

**MEETING MINUTES
TOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JULY 8, 2025
7:00 P.M. HYBRID MEETING
275 BROAD STREET, WINDSOR, CT**

Present: Commissioners Mips, Levine, DeCarlo and Jepsen

Absent: Commissioner Jaggon and Alternate Commissioners Harvey, Hallowell and Tetteh

Also Present: Town Planner Todd Sealy, Assistant Town Planner Mitchell Vye and Secretary Andrea Marcavitch

I. NEW BUSINESS

Commissioner Mips opened the meeting at 7 p.m.

- A. Public Communications and Petitions (five-minute time limit per person) – None**
- B. Communications and Petitions from the Town Planning and Zoning Commission – None**
- C. Zoning Enforcement Officer’s Report – None**

D. C.G.S. §8-24 Referral Requests

1. Public Improvements Associated with Addison Road

Town Planner Todd Sealy reviewed the request. The Commission had no questions.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved that the Planning and Zoning Commission of the Town of Windsor, pursuant to the provisions of Section 8-24 of the General Statutes of Connecticut, recommends the Windsor Town Council agree to accept the roadway improvements, right-of-ways and easements as depicted on “Subdivision – Town R.O.W. Plan, property of 175 Addison Property Owner, LLC, 175 & 176 Addison Road, Windsor, CT, sheets SUB-1 and SUB-2 by F.A. Hesketh & Associates, Inc., dated 5/2/2023, revised 7/1/2025, scale 1”=100’.”

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

E. Pre-Application Scrutiny – None

F. Re-Approvals/Revisions/Extensions

- 1. 3.9 Site Plan Revision – 92 Deerfield Road, Site modifications, I Zone, 19.76 acres, IRG/Realty**
- 2. 3.9 Site Plan Revision – 550 Marshall Phelps Road, Add outdoor patio and freestanding sign, I Zone, Bodum USA, Inc.**

Assistant Town Planner Mitchell Vye reviewed the applications.

G. Site Plans – None

H. Minutes**1. June 10, 2025**

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to approve the draft minutes of June 10, 2025 as amended. Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 5-0-0.

II. MISCELLANEOUS – None**III. PLANNER’S REPORT****A. Update on recent development**

Mr. Sealy reported that a special meeting had been scheduled for Tuesday, August 12 at 7 p.m. in the Council Chambers to discuss the report from the Day Hill Road Corridor Study and to review a text amendment to add regulations about adaptive reuse in the I (Industrial) Zone. He also reported that the ribbon cutting for Wilson Gateway Park would be Saturday, July 12.

IV. BUSINESS MEETING**A. Application Acceptance**

- 1. Special Use – 494 (578) Windsor Avenue**, Section 5.2.6D(2), Full-service restaurant entertainment, B2 Zone, Singh
- 2. Special Use Re-approval – 6 Spring Street**, Section 4.5.1, Conversion of existing buildings, R8 Zone, .24 acres, Zheng
- 3. Site Plan – 60 Ezra Silva Lane**, New 100’x330’ warehouse, I Zone, Ezra Silva Lane, LLC
- 4. Subdivision – 445 Poquonock Avenue**, Create 3 lots, AA Zone, 7.80 acres, Alford Associates, Inc.
- 5. Special Use – 445 Poquonock Avenue**, Section 4.5.14, Flag Lots, AA Zone, 7.80 acres, Alford Associates, Inc.
- 6. Special Use – 445 Poquonock Avenue**, Section 4.5.14, Flag Lots, AA Zone, 7.80 acres, Alford Associates, Inc.
- 7. Text Amendment – Add section 8.6L, Adaptive reuse of vacant, underutilized, or obsolete industrial facilities**, I Zone, Brady Sullivan Properties

The above applications will be heard in September, but the text amendment would be heard at the August 12 special meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Commissioner Levine read the legal notice into the record.

Agenda items A through D were heard together.

- A. Design Development Concept Plan – 1 & 10 Targeting Centre and 465 Bloomfield Avenue**, Mixed-use development, RC & B2 Zones, 11.81 acres, Alford Associates, Inc. – *continued from June 10, 2025*

- B. Special Use – 465 Bloomfield Avenue (portions of 465 Bloomfield Avenue & 1 Targeting Centre),** Section 5.1.6A, Drive-through windows, B2 & RC Zones, Alford Associates, Inc. – *continued from June 10, 2025*
- C. Special Use – 1 Targeting Centre (portions of 465 Bloomfield Avenue & 1 Targeting Centre to become 475 Bloomfield Avenue),** Section 5.1.6A, Drive-through windows, B2 Zone, Alford Associates, Inc. – *continued from June 10, 2025*
- D. Special Use – 1 & 10 Targeting Centre and 465 Bloomfield Avenue (includes future 475 Bloomfield Avenue address),** Section 15.2.6, Shared required parking and Section 15.2.7, Reduced parking, B2 & RC Zones, 11.81 acres, Alford Associates, Inc. – *continued from June 10, 2025*

Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor Wilson Alford, Jr. and Traffic Engineer Scott Hesketh of F.A. Hesketh & Associates were present, as well as, principals to the project Mark Greenberg and Blaine East. Mr. Alford reviewed the applications stating that the project was a mixture of residential and commercial where Starbucks would be located at the northeast corner of the property and another retail facility to the west. He stated they would convert the two existing office buildings to residential. He discussed parking, amenities, and three special use applications – two for a drive-through and one for shared required parking and reduced parking. He also discussed traffic stating that the traffic report showed an overall 2% increase in the morning traffic and a 1.5% increase in the traffic in the afternoon.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked if they had thought about putting a stop sign near the retail entrance, and stated that he was concerned for those walking across the walkway and that drivers would not stop. Mr. Alford responded that they do have stop signs at some spots and that they would come back to the Commission with a detail plan. He said Commissioner DeCarlo would likely see a stop sign there next time.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked if Starbucks' traffic analysis correlated with their traffic study. Mr. Alford replied that Hesketh's study was based on the ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers). Mr. Hesketh stated that Starbucks did not provide any information in advance. He said they did give Starbucks the information they had. He stated he had done counts at other locations and did incorporate that into the study. He said they did not tell them that they were off base.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked how big the proposed restaurant would be so he could better understand the parking. Mr. Alford responded that they were not sure of the tenant for the space yet, but that he would anticipate that it would be a lunch and dinner establishment. Mr. Hesketh added that they had calculated the building as having both retail and a restaurant and that it was included in their analysis.

Commissioner Levine stated that their application mentioned the conversion of two existing three-story office buildings and construction of two new four-story building for a total of four buildings. Mr. Alford responded that initially they were considering four buildings but that they determined three would be more appropriate. Commissioner Levine wanted to make sure the record is correct.

Commissioner Levine asked what the rectangular shape was between the two retail buildings and Commissioner DeCarlo responded that it was a dumpster for garbage and Mr. Alford agreed.

Commissioner Levine shared that she spent a lot of time looking at the plans and trying to visualize it all. She stated that she was still very troubled with all of the congestion especially with the retail building. She asked if anyone had given thought to having one building there instead of two. Mr. Alford replied that several professionals had reviewed the project, including an engineer that the town hired, and no one commented on the congestion.

Commissioner Levine stated that the congestion issue around the Starbucks was raised at the last meeting and that it was still congested. She said that she noted a few changes were made and she appreciated that but that it still seemed that there is a lot going on in that little parcel especially when you combine that with one driveway in and out and combined with new residential traffic that will be generated. Mr. Alford replied that the residential traffic will not have to go through that intersection.

Commissioner Levine replied that people would go out to the main road that parallels Mountain Road and Mr. Alford responded yes. Commissioner Levine stated that she was most concerned with the traffic that those retail establishments are going to generate combined with the residential tenants that are going to be going out to work or coming back from work and that they all have to use that one 40' road with only one lane going out and one lane coming in. Mr. Alford gave the example of the Dunkin' Donuts on Poquonock Avenue and stated that they will not have anywhere near the level of traffic that is on Poquonock Avenue and that there is more space as well. He stated that Mr. Hesketh and the town's contracted traffic engineer had reviewed it and they did not have any concerns with it.

Mr. Hesketh added that they are projecting about 300 trips during a peak hour on Targeting Centre and that is about five vehicles a minutes through a signalized intersection.

Commissioner Levine shared concerns with concentrating these trip with the morning rush and Mr. Hesketh replied that the trips he mentioned was the morning rush. He stated that they project about 300 vehicles with 140 entering and 170 exiting. He said they are looking at three vehicles a minute leaving the site and about two vehicles a minute coming into the site, which takes into account the coffee shop and residential. He said the signalized intersection has enough capacity to accommodate the volume of traffic going in and out of Targeting Centre.

Commissioner Levine asked if the traffic study included the residential complex that will be built behind Ciceros and Mr. Hesketh replied yes and that they used the combined traffic volumes from that development as the background traffic in the analysis.

Commissioner Levine stated that she had also been thinking about the people who live on Mountain Road and the impact that this project is going to have on them. She asked if there had been any consideration for a permanent barrier between this project and the residences on Mountain Road to give them a little more privacy and noise screening. Mr. Alford asked if she was referring to a fence and Commissioner Levine said no and that she was talking about attractive concrete barriers, not just poured concrete. Mr. Alford replied that he would consider a fence. Commissioner Levine said she was thinking about the barriers that are along the highway and are now being replaced with fabricated concrete. Mr. Alford replied that he could understand a fence for a visual barrier and Commissioner Levine replied that she was not thinking just visually. She stated that people have a right to have peace and quiet in their home and was concerned about all the noise this project would generate.

Mr. Alford replied that they did not analyze the noise and that there is already background noise from the interstate highway that is there with cars and motorcycles going 70 to 75 miles per hour. He said most cars in the development would be driving 10 to 15 miles per hour.

Commissioner Levine stated that the Commission had received a lot of correspondence in their packets from people who have comments about the project. She recognized that a lot of them deal with the traffic issues on Bloomfield Avenue. She shared that yesterday she took exit 37 on her way home and noted there were seven tractor trailers in the middle lane to take a left-hand turn. She stated that it drove home the point for her that it is not something that the applicant can fix, but that it adds to the problem of this whole project. She thought the Police Department needed to be more proactive there and she was concerned for drivers' safety.

Public Comment:

Donna Chapman of 50 Somerset Drive shared a petition with 440 signatures from residents who are very concerned about the traffic impact of the proposed concept plan. She said these residents feel the best use of this property is residential for a senior living community, including assisted living or condominiums, and requested the removal of the commercial establishments and retail from the site. She provided a handout to the Commission, which raised questions about trip counts and the traffic report's analysis. She also raised questions about the ratings for some of the intersection scores on the traffic report, and asked if more apartments were needed in Windsor. She stated that abutting homeowners request some type of a barrier, possibly an 8' fence, to provide some privacy, visual screening and prevent shortcuts through their property.

Bob Mazairz of 26 Sylvia Lane stated that he spent time recording and filming the traffic at Dunfey Lane and Mountain Road. He reported watching 243 red light cycles and recorded 82 vehicles went through red lights and recounted how many of each type of vehicle. He stated that the 440 signatures represented people who live within a mile of these two intersections and how they have had to develop coping strategies. He said many of those who live in the area recounted accidents that they had seen or been involved in. He hoped the Commission would reject the plan as proposed as the burden of traffic would be much greater with commercial development and hoped that they would consider a senior living facility or an opportunity for homeownership.

Mark Greenberg, owner of 10 Targeting Centre and the contract vendee for 1 Targeting Centre, spoke in favor of the application. He stated that they had been working on this plan for about four or five months and had met with staff a number of times to review the plans and resolve staff comments. He stated that he understood the traffic was a sore point for residents and recommended the Police Department sit out there and give tickets out. He suggested that an increase in traffic would help the situation and make folks more hesitant to go through a red light.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked Mr. Greenberg if they were planning to build apartments or condominiums because Mr. Greenberg had mentioned condominiums in his comments and the Commission had understood that apartments were being proposed. Mr. Greenberg replied that his outlook is that it would be great to have condominiums in town and thought there was a market for it. He went on to recount that a burglary had taken place recently at 10 Targeting Centre where they estimated damages around \$1.5 million. He said that

these vacant buildings do absolutely no good for Windsor and welcomed regulation changes to assist the conversion of some of these vacant buildings.

Marie Bendzans of 343C Dunfey Lane shared what life is like for her now living on Dunfey Lane. She reported that 3 to 4 cars can make a left-hand turn at the Mountain Road/Bloomfield Avenue intersection and that one tractor trailer eliminates the benefit of the left turn signal because it takes that long to get through the intersection. She stated that no one is talking about the fact that Bloomfield Avenue from Mountain Road to Addison Road becomes a one lane road on trash removal days, when oil is being delivered to a house, and if Amazon or UPS or any other delivery trucks block one lane. She said it creates a situation where all drivers are fighting for that one lane to get through. She believed it was an insult to those living in the area to say that adding three to four cars a minute is no big deal.

Karen Monty of 14 Brookview Road shared that the traffic is horrendous and that at times she has trouble getting out of Brookview Road to take a right and that it is impossible to take a left as there is a constant flow of traffic. She thought more condos might work but objected to all the apartments and Starbucks.

Allan Ferry of 570 Bloomfield Avenue shared that he had lived at this address for over 30 years and had seen quite a bit of change in the traffic pattern. He understood that some of this is out of Windsor's control as the road is a state road and over the past 15-20 years the Town of Bloomfield has permitted a lot of very large warehouses. He said with that they get 24 hours, 7 days a week truck traffic coming down the hill with Jake brakes day and night and reported that the noise level has raised considerably. He stated that the traffic mess at exit 38 forces a lot of traffic onto Bloomfield Avenue at exit 37. He shared that turning right out of his driveway is difficult and often have to wait two to three minutes until the light on Mountain Road turns. He also shared two accidents with significant injuries that he had seen in front of his home. He asked the Commission to consider uses for this property that do not affect the peak times in the morning and in the evening and strongly opposed the current proposal.

Mark Blomquist of 85 Sheffield Drive shared that he had previously lived on Bloomfield Avenue and was very thankful to get his family off that street and to a quieter street where his young daughters could ride bicycles, skateboards and scooters, and own a dog. He shared that he has seen more accidents coming up to Mountain Road in Bloomfield than anywhere else up and down Bloomfield Avenue. He said if there is an accident there it backs the traffic up all the way to I-91. He stated that he is against the proposal and was concerned for his family and all families in the area. He said he would rather see a senior living center there.

Blaine East with Citicore Development Group shared that his company was an applicant along with Mr. Greenberg. He stated that they are shopping center developers and have been in business for over 45 years that have built many shopping centers with components like Starbucks and others all over the country. He stated that retail development is not a major traffic generator and this would be a small local regional shopping center, nothing like a Target or a Wal-Mart. He believed the police need to be patrolling the area and that the shopping center would give them reason to patrol more. He stated that he would be happy to answer any questions the Commission might have.

Jim McGuire of 10 Oxford Lane shared that he signed the petition. He believed that Starbucks would cause a big congestion problem and reported that the traffic in the area is terrible. He shared that he believed

Windsor's Police Department to be understaffed and did not know how they would be able to do anything about the traffic there.

Paul Panos of 48 Brookview Drive stated that he was there to add his voice to what the Commission has already heard. He shared that getting from Brookview onto Bloomfield Avenue is downright dangerous, especially trying to make a left turn. He reported that visibility is poor. He believed this was not the right place for this project and said there must be a better use for these old office buildings. He feared it would turn into a congested urban center.

Mr. Sealy explained the intent of design developments and the two step process. He stated that the Highway Transitional Design Development is intended to encourage both new development and the redevelopment of underutilized parcels with an emphasis on enhanced architecture and site design. He noted that it was important for the public to participate in the concept planning stage and thanked everyone who came to the meeting. He stated that the Commission has discretion during the concept plan and special permit phases far more than a typical site plan review. He noted that this property was added to the Town's priority redevelopment property list back in November of 2024, which was reviewed and approved by the Town Council. He also noted that the recent Day Hill Corridor Study recommended adaptive reuse of office space, multifamily housing and retail along Bloomfield Avenue and provides some guidance for evaluating proposals like this one.

He reported that since that last meeting staff have carefully reviewed the comments and the feedback from the Commission, the public and other departments and have been working closely with the applicant to address those concerns. He stated they specifically focused on refining the internal circulation, the emergency access, pedestrian and public amenities, and also the traffic in coordination with the Fire Marshal's Office. He reported that the applicant made improvements to the site. He asked Mr. Hesketh to speak and if there were any significant concerns raised by the 3rd party reviewer regarding the level of service or safety issues with the intersections or the internal circulation.

Mr. Hesketh stated that there were no major concerns raised about those types of things. They had some minor comments about the land use and trip generation, which were addressed in the initial response memo to them. He said he believed they satisfied all of their comments and revised the original report to incorporate their comments. He reported that they used a higher trip generation than what they suggested should have been used and were conservative in their analysis.

Mr. Sealy stated that according to these traffic studies, we are not talking about a capacity issue. He said the traffic signals and intersections are expected to continue operating at the same level of service following the project, and he asked Mr. Hesketh to explain the comment made initially at the beginning of the public hearing when an intersection grade goes from a D to an E. Mr. Hesketh stated that he needed a moment and Mr. Sealy reported that he would continue his comments and come back to Mr. Hesketh.

Mr. Sealy stated that he sympathized with the concerns mentioned by the public but that he could not refute an empirical study done by a licensed traffic engineer and reviewed by a third party reviewer hired by town staff. He said staff had scrutinized and reviewed this aspect heavily because we are all aware of the traffic concerns here. He encouraged the Commission to carefully review the proposal and to ask any questions to the staff or the applicant as needed. He said that remaining staff comments were relatively minor.

Commissioner Mips wanted to be sure everyone understood that there is going to be something there eventually and that a residential use would create a more tapered pace with traffic and a business would have traffic coming and going all day. She believed the traffic everyone talked about was created when I-91 was widened and the flyover from Poquonock Avenue to Day Hill Road that the government proposed did not happen. She believed that is what caused Bloomfield Avenue to be what it is now. She stated that she asked the Planning Department to forward the reports that were emailed from Mr. Mazairz to the Chief of Police so they can help stop some of it and to slow everyone down. She believed a police presence is needed there. She said she would like to see an 8' or 6' fence or something to help the people on Mountain Road area. She stated that she would like to see only one retail establishment and did not think they needed two businesses there.

Commissioner Levine stated that she agreed with everything Commissioner Mips just said.

Commissioner DeCarlo stated that he saw both sides but thought one retail establishment would be a good idea. He thought there was too much going on in that corner. He stated that he understood there to be one way in and one way out and wondered if there could be two lanes exiting where one could go left and one to the right. Commissioner Mips replied that he could ask the applicant during the rebuttal. Commissioner DeCarlo also agreed with the fence or some way to provide a buffer.

Commissioner Jepsen stated that he agreed with a lot of what Commissioner Mips said and stated that he was not sure one or two retail buildings there really matters and that he was flexible on that. He said he was in favor of a fence and that it might be best to be constructed on the abutter's side of the land because of the topography. He thought a lot of the traffic coming out of the development would be going right to I-91 and, based on the drawing, the turn ramp to get on that ramp starts after the driveway out. He wondered if there might be a way to extend that to make that right turn right onto the ramp going out. He thought a turn lane might help and the other Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Sealy asked to make a note about senior housing as the topic came up several times during public comments. He stated that senior housing continues to be an active discussion point in Windsor and that our Economic Development Director Patrick McMahon has attended conferences and participated in discussions with developers and other municipalities regarding successful senior housing projects. He stated that staff are fully aware of the demand for this type of housing and that they are continuing to explore it in our community.

Commissioner Mips asked the applicant to provide a rebuttal. Mr. Hesketh spoke in response to Mr. Sealy's earlier questions. Mr. Hesketh responded to Ms. Chapman's table that was submitted to the Commission and stated that theoretically they could reopen the office buildings tomorrow and generate those volumes of traffic without being required to go before the Commission, so he believed they were entitled to the numbers they used as existing volumes of traffic. He continued that their traffic study represents the full build traffic volume of the development. He said if it were to be approved, there would be an increase of about a hundred trips during the peak hours, but they analyzed the 300 trips in their analysis. He also reported that after revisions, the level of service that was listed as an E was brought up to a D. He did note that the Connecticut Department of Transportation would also review and approve this under an OSTA (Office of the State Traffic Administration) certificate. He stated that he assumed that the number of people running red lights is correct and believed this was not unique to Windsor. He said when they analyze traffic intersections, they

assume that there is going to be one or two cars running the red light occasionally and that is why there is a one or two second delay before the side street light turns green. He suggested notifying the Police Department and ask them to sit out there. He reported that the Starbucks will be the highest trip generator on this development and stated that he likes to call it a trip accommodator as people do not typically go out to get a coffee and return home. He said people typically stop on the way to and from somewhere else. They estimate 70% of the traffic to a Starbucks type of facility is a car that is already on the local roadway and just happens to stop there and make use of the facility. He stated that high traffic developments should be at interstate highway intersections to avoid bringing traffic down residential streets.

Mr. Alford wanted to address the request to eliminate one building. He believed eliminating one building would not really affect anything and that it is more about the intersection that is of concern. He stated that the Starbucks would be busiest in the early to mid-morning and that none of the other shops would open before 9 a.m. and the proposed restaurant would not open before 11 a.m., so their hours will be offset from one another. He stated that any conflict between the two buildings would happen in the middle of the day when there is very little traffic that is on the residential side. He said they have been working with staff on this intersection to get it to a point where they are comfortable with it. He stated that the traffic consultant made comments about crosswalks and suggested adding or moving them to different locations but there was nothing mentioned about congestion.

Commissioner Levine asked why they could not put the Starbucks in the bigger building and Mr. Alford replied that he did not think there was a congestion problem and said that is where Starbucks wants to be from a marketing point of view since the off ramp for I-91 south is pointed right at the building.

Commissioner Mips asked if there would be more than a restaurant there in the north building and Mr. East offered to speak as the real estate developer. Mr. East explained that the retail building is a neighborhood retail building where there may be a small restaurant on the end and may have other uses like a hair or nail salon, an eyewear store or an Orange Theory type of neighborhood services where most open around 9 or 10 a.m. and usually close at 5 or 6 p.m. He said deleting one building does not make sense for the whole connectivity that they have tried to create and there is an economic factors as well. He said if it pleased the Commission they could look at possibly shrinking the larger building a bit and could come back with a revised plan. He said they would love to put up fencing but that it would not be feasible to put up concrete walls. He suggested a privacy fence with proper landscaping in front of it creates a double barrier and often works very well. He said if their traffic engineers tell them that there is a major traffic impact then the retailers will not survive and they would have another empty building and that is the last thing they want to do. He said the neighbors are often the first ones to utilize the services in these buildings and can get services within a three to five minute drive instead of driving across town.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked about the exit and if they could put two lanes going out of the development. Mr. Alford said he was not sure whether they have a non-access line on the highway, and if the access line would allow them to do it then he would be happy to do it.

Mr. Hesketh added that he was not sure from a capacity standpoint if it is necessary. He said one of the things that makes it difficult is that there are crosswalks and sidewalks there and with the new rules with the Department of Transportation (DOT), you cannot just head up to a traffic signal. He said you end up

replacing the entire traffic signal when you do that. He said it sounds like a good idea and then a half a million dollars later, you have an extra lane which really is not necessary.

Commissioner DeCarlo stated that he is just looking at the peak hours and how to alleviate the pressure there during those times.

Commissioner Levine stated that they do not know who is going into that larger building yet and if a full blown gym goes in there everybody goes to the gym in the morning or after work and that would not align with the offset times Mr. Alford spoke about. Mr. East replied that they would not have enough parking spaces for a gym.

Mr. Alford stated that they envision a smaller restaurant that sells something like sandwiches with a pickup window and a couple smaller businesses like a nail salon. He said that they will not impact each other.

While the Commission was gathering their thought, Mr. Sealy read public comment letters that were sent in from people who were not present this evening.

Beverly Coker of 2 Sabrina Drive expressed her displeasure in the possibility of having commercial establishments at 465 Bloomfield Avenue and stated that she supported the idea of a residential facility.

Pamela Garzone of 625 Palisado Avenue believed senior assisted living or condominiums were needed in Windsor, not additional commercial establishments. She shared concerns of the negative impact on traffic.

Jose Vendrell of 278 Mountain Road shared concerns of increased traffic congestion, accidents, gridlock and cause hazardous conditions to the residents of Mountain Road and to those on adjacent roads. He believed that we should continue to keep our community safe and listen to the residents' concerns.

Marian McDonald of 336A Dunfey Lane believed we should not have more apartment buildings built with all the new apartments that are being added to town. She suggested helping the elderly and low income and those that are struggling to afford to live here.

Mr. Alford stated that he could not remember if he said it previously but 10% of the units will be affordable. He stated they would be willing to put a fence along the top of the hill but in some cases they would need permission from the abutters to put it on their property. He thought it would be a waste in some cases to put the fence at the bottom of the hill.

Ms. Chapman stated that she disagreed with the statement made by the applicant that there would be minimal traffic in the afternoon. She stated that according to the traffic study that there will be 94 trips per hour to the Starbucks in the afternoon and the retail would be getting up to about 63 trips per hour. She said they did not see huge differences between the morning and afternoon peaks.

Commissioner Mips said this is a concept plan and asked Mr. Sealy what kind of conditions could the Commission put on this application. Mr. Sealy responded that it depended on what level of conditions they were looking to put on it.

Commissioner Levine stated that she would make a motion and that Mr. Sealy could tell her if it is out of order.

Mr. Sealy stated that with the concept plan, they are focusing on the general layout, design, density and the uses. He said he would be cautious if they get into more significant changes where they want to move buildings and things like that.

Commissioner Levine asked about comments from staff and Mr. Sealy replied that they could condition the approval subject to resolution of outstanding issues.

Commissioner Levine made a motion requesting that the applicant consider reducing the two retail buildings to one and Mr. Sealy asked her to talk more about that. Commissioner Levine said that if this came to a vote tonight and she is feeling the way she is feeling that she will vote against it. She said that she really wanted the developer to think this through and make this an attractive parcel and not just use every ounce of space that they have.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked if the wording in the motion could be modified to change the size of the larger building and asked Mr. Sealy if that would be appropriate. Mr. Sealy replied that a minor scaling back of things would be appropriate but that it puts the developer in a difficult position when the Commission says we approve this layout, but we would like you to consider removing a building.

Commissioner Levine replied that she was not saying that but to approve the design the development concept plan with the following caveats and the first one is that the developer consider reducing the number of retail buildings on the parcel.

Commissioner Jepsen spoke while Mr. Sealy was thinking about Commissioner Levine's motion. Commissioner Jepsen said that he was convinced by Mr. Alford's point about the timeframe difference for the two buildings and that initially he had concerns. He said he did not have a problem with the two buildings as a concept. He said that it did sound like Starbucks peak is in the morning and the other retail building's peak would be in the afternoon and that it all made sense to him. He said they have a right to put in whatever they want to put in as long as it meets all of the requirements.

Commissioner Levine replied that as a Planning and Zoning Commission that they have a responsibility not only to carry out the duties of the Commission but also to listen to the residents.

Commissioner Jepsen replied that he listened to the residents and was very pleased to have this kind of turnout. He said we all know there is a huge traffic problem on Bloomfield Avenue but we should not blame it on this plan. All the Commissioners agreed.

Commissioner Levine stated that she understood that it was a totally separate issue and not for the Commission to decide but that she was troubled by the fact that there are 19 parking spaces for Starbucks and 27 parking spaces for the other retail building. She was concerned with overflow parking and if there were more than 19 cars going to Starbucks, not the drive-through, but into the store.

Commissioner DeCarlo stated that they will not get that and that Starbucks would not draw a person coming in and sitting there like a McDonalds or Burger King. He said they would get a few people coming in to use the Wi-Fi or a little conference. He said there is not a lot of seating inside. He said they will all go through the drive-through and that will be the issue. He said he liked the concept that they have made changes to and that has made him feel more comfortable with it. He said he is okay with the parking at Starbucks but it is the secondary retail that he is trying to figure out and understand what the needs may be.

Commissioner Jepsen stated that he envisioned something like the little shops next to the Stop & Shop.

Commissioner DeCarlo replied that if it is like that then not much parking is needed. He said if they could fix the exit that would make him happier, but he understood there were issues there.

Commissioner Mips stated that if they could reduce the size of the building then more room could be available for a turning lane.

Commissioner DeCarlo thought that it might help to reduce the size of the building then they would be limiting what the applicant could put in there instead of eliminating a building and make Commissioner Levine more comfortable about the concept.

Commissioner Mips asked Commissioner Levine if she would consider changing the motion to read consider reducing the size of the larger retail building. Commissioner Levine replied, I guess, and said that she just did not care for it and that is her personal opinion.

Commissioner Mips asked Commissioner Levine again about changing the language in the motion to read consider reducing the size of the larger retail building and Commissioner Levine said sure.

Design Development Concept Plan – 1 & 10 Targeting Centre and 465 Bloomfield Avenue, Mixed-use development, RC & B2 Zones, 11.81 acres, Alford Associates, Inc.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to approve the Design Development Concept Plan for 1 and 10 Targeting Centre and 465 Bloomfield Avenue with the following conditions: consider reducing the size of the larger retail building, the developer provide a buffer for neighbors to provide privacy and a sound barrier, the developer research the possibility of a right-turn lane exiting the complex, and resolution of all outstanding issues raised by town staff as noted in their memos.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

Special Use – 465 Bloomfield Avenue (portions of 465 Bloomfield Avenue & 1 Targeting Centre), Section 5.1.6A, Drive-through windows, B2 & RC Zones, Alford Associates, Inc.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved the approval of the special use at 465 Bloomfield Avenue, the drive-through window, in the B2 and RC Zones.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

Special Use – 1 Targeting Centre (portions of 465 Bloomfield Avenue & 1 Targeting Centre to become 475 Bloomfield Avenue), Section 5.1.6A, Drive-through windows, B2 Zone, Alford Associates, Inc.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved the approval of the special use at 1 Targeting Centre, the drive-through window, in the B2 Zone.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

Special Use – 1 & 10 Targeting Centre and 465 Bloomfield Avenue (includes future 475 Bloomfield Avenue address), Section 15.2.6, Shared required parking and Section 15.2.7, Reduced parking, B2 & RC Zones, 11.81 acres, Alford Associates, Inc.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved the approval of the special use at 1 and 10 Targeting Centre and 465 Bloomfield Avenue for shared required parking and reduced parking spaces.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

E. Special Use – 144 (150) Broad Street, Section, 5.2.6D(1), Limited-service restaurant, B2 Zone, Moneta Moments, LLC

Moneta Moments Co-owners Veronica Martins and Diane Smith of 213 South Center Street in Windsor Locks were present and reviewed the application. Ms. Martins explained that the space on Broad Street would be retail only and there would be no kitchen. She said since COVID-19 they converted to pre-order only, so they do not do walk-in traffic anymore.

The Commission did not have any questions.

Public Comment: None

Mr. Sealy stated that staff did not have any questions on the application.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the special use at 144 (150) Broad Street, Moneta Moments, for a limited-service restaurant.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

F. Special Use – 27 Sinclair Street, Section 4.5.7B, Group Homes, R8 Zone, .25 acres, Myers
The applicant was not present. Commissioner Mips moved the application to the bottom of the agenda.

G. Special Use – 200 Rainbow Road, Section 4.5.16, Increasing accessory building size, R11 Zone, 1.56 acres, Enders

Homeowners Lisa Chung Enders and Frank Enders were present and explained that they would like to build a 24'x24' garage and because they have a shed it will put them over the allowed square footage for an accessory structure by 88 square feet. Mr. Enders stated that the garage would not be connected to the house and would be 16' from the house and 16' from the property line as well.

Commissioner Mips asked if the square footage is over what is allowed and Mr. Enders replied that it was over by about 88 square feet.

Commissioner Mips said she should thought they were allowed an additional 1,000 square feet and Mr. Vye agreed.

Commissioner Mips asked if they were looking for just 88 square feet and Mr. Vye agreed.

Commissioner Mips stated that was way under 1,000 square feet, so it would be allowable.

Commissioner DeCarlo mentioned that there were staff comments.

Commissioner Mips stated that there will be work in the town right of way according to the Town Engineer. Mr. Vye asked if there would be any work with the driveway and Mr. Enders stated that there was no town right of way there and that construction would be in the driveway and the yard.

Mr. Vye stated to the Commission that the Town Engineer's comment is a standard comment that she put in the memo.

Commissioner Mips said that it did not look like it was in the right of way on the map.

Commissioner Mips asked the applicant if they realized that they would have to go to the Health Department for a septic review before the project begins. Mr. Enders said he did not know that and Commissioner Mips read the Health Department's comments from the staff memo. Mr. Enders did not understand why as there would be no work anywhere near the septic.

Commissioner Levine asked if they had seen the comments from staff and she read some of the comments to the applicant. She asked where the town right of way is on the property and Mr. Enders replied that he was not aware of any town right of way as they are way off the road.

Commissioner DeCarlo asked about number two on the Town Engineer's comments and asked if they had seen these comments. Mr. Enders said that he did not. Commissioner DeCarlo gave them his copy of the staff comments.

Mr. Enders stated that they did just have a professional survey done and asked if they provided the town with that plan.

Commissioner Levine stated that they have a copy of the plot plan that Mr. Alford did back in April of 1986 and Mr. Enders said that they have a new one that they will submit.

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Mips asked Mr. Vye if it would be all right to approve with final staff approval and Mr. Vye replied yes.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the special use at 200 Rainbow Road, increasing the accessory building size, in the R11 Zone pending resolution of the outstanding issues raised by staff.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

Commissioner Levine stated for the record that she knew one of the property owners for the next application but felt she could render an unbiased opinion.

H. Special Use – 63 Lighthouse Hill Road, Section 4.5.16, Increasing accessory building size, A Zone, .67 acres, Bramucci

Homeowner Angelo Bramucci of 63 Lighthouse Hill Road was present and stated that out of a medical necessity that had converted their attached garage to make a first floor bedroom and bathroom, which left them without a garage. He stated that he would like to build a 24'x24' garage within their property line and that he was working with the Engineering Department to get them a plot map.

Commissioner Mips asked if Mr. Bramucci saw the staff comments and he replied yes.

Commissioner Mips asked if he understood that this would require staff approval after the Commission's approval tonight and Mr. Bramucci said correct.

Commissioner Levine asked if they had to do anything to the existing garage and Mr. Bramucci said that the work on the existing garage to make it a first floor suite has been completed. He said it was inspected and signed off on about two weeks ago.

Public Comment: None

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the special use at 63 Lighthouse Hill Road, increasing the accessory building size, in the A Zone.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

I. Text Amendment – Section 8.6E, Commercial recreational and cultural buildings and facilities, I Zone, Donegan

Owner of Pinball Valley Bill Donegan was present and discussed that he is looking at a space at 1001 Day Hill Road on the back side of the Dudley Town building to put in a retro pinball and classic arcade.

Commissioner Mips asked if it would be downstairs on the lower level and Mr. Donegan said yes and that it would be facing the softball fields.

Commissioner Mips asked if there were any staff comments and Mr. Donegan said that there had been one from the Fire Marshal.

Commissioner Mips asked Mr. Vye if there were any comments and Mr. Vye said they did not have any comments and that the Planning Department worked with the applicant on the language.

Commissioner Jepsen asked if the text amendment would apply all over town or does the Commission limit it to a certain part of town. He asked how it worked. Mr. Vye replied that it would allow for a special use in the I (Industrial) Zone.

Mr. Sealy said that it is limited to the commercial recreational special use under the I Zone.

Public Comment: None

Commissioner Levine read the CRCOG (Capital Region Council of Governments) letter dated July 3, 2025 into the record.

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved approval of the text amendment to Section 8.6E, Commercial recreational and cultural buildings and facilities, in the I Zone pending resolution of any outstanding issues raised by staff.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

The Commission went back to agenda item V.F.

Special Use – 27 Sinclair Street, Section 4.5.7B, Group Homes, R8 Zone, .25 acres, Myers
The applicant was not present. Mr. Sealy stated that the staff had received no indication that the applicant was not going to be present and apologized to members of the audience that were present.

Commissioner Mips asked if there was enough time to postpone the hearing and Mr. Sealy said yes and that they have 65 days to open the hearing, 35 days to close the hearing and another 65 days to make a decision.

The application was postponed to Tuesday, September 9, 2025.

VI. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS AND PETITIONS – None

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Motion: Commissioner Levine moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:53 p.m.

Commissioner Jepsen seconded the motion and it passed 4-0-0.

Respectfully submitted, _____, Andrea D. Marcavitch, Recording Secretary on July 8, 2025.

Jill Levine, Secretary