

April 22, 2002

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs. Friedman, Mr. Martin, Ms. Page, Mr. Potter

ALTERNATES PRESENT: Mr. Fitzherbert, Mr. Shapiro

ALSO PRESENT: Ms. Habib, Mr. Farmen, Mr. Slocum

MEMBER ABSENT: Mr. Owen

ALTERNATE ABSENT: Mr. Abella

STAFF PRESENT: Mrs. Hill

PUBLIC HEARING

Rumsey Hall School/201 Romford Road/Special Permit: Section 4.4.10/Construct Science Building

Mr. Martin called the public hearing to order at 7:30 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Page, and Potter and Alternate Fitzherbert for Mr. Owen. Ms. Page read the legal notice published in *Voices* on 4/7 and 4/17/02.

Mr. Martin explained the application had not been accepted at the last meeting because it had been incomplete. However, soon afterwards the deficiencies of the application had been addressed when both Inland Wetlands and Health approvals had been granted. Therefore, upon receiving a written request from Mr. Farmen, a public hearing was scheduled.

Mr. Martin reviewed the documents in the file. (See attached list.) He asked Mrs. Hill if the list of adjoining property owners was accurate and she said it was.

Mr. Farmen thanked the Commission for convening the public hearing and reviewed the "Campus Master Plan 2000," dated 5/15/00 by the SLAM Collaborative.

Mr. Slocum, architect, presented a proposed floor plan and updated drawings entitled, "Rumsey Hall School Science Building," Sheet L201, by SLAM Collaborative. He explained the 5800 sq. ft. building would be located between two existing buildings and would be built into the hillside to take advantage of the existing grade. The position of the building would not restrict the flow of student traffic and would preserve the existing open courtyard. The lower level would have a walk out in the back and would be used for storage and for offices. It would be located behind the new math building and the view from Romford Road would be the gable end of a one story building. He added that from the road the height would be similar to the math building. Mr. Martin noted the high roof line and asked what the upper level under the roof would be used for. Mr. Slocum stated this was attic space and the roof line was for aesthetics so that the pitch would match the other campus buildings and have a residential look. The height requirements were discussed and it was noted that due to the grade, the height approached the maximum permitted. Mr. Potter noted the proposed building was about the same height as those on either side of it and thought the design was in good taste.

Mr. Slocum said a portion of the building was within the regulated wetlands area, but that no wetlands soils would be disturbed, and an Inland Wetlands permit had been granted.

Mrs. Friedman asked if the school had future plans for development. Mr. Farmen stated hopefully faculty housing would be built across the street and various buildings would be renovated.

Coverage was discussed. While SLAM had computed the coverage would be 5.75% Mr. Potter thought if the school owned parcels had been considered separately, the coverage would have been higher. Mr. Martin thought it was reasonable to consider the properties as one campus from a water quality viewpoint.

Exterior siding was discussed. Mr. Slocum said it would be similar to the siding on the math building.

It was noted bathrooms had been deleted from the plans to obtain immediate approval from the Health Department so that the application process could get under way. Mr. Farmen said he expected the state DEP would approve plans for the bathrooms in about 2 weeks.

It was noted the ZEO report asked if there would be exterior lighting and recommended if there would be it should meet the same standards recently cited in Special Permit approvals: aimed downward, directed toward the property, light fixtures shielded, and wattage as low as possible and still ensure safety and security. Mr. Slocum said the three existing lights on campus would provide adequate lighting. He said there would be some building mounted fixtures and that they would be directed downward according to the school's current lighting policy. Mr. Farmen said he had no problem with the standards noted above.

MOTION: To close the public hearing to consider the Special Permit application: Section 4.4.10 submitted by Rumsey Hall School to construct a science building at 201 Romford Road. By Mr. Potter, seconded by Mr. Fitzherbert, and passed 5-0.

Mr. Martin closed the public hearing at 8:00 p.m.

This public hearing was recorded on tape. The tape is on file in the Land Use Office, Bryan Memorial Town Hall, Washington Depot, Ct.

REGULAR MEETING

Mr. Martin called the Regular Meeting to order at 8:00 p.m. and seated Members Friedman, Martin, Page, and Potter and Alternate Fitzherbert for Mr. Owen.

Consideration of the Minutes

MOTION: To accept the 3/25/02 Regular Meeting minutes as written. By Mrs. Friedman, seconded by Mr. Martin, and passed 3-0. Mr. Fitzherbert and Mr. Potter did not vote because they had not attended the meeting.

It was noted the April 8, 2002 Special Meeting minutes would be considered when a quorum of those who attended is present.

Rumsey Hall School/201 Romford Road/Special Permit: Section 4.4.10/Construct Science Building

Mr. Potter noted the Commission appreciated the thought put into the science building proposal and the master plan. Mr. Martin said it was helpful to view the current application in the context of the overall plans for the school.

The recommendations in the 4/22/02 ZEO report for conditions of approval were discussed and agreed upon as follows.

MOTION: To approve the Special Permit application: Section 4.4.10 submitted by Rumsey Hall School to construct a science building at 201 Romford Road subject to the following conditions:

1. that all exterior lighting be directed downward and onto the property, shielded, and use the lowest possible wattage consistent with security and safety requirements and
2. that a certified as-built be submitted to verify the height of the building prior to zoning compliance sign-off.

By Mr. Potter, seconded by Ms. Page, and passed 5-0.

Other Business

Mr. Martin noted he had received a copy of the Conservation Commission's Open Space Plan Interim Report, March 2002 and said it was available for any Member who wanted to review it.

Website/Communications

Mr. Martin gave a brief update on work in progress to improve the Town's website and enable the Zoning Commission to post its minutes, Regulations, agendas, etc. there. Mr. Owen and Mr. Swain have met with the First Selectman, who encouraged them to proceed. Mr. Owen will report progress to the Commission at the next Regular Meeting.

Revision of the Zoning Regulations

The following topics were discussed.

- **Section 14 - "Site Plan Requirements."** Mr. Martin has asked Land Tech to review this section and recommend how to bring it into conformance with 2002 standards. Land Tech will also be asked to review drainage and runoff issues. It was also noted that the paragraphs in Section 12 dealing with wetlands and soil erosion should be included in this project.
- **Height** - This issue had been previously discussed by the Commission, but was still unresolved. Mr. Martin advised the Commission that he had referred this matter to the Planning Commission for discussion as part of the update of the Plan of

Conservation and Development.

- Section 17 - "Non Conforming Lots, Land, Structures, and Uses." Mr. Martin will ask Atty. Byrne to review this section to make sure it is up to date.
- Possible requirement that all new fuel tanks be installed above ground. Mr. Martin noted that due to leaks from fuel tanks infiltrating the Town's water supply, Bethlehem had adopted a regulation as part of its Subdivision Regulations addressing this problem. Several Commissioners thought this was a Health Department issue. Others thought additional protection by a Zoning regulation would be a good idea. Mrs. Hill will contact CCM and COG to ask for information on how other towns handle this matter. She will also find out how the state laws govern the installation of fuel tanks.
- Clarification of terms: accessways, driveways, and private roads. Mrs. Hill will contact Mr. McGuinness of the NW Ct. COG to compare regulations from other towns.
- Size of sign permitted on a wall in a commercial district. It was the consensus the current regulation is too permissive. Mrs. Hill will contact COG to obtain sign regulations from other towns to compare the size permitted.
- Parking. Parking requirements will also be requested from COG. For several uses, the number of parking spaces required was outdated. Also, it was thought pervious parking areas should be addressed.
- Generators and other noise generating equipment. It was noted the ZBA had sent a draft proposal on how to address this issue. (See attached.) The Commissioners generally supported the concept of the draft, although noted that specific wording may have to be changed. The Commissioners were asked to review the draft, which will be discussed again at the next meeting.
- Update the format of the remainder of the district sections regarding accessory uses. Woodville and Marbledale have already been done and the rest of the districts will be revised in the same way.
- Sections 4.3 and 4.4 - Residential uses. The Commissioners reviewed each of the uses permitted in the R-1 District to determine whether the use was appropriate.

4.3.3 FARMSTAND. It was noted the requirement that the majority of the produce be raised on the property did not match the requirement in 12.13 that 75% be raised on site. Mr. Martin noted this provision was to protect local farmers. It was agreed that both sections should refer to the "major portion."

4.3.4 PONDS. It was noted zoning permits are not issued for the construction of ponds, but it was the consensus to leave this section as is.

4.3.5 PUBLIC DUMP, sanitary landfill, etc. It was unanimously decided to move this use to the Special Permit section.

4.3.6 DAY CARE. Mrs. Hill thought the classifications for day care and what districts they were permitted in was governed by

state law. Ms. Page supported day care facilities because of their small number in relation to their great need. Mrs. Hill will research this for the next meeting.

4.4.1. and 4.4.6. The definitions for bed and breakfast, inns, tourist home will be streamlined and reconciled with the revisions recently approved for bed and breakfasts.

4.4.2 CEMETERY. It was the consensus to leave this as a Special Permit use in the R-1 District.

4.4.4 KENNEL. Several Commissioners thought this use should be deleted. Mrs. Hill pointed out that this was a residential use and that commercial kennels are a different use and are not allowed in the R-1 District. Kennels will be handled as accessory uses to primary residences.

4.4.10 CHURCH, PARISH HOUSE, SCHOOL, LIBRARY, MUSEUM, registered group day care home. Mr. Martin noted that if any of these uses are deleted, the existing facilities will become non conforming and would not be able to expand without a variance. Mr. Potter was concerned about expansion of existing schools. Mr. Fitzherbert said the elimination of schools would mean no smaller operations like dancing schools. Mr. Martin said the elimination of schools from the R-1 District could be viewed as contrary to the Plan of Development, which encourages cooperation with them. Mr. Martin also noted that schools in the R-1 District are permitted 10% coverage as are all uses in the R-1 District. The ZBA, however, often grants variances because it thinks there should be 25% coverage for institutions despite the potential harm that could be done to their residential neighbors. He noted that The Gunnery is now at about 23.8% coverage. Mr. Potter said the Gunnery has had pollution problems with its existing septic system and so he would be concerned should it propose to expand. Mr. Martin said the recent septic improvements at The Gunnery will improve this situation and the larger issue was that state statutes require the Zoning regulation changes be consistent with the Plan of Conservation and Development. He said he understood, however, that large campuses in the R-1 District were not necessarily consistent with rural character. Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the problem with the Plan is that it encourages both schools as an industry and the preservation of rural character, which can be conflicting goals. It was noted a related issue is the use of R-1 properties not adjacent to school campuses for auxiliary school uses. Mrs. Friedman suggested the Zoning Commission meet with the Planning Commission to discuss this matter. Mrs. Hill also recommended the Zoning Commissioners write to Planning's consultant to express their thoughts on this subject. Mr. Martin will call Mr. Bender to discuss these matters. Many of the Commissioners thought libraries, inns, churches, and museums should only be allowed in village centers as opposed to being allowed generally throughout the R-1 District.

4.4.1, 4.4.6, 4.4.14. These sections will be consolidated.

Overall, Mr. Martin thought the Zoning Commission should postpone major changes to the Zoning Regulations until either the updated Plan of Conservation and Development is adopted or it becomes known that the view expressed in the 1993 Plan of Development will not change. In the meantime, he asked the Commissioners to review the sections discussed. The proposed regulation revisions will be considered again at next month's meeting.

MOTION: To adjourn the meeting. By Mr. Potter.

Mr. Martin adjourned the meeting at 9:50 p.m.

FILED SUBJECT TO APPROVAL

Respectfully submitted,

Janet M. Hill, ZEO