full force and effect.

PROVIDED, HOWEVER, AND UPON THE FOLLOWING EXPRESS CONDITIONS:

1. This bond shall be and remain in full force during the term of said license or permit unless canceled in accordance with paragraph 2 below; but if said license or permit was issued for a specific term, and is renewed for one or more specific terms, this bond will be extended to cover such additional term(s) upon the execution by the Surety of a Continuation Certificate, provided such certificate is acceptable to the Obligee. In no event , however, shall the liability of the Surety be cumulative from year to year or from period to period, nor exceed the penal sum written in this first paragraph of this bond.

2. The Surety shall have the right to terminate its liability by notifying the Obligee in writing ten (10) days in advance of its intention to do so.

SIGNED, SEALED AND DATED February 1, 2012

Scott R. Plimpton

By: Scott R. Plimpton

The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company

By: Peter J. Starkel

Peter J. Starkel Attorney-in-Fact

Principal: Scott R. Plimpton

POWER OF ATTORNEY

THE OHIO CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY

Agency Name: Wilcox & Reynolds Insurance, LLC

Obligee: Town of Mansfield

Bond Number: 601021690

Know All Men by These Presents: THE OHIO CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY, an Ohio Corporation pursuant to the authority granted by Article IV, Section 12 of the Code of Regulations and By-Laws of The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company do hereby nominate, constitute and appoint: Michael Gergler, Peter J. Starkel of Storrs-Mansfield, Connecticut its true and lawful agent(s) and attorney(ies)-in-fact, to make, execute, seal and deliver for and on its behalf as surety, and as its act and deed any and all BONDS, UNDERTAKINGS, and RECOGNIZANCES, not exceeding in any single instance

One Hundred Forty-five Thousand Dollars And Zero Cents

$145,000.00

excluding, however, any bond(s) or undertaking(s) guaranteeing the payment of notes and interest thereon. And the execution of such bonds or undertakings in pursuance of these presents, shall be as binding upon said Company, as fully and amply, to all intents and purposes, as if they had been duly executed and acknowledged by the regularly elected officers of said Company at their administrative offices in Fairfield, OH, in their own proper persons. The authority granted hereunder supersedes any previous authority heretofore granted the above named attorney(ies)-in-fact.

In WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned officer of the said The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company has hereunto subscribed his name and affixed the Corporate Seal of said Company this 12th day of July, 2011.

THE OHIO CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY CORPORATE SEAL OHIO

Gregory W. Davenport Assistant Secretary

STATE OF OHIO,
COUNTY OF BUTLER

On this 12th day of July, 2011 before the subscriber, a Notary Public of the State of Washington, in and for the County of King, duly commissioned and qualified, came , Vice President of The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company, to me personally known to be the individual and officer described in, and who executed the preceding instrument, and he acknowledged the execution of the same, and being by me duly sworn deposes and says that he is the officer of the Company aforesaid, and that the seal affixed to the preceding instrument is the Corporate Seal of said Company, and the said Corporate Seal and his signature as officer were duly affixed and subscribed to the said instrument by the authority and direction of the said Corporation.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my Official Seal at the City of Seattle, State of Washington, the day and year first above written.

K D RILEY COMM. EXP. NOTARY PUBLIC 12-09-2013 STATE OF WASHINGTON

Notary Public in and for County of King, State of Washington
My Commission expires December 9, 2013

This power of attorney is granted under and by authority of Article IV, Section 12 of the By-Laws of The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company, extracts from which read:

ARTICLE IV - Officers: Section 12. Power of Attorney.
Any officer or other official of the Corporation authorized for that purpose in writing by the Chairman or the President, and subject to such limitation as the Chairman or President may prescribe, shall appoint such attorneys-in-fact, as may be necessary to act in behalf of the Corporation to make, execute, seal, acknowledge and deliver as surety any and all undertakings, bond, recognizances and other surety obligations. Such attorneys-in-fact, subject to the limitations set forth in their respective powers of attorney, shall have full power to bind the Corporation by their signature and execution of any such instruments and to attach thereto the seal of the Corporation. When so executed, such instruments shall be as binding as if signed by the President and attested to by the Secretary.

Any power or authority granted to any representative or attorney-in-fact under the provisions of this article may be revoked at any time by the Board, the Chairman, the President or by the officer or officers granting such power or authority.

This certificate and the above power of attorney may be signed by facsimile or mechanically reproduced signatures under and by authority of the following vote of the board of directors of The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company at a meeting duly called and held on the 15th day of February, 2011:

VOTED that the facsimile or mechanically reproduced signature of any assistant secretary of the company, wherever appearing upon a certified copy of any power of attorney issued by the company in connection with surety bonds, shall be valid and binding upon the company with the same force and effect as though manually affixed.

CERTIFICATE

I , the undersigned Assistant Secretary of The Ohio Casualty Insurance Company, do hereby certify that the foregoing power of attorney, the referenced By-Laws of the Company and the above resolution of their Board of Directors are true and correct copies and are in full force and effect on this date.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the Company this 1 day of February 2012

THE OHIO CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANY CORPORATE SEAL OHIO

David M. Carey Assistant Secretary

Mansfield, CT
Doc # 2012-0003334
Vol 720 Pg. 419
02/02/2012 04:20:43pm

Return to:
Town of Mansfield
ATTN: Linda Painter, Director of Planning
4 South Eagleville Road
Storrs, CT 06268

NOTICE
OF
CONDITIONS OF SUBDIVISION APPROVAL
BY THE
TOWN OF MANSFIELD PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Property Owners: SCOTT RICHARDSON PLIMPTON a/k/a SCOTT R. PLIMPTON

Description of Property: Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, Wormwood Hill Road and Gurleyville Road, Mansfield, CT

Subdivision Plan: 627 Wormwood Hill Road as depicted on the plan entitled:"SWAMP YANKEE SURVEY LLC EAST HAMPTON, CONNECTICUT PLAN PREPARED FOR SCOTT RICHARDSON PLIMPTON 627 WORMWOOD HILL ROAD MANSFIELD CENTER – CONNECTICUT TITLE SHEET SCALE: NONE DATE 1-7-2011 DRN BY: ACG CHK BY: DB/PB C1 REVISIONS 2-9-2011 TOWN COMMENTS 5-24-2011 TOWN COMMENTS 6-20-2011 TOWN COMMENTS 7-12-2011 TOWN COMMENTS 9-6-2011 TOWN COMMENTS 12-12-2011 TOWN COMMENTS 1-23-2012 TOWN COMMENTS 1-27-2012 TOWN COMMENTS, Sheets C1-C15", hereinafter the "Plan."

On August 1, 2011, the Mansfield Planning & Zoning Commission approved a 4 lot subdivision on Wormwood Hill Road and Gurleyville Road in Mansfield, Connecticut. The Commission's Approval **requires** that this Notice of Condition(s) 2 and 3 be recorded in the Land Records of the Town of Mansfield, **and that the following language be incorporated into any deeds of conveyance of Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4,** as applicable, of said subdivision by the owner, his agents, heirs, successors, or assigns, as agreed herein by said owner:

(As to Condition #2): "Pursuant to Mansfield Subdivision Regulations, particularly Sections 7.5, and 7.6, this action specifically approves the depicted Building Area and Development Area Envelopes, setback waivers and frontage waivers for lots 2, 3 and 4. Unless the Commission specifically authorizes revisions, the approved envelopes shall serve as the setback lines for all future structures and site improvements, pursuant to Article VIII of the Zoning Regulations."

(As to Condition #3): "Pursuant to Section 7.7 of the Mansfield Subdivision Regulations, no existing stone walls shall be altered except for site work depicted on the approved plans. No stones from existing walls shall be removed from the site. No Zoning Permits shall be issued on

Mansfield, CT
Doc # 2012-0083334
Vol 720 Pg. 420
02/02/2012 04:20:43pm
Rec. Fee: 15.00
Hist Fee: 3.00
Land Fee: 40.00
Recorded - Mary Stanton
Town Clerk

either Lot 2 or Lot 3 until a protective barrier has been placed around the specimen trees identified to be saved and the barrier has been found acceptable to the Zoning Agent."

Also, Conditions Nos. 5 and 6 of the Approval require driveway work for lots 2, 3 and 4 to be completed or bonded prior to the signing of final maps for filing in the Land Records. In lieu of a cash bond, the Town of Mansfield Planning & Zoning Commission and the aforementioned Property Owner have entered into a Bonding Agreement for the completion of said driveway improvements, requiring that a surety bond of $145,000.00 be secured by said Property Owner to better ensure the completion of the driveway and associated work. **It is hereby required that the following language be incorporated into any deeds of conveyance of Lots 2, 3 & 4 of this subdivision** by the owner, his agents, heirs, successors, or assigns, as agreed herein by said owner:

"The Property Owner/Seller has agreed with the Town of Mansfield that the driveways and associated work must be completed by the subdividing Property Owner, Scott R. Plimpton, who has submitting a surety bond in the amount of $145,000.00 in accordance with a Bonding Agreement with the Town of Mansfield Planning and Zoning Commission to better ensure that said private improvements are timely completed by him, or his successors or assigns. Said Bonding Agreement provides that 'Nothing in this Agreement shall be interpreted to mean that the Town of Mansfield has any legal obligation whatsoever to complete said [driveway and associated] improvements if the Property Owner or his successors or assigns fail to do so.'"

Dated at Mansfield, Connecticut, this 2nd day of February, 2012.

Witnessed by:

Antoinette M. Webster

STEPHEN M. BACON

OWNER:

Scott Richardson Plimpton a/k/a Scott R. Plimpton

STATE OF CONNECTICUT:
: ss: Mansfield February 2, 2012
COUNTY OF TOLLAND :

Personally appeared, Scott R. Plimpton, who acknowledged he executed the foregoing instrument for the purposes therein contained, before me.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set me hand.

Antoinette M. Webster
Commissioner of the Superior Court

TOWN OF MANSFIELD

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Date: July 28, 2016

To: Planning and Zoning Commission

From: Linda M. Painter, AICP

Subject: Director's Report

If there are any other items or questions, I will address them at the August 1st meeting.

HOUSING

Ad Hoc Committee on Rental Regulation and Enforcement. The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for Wednesday, August 10th at 5:30 p.m. in the Mansfield Community Center Community Room.

Connecticut Legislative Commission on Aging. Prior to their dissolution, the Connecticut Legislative Commission on Aging commissioned a consulting firm to review the Plan of Conservation and Development and Zoning Regulations for a single Connecticut town. Mansfield was selected based upon recommendations from various stakeholders. A copy of the summary report is attached to this memo for your information. If you are interested in seeing the detailed recommendations, please let staff know and we will provide them.

INFRASTRUCTURE

Water Conservation Alerts. The Connecticut DPH, UConn and Connecticut Water Company have all issued water conservation alerts requesting that residents and businesses voluntarily take steps to conserve water. The attached flyer has been prepared by the Town to help identify conservation measures for residents.

Connecticut Water Project. The interconnection between the UConn water system and the Connecticut Water Company system is 90% complete and is expected to be finished in August.

Four Corners Water and Sewer Project. The Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) has submitted the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) for the Four Corners Water and Sewer Project to the Office of Policy and Management for their review, which is the final step in the EIE process. Upon completion of the EIE process, the Town will finalize design and initiate the permitting process for the project.

Mansfield Tomorrow: Plan of Conservation and Development & Zoning Regulations –

Aging-in-Community Review

Introduction and Background

In 2016, the Connecticut Legislative Commission on Aging hired the consulting firm *Planning/Aging* to review the Plan of Conservation and Development and the Zoning Ordinance or regulations for a single Connecticut town in order to:

1. Evaluate the two documents as to how well and consistently they appear to work to helping the town become a "great place for people to grow up and grow older";
2. Offer comments and suggestions as to how each document might be modified or enhanced to the town's livability for residents throughout the life cycle; and
3. Potentially serve as a guide for similar livability audits of other towns' Plans of Conservation and Development and Zoning Ordinances or regulations.

The Commission selected the Town of Mansfield, Connecticut for *Planning/Aging* to review, and provided *Planning/Aging* with the following documents:

1. "Mansfield Tomorrow: Plan of Conservation and Development" dated October 8, 2015; and
2. "Zoning Regulations of the Town of Mansfield, Connecticut" revised to September 1, 2014.

The Commission indicated that the Mansfield Plan was selected upon numerous stakeholders' suggestions, in part due to it being a recent and well-regarded Plan that is seen as supportive of the Commission's mission of helping towns become increasingly supportive of their aging populations within their overall livability strategies.

Mansfield Tomorrow: Plan of Conservation and Development

Specific notes on the review of Mansfield Tomorrow: Plan of Conservation and Development:

1. The review was done without access to any of the Plan addendum items, which were not provided; and
2. The reviewer (Brad Winick of *Planning/Aging*) knows and has friendly professional relationships with one or more members of the Plan's authorship team. These relationships in no way influenced the review comments.

General comments on the Mansfield Tomorrow: Plan of Conservation and Development:

1. The Mansfield Plan is an exemplary document, well-written and illustrated, with a fine logical flow and a pleasant graphic layout;
2. The Mansfield Plan links physical planning and development, and human and public health, and essentially takes what is referred to as a "health-in-all-policies" approach, suggesting linkages and causality between planning priorities and decisions, and their health impacts and consequences; and

3. In light of the Mansfield Plan being so exemplary, it might be worthy of consideration whether there might be different – and potentially broader – utility in a review of a more "typical" plan of conservation and development.

Zoning Regulations of the Town of Mansfield, Connecticut

General comments on the Zoning Regulations of the Town of Mansfield, Connecticut (Revised to September 1, 2014):

1. The zoning regulations reflect – as do many zoning regulations -- their having been developed over a period of time, with different writing styles and different general approaches to land use regulation.
2. The zoning regulations reflect two major approaches to land use. The (presumably) older approach, which likely influenced the drafting of the more traditional residential, commercial and industrial land use districts, which are rather typical in their explicit listing of permitted and non-permitted uses.
3. Distinctly different is the approach behind the 15 "Design Development Districts" which are more flexible in their permitted land uses and other development regulations.
4. Even more flexible than the "Design Development Districts" is the super overlay "Storrs Center Special Design District" wherein virtually all uses and development regulations are intended to be negotiated as part of a robust review process that has unique requirements.
5. Having these very different and conflicting approaches to land use and development existing side-by-side within the Zoning Regulations is somewhat confusing. It is recommended that prior to the next updating of the Zoning Regulations, a singular approach is decided – either prescription-based or negotiation-based – and the entirety of the regulations reviewed and re-drafted as needed to reflect this unified approach.

Comparative Comments of the Two Documents

The two documents do appear to be somewhat mismatched, although it is not unexpected for these types of documents to differ: the Plan is goal-driven, visionary and reflects a broad stakeholder engagement process, while the Zoning Regulations are more mundane, rule-driven, and reflect a range of voices and approaches. Notably, there are virtually no cross-references between the two documents.

If possible, it would be a worthwhile exercise for the re-drafting of the Zoning Regulations mentioned in the Plan to become an exercise in making the two documents more of a matched set – in tone, approach, and most notably, in their vision of implementing the lofty goals within the Plan, including – but not limited to – becoming a livable community wherein older adults can age-in-community.

Water Conservation Alert

Wednesday, July 27, 2016

Due to this summer's dry conditions, we are experiencing low stream flows in the area. This has led to the issuance of a Drought Advisory by the Connecticut Department of Public Health for all residents and businesses; a Stage IA Water Conservation Alert by the University of Connecticut for customers of their water system; and a request from the Connecticut Water Company for voluntary water conservation. The Town of Mansfield requests your support and cooperation to conserve water until further notice. For more information, see the June 24, 2016 DPH Press Release, UConn's Stage IA Water Conservation Alert, and the Connecticut Water Company's Press Release.

Given current conditions, the Town of Mansfield is encouraging all residents to voluntarily conserve water, including customers of UConn Water, Windham Water Works as well as those with bedrock and dug wells. There are many ways to conserve water including:

- Taking shorter showers
- Running dishwashers and laundry machines with full loads
- Shutting off water while washing dishes, shaving, brushing teeth, and lathering up to wash hands, rather than running the water continuously
- Avoid washing vehicles, or power-washing homes and other buildings
- Not using water to clean sidewalks, driveways, and roads
- Reducing as much as possible the watering of lawns, recreational and athletic fields, gardens, or other landscape areas
- Not using public water to fill residential pools
- Promptly repairing any leaks