

Planning & Zoning Commission – October 6, 2015

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
October 6, 2015

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, October 6, 2015. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

Paul Chaplinsky	Kevin Conroy
James Macchio	Susan Locks
Jennifer Clock	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Joe Coviello, Steve Leggett, James E. Morelli, Jr. & Anthony D'Angelo,

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development
James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer
Mark Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/ Town Attorney

Absent: Steve Kalkowski, Commissioner

The Chair seated Mr. Coviello for Mr. Kalkowski and a quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular meeting of September 15, 2015

Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

5. BUSINESS MEETING

Planning & Zoning Commission – October 6, 2015

A. Shelconn Construction, applicant, Paul Bracone, owner, site plan application to renovate existing building and construct 16,560 square foot addition, 39 DePaolo Drive, in an I-1 zone. (SPR #1701) tabled from September 15.

Joseph Greene, from Robert Green Associates, presented. Last time here we had an engineering comment we needed to address in regards to doing a little bit more to the drainage report. We have submitted that and Jim is all set with that, I think. Any outstanding comments from planning and zoning or engineering we've addressed and the plans before you take in those comments.

Mr. Grappone confirmed the drainage issue has been addressed. We have some stipulations.

Mr. Phillips added it would be subject to a \$500 sewer connection fee.

This item is ready for action with the following stipulations:

1. The existing ornamental tree "to be relocated" will be moved to satisfy the street tree requirement.

2. Any rooftop mechanicals will be screened as necessary upon inspection by town staff at the Certificate of Zoning Compliance level.

3. The applicant will work with town staff on additional landscaping in front of the front parking area at the time of application of Zoning Permit.

4. Confirm Engineering comment #4 (disposition of floor drains) from Memo dated 8-25-15, engineering department.

5. Shop drawings to be approved by engineering prior to ordering of pump station - comment #7 from memo dated 8-25-15.

Mr. Green brought up the waiver for the sidewalks asked for. That was in writing to you. Mr. Phillips clarified it's not required --- sidewalks are not required in an industrial zone. Mr. Green noted they were shown on the site plan so they will be taken off.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the Town Planner's stipulations above. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. B & R Corp site plan modification to consolidate process building into one structure, 49 DePaul Drive, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1667.2)

Planning & Zoning Commission – October 6, 2015

Brian Paganini, Vice President of Quantum Biopower and a representative of B & R presented.

B & R Corporation is requesting a site plan modification to SPR 1667. This requested was initiated by comments and conditions brought forth by the Town of Southington P & Z Commission for the approval of SPU 531 & SPR 1667.

In addressing these stipulations, we were required to add equipment to the original processes proposed in order to comply with the P & Z requests. The following is a review of those comments and remedies we are proposing to comply with the Town of Southington P & Z.

I'd like to answer the stipulations and comments provided to us by staff prior to this meeting:

- Comment by staff which asked us to clarify the hours of operation that are inconsistent between the plans and the response to comments. The activities that we are going to propose for our anaerobic digestion facility are going to occur between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm, Monday thru Friday.

In the adjoining site on DePaolo Drive, we also are performing other volume reduction activities, process and storage and those activities will occur between 7:00 am and 6:00 pm, Monday thru Friday and 7:00 am to 4:00 pm Saturday and closed on Sunday.

- The town has asked us to clarify the term volume reduction. On Note #12 on the plans it is generally referred to as organic food waste stream. The CTDEP identifies as various activities under the term volume reduction. These activities could include clean and green waste processing, composting, mulch manufacturing, storing millings as well as food waste processing via anaerobic digestion.

Our application includes these operations and we'll amend our plan to include anaerobic digestion of organic food waste streams under volume reduction.

- Provide details of the waste water treatment to the satisfaction of both the Town of Southington WPCA and the CTDEP. To-date we have submitted a narrative of the treatment system to staff. We've adopted technology that removes the high constituents of hydrogen and phosphorus in our effluent stream. This information was provided to staff outlining our technology approach which puts us in compliance with the effluent discharge parameter determined by the Town of Southington.

The treatment approach will be reviewed by the CTDEP and we're happy to furnish additional information about this approach to staff upon questioning.

Planning & Zoning Commission – October 6, 2015

- We were asked to install flow meter of effluent discharge into the public water system. Yes. We will add flow meter to our plan.

- We were asked to describe our odor control device which was in the previous SPU session. We have provided details about the odor control device which is a carbon filtration system. We've also provided the vendor to the town and the CTDEP and we'll provide the details of the process and detailed engineering once they are completed.

Showed visuals and explained changes.

Changes:

- We had proposed multiple processing buildings as well as a command center for our facility. Those operations have been joined into one processing building which will handle multiple functions. We've reduced the amount of spatial requirements for the buildings on the site.

The digestion component of our original site plan, we have added two additional tanks. The primary tank was pointed out. To the immediate right the tank is what is known as a tar tank which essentially pre-chews the food prior to digestion. After the digestion tank (indicating) is a digestate holding tank and that provides two to three days worth of buffer to gradually feed our waste water pretreatment system to keep the bugs and biology alive throughout the weekends when we're not fully operational.

The other change to the site plan is we've added pretreatment tanks here (indicating) and essentially this a membrane bioreactor system that will remove the constituents of nitrogen phosphorus from our liquid waste stream to meet the discharge requirements outlined to the town.

Those are the primary changes to the site plan. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Conroy addressed the aeration tank. Is that open air or closed. Mr. Paganini responded it is open air. It's a diffused bubbler open air tank. That's pre-treated before it is treated, the dewatered liquid flows into the tank where it is aerated. Discussion.

Mr. Conroy questioned the no odor control on the tank. Mr. Paganini said this a system that is a bottom tank diffuser. With another form of aeration we'd have been more concerned but because the aeration is diffused from the bottom, we've been told by the technology writer that there is no need or worry for odorous constituents coming from the tank. Discussion.

The pretreatment phase was explained by Mr. Paganini to the commissioners. Four steps were described.

Mr. Conroy noted one of the points from the original application was that all that activity was going to be conducted indoors with very little

outdoor activity which would be related to maintenance mainly. The new plan now has quite a bit of activity going on outdoors including this treatment phase that wasn't part of the original plan. I'm a little concerns we're getting a little of bait and switch here. We were promised an enclosed system but now we have basically a tipping floor and a waste water treatment plant on the outside. It is treating food waste and not municipal waste but the processes are similar. Discussion.

Mr. Paganini concluded by saying this is going to help us meet the discharge parameters that the town says we need to meet in order to discharge back to the WPCA.

Mr. Conroy said his concern with this site has always been the location. It's an industrial site, yes, but it is wedged into a residential area within a very short distance of commercial districts. It's uphill from the Lake Compounce who has a new campground. The idea of waste water treatment outdoors is a bit of a concern. I'll defer to the staff as to whether that is acceptable or not but for my mind it seems to me that this process is a little different from what we were shown the first time. Maybe you can explain that a little bit as to what is occurring here. Our concerns are odor and any visual nuisances that come with that.

Mr. Paganini explained the original site plan had an inbound waste receptor located outdoors. Trucks bring clean material and dump it into a sump grade hopper with a garage door style process on it with negative air pressure. We opted to consolidate all of those activities into one building and put it through one primary odor control device located in an adjacent part of the building. We felt this was a dramatic improvement to managing the odors within the organics processing building. Explained why this was a better process with no odorous emissions coming from the processing building.

As to pretreatment steps, we've provided staff with information. I'd be happy to follow up with any questions after this meeting but it has been our determination through our technology provider that the material that is going to be odorous in nature, if removed during the methane collection of the digestion process, once we perform mechanical separation where liquids are removed, the solid material goes to compost at the rear of the property and then the liquid material is put through a tank where we introduce bacteria that like to eat the odorous nitrogen and then from there it goes into an aeration step where we use air through the bottom of the tank to diffuse the remaining ammonia which our technology provider has indicated to us is a relatively low to zero odor emission type of process.

The final step is a membrane bioreactor step. We polish the remaining constituents of nitrogen phosphorous out of the waste water which makes it amenable to discharge to the local sanitary sewer.

Planning & Zoning Commission – October 6, 2015

Mr. Conroy asked Mr. Paganini to walk the commission around the site and follow the flow of material from the main building which he did.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about similar systems in our area. Mr. Paganini said there are 18 of them running in the State of Connecticut. A very common process. MLE Pretreatment Process. Mr. Paganini will provide a list of them to the commissioners.

Mr. Grappone was asked to comment. We made very low level requirements for phosphorous nitrogen after the approval of the application. That is in keeping with our own permit which is the state's discharge permit for the town. That is a main reason why we are going to a major upgrade in the future. We basically set the same limits for this application as we are.

With that, B & R went back and looked at the technologies to meet the low level nitrogen and phosphorus levels. We don't have any of the details, the building plans or what the proposed changes are as far as fan size or the odor control system but basically the technology they're using for food waste is what we're using for our waste water treatment plant.

Aeration which we have aeration tanks right now which are nitrogen reactors which are aeration tanks. We are going to fine level diffusion in our treatment plant upgrade.

As far as odor control, we are going with activated carbon units and that is what they're proposing.

The technology as Mr. Paganini indicated would be basically in sync between the food reduction plan and the human waste reduction plan.

Part of the stipulation is we will require further detail that we don't have at this point in time. Staff feels they're going in the right direction.

Mr. Conroy asked, other than cost, is there another reason for the change? Could this technology be done under the original site plan?

Mr. Paganini indicated this is a significant upgrade in our cost. To meet the regulations for discharge, this was the technology. This is the technology that removes very high constituents of nitrogen and phosphorous which is what we make on a daily basis. We feel this is what we need to get the job done.

Mr. Phillips stated if you want to approve the project, he has three stipulations in accordance with the engineering suggestions.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted there is a change to the plan here. I sense there is a concern on Mr. Conroy's part as it is a significant issue we want to insure that the area is protected from something like odor. Based on what you are telling me, I have a reasonably high confidence level and based on

Planning & Zoning Commission – October 6, 2015

what staff is reporting that there is probably not a concern here. However, I would appreciate your feedback about allowing the commission a little bit more time to look into this, maybe visit a site in the area. Would you be supportive of allowing us a few more weeks to look into this?

Mr. Paganini said we are utilizing 40% of the capital cost of this coming out of our own pocket. The last thing we want to do is build a facility that is going to create odors. This is going to be a model in the region or anaerobic digestion.

Secondly, there are other MLE processes in the state but only a handful in the country do food waste. I would suggest if you go to a waste water treatment plant it might not be representative of what we're doing. I would contend we'll be far less odorous because of the nature of how we capture the substrates. That being said, I want to be sure the commission has a high level of comfort with our application and I defer to you all for further action.

Mark Vigenault, Quantum Biopower operations manager spoke. I'd like to note also that aeration tanks are not really covered in almost any application of waste water treatment. Explained that is why the design is the way it is.

Attorney Sciota noted stipulation 3: final design approval by Engineer of Advance Carbon System for Odor Control Unit. He asked staff if they would be doing the same thing the commissioners are talking about as far as review. Mr. Grappone said yes.

Attorney Sciota added to the commission you will have staff doing what you are talking about doing. If you feel comfortable with staff doing that work, I think the stipulation is a pretty solid one.

The applicant's timetable was discussed.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. Lovley Development, request for reduction of subdivision bond from \$774,000 to a new amount of \$202,000, East Gate Meadows Estates (S #1298)

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

D. Road acceptance - Triano Drive from Lazy Lane to its terminus, a distance of 660 feet (.13 mi), South Farms subdivision (S #1211.3).

Ready for action subject to the installation of fiber optic or revocation of bond.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the Town Planner's stipulation noted above. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Road acceptance - Westfield Drive from Canal Street to its terminus, a distance of 545 feet (.10 mi).

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

6. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Jennifer Clock thanked Commissioner Conroy for attending and reviewing the entire plan. He added a lot of valuable input.

We're going to have one more meeting for discussion and then we're going to have our public input meeting Thursday, November 19th. It will be advertised. We really would like a good attendance. It's very important for this meeting.

Mr. Phillips added right now he is working on the Implementation Schedule which has policy and action items with basically leaders and partners. Right now we're identifying the board and commissions and other agencies and town staff, departments that would be involved as a leader or partner. I'm working through that right now.

That'll be part of the draft plan that will be prepared certainly for the public informational meeting. I'll be getting that information out to the various boards and staff for final review and comments.

The ultimate goal is to make sure that everybody has a chance to have a look at it and buy in. Get through the process with as minimal bumps in the road as we can considering we've done a lot of great work on it with a lot of great involvement.

The Chair asked everyone to look at the draft, read it and if there are questions ask Jen and he'll pass them to Glenn to get the answers. We should all plan on attending that meeting.

Very user friendly and interesting to read commented Mr. Phillips.

Mr. D'Angelo serves on the committee and he felt the plan will be as good as it is going to be used for the next ten years. We all have to do due

diligence to make sure that the plan is being used. Look at the recommendations and not just put it on the shelf. A good thing for the town.

It is available on the town's website.

Ms. Clock echoed what Mr. D'Angelo said. What he said is so true because this plan is only as good as its implementation. We are suggesting either a formal or informal implementation committee so that however often they can meet we can insure that this plan is being used by all the boards and commissions so it stays current for the next ten years.

7. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Phillips noted an administrative approval, SPR 1686.1 - 99 Executive Boulevard aka Executive West. A quick rundown is they've been going through some value engineering trying to negotiate with their prospective tenants. They are Michael's and Home Goods.

Through that process they've made some minor changes to the building. The most noticeable change is the hanging shelving (chads) on the sides and the front, those proved to be very expensive and they're proposing to remove those. They propose to change a few of the treatments on the side of the building. I wasn't a big fan of the hanging chads, anyway.

I am not concerned about the building changes. Both façade changes on each end a little bit in the back, but that is going to be screened. The units in-between are not touched as they don't have occupants yet.

As far as the site plan, the curbing is going to be granite except they want to change the curbing on the side and the back and change that to concrete because it's a cost saving measure and not terribly visible to the general public.

They wanted to move some islands around but I told them our regulations have a maximum of ten spaces and they have to break it up. It doesn't work very well, but the regulations are what they are.

The other major noticeable change is along the southern pad site, they want to, instead of putting in the sidewalk in that area, they want to put in a 3:1 slope or 2:1 slope area with the reasoning they don't want to put the sidewalk in now because there are no tenants that've purchased those pad sites.

It's understood once those pad sites are taken up, they would install the curb to the original plan. Just a temporary phasing.

I didn't see a lot of issues there. I'm hoping you would look at it as an administrative site approval. They want to move forward. We don't have a lot of control over the building design, anyway. To me, I think, if anything, it might be an improvement over those hanging things.

The circulation pattern is staying the same.

They're moving a dumpster in the back of the parking lot.

Pedestrian access was discussed. There are no changes to what was approved.

Parking requirements were discussed. Can we do a reduction in parking spaces. Do we need all the black asphalt commented Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Phillips said they are reducing the parking spaces along the sidewalk area where the pad sites are. At this point, the regulations are what they are and they have what they require.

More discussion on the treatments to the building.

Everyone agreed it could be an administrative approval item.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Just what was discussed as an administrative approval.

The Chair noted an email he sent out earlier today asking everyone to take a look at Section 1305-D.1. I won't do anything tonight but I am hoping everyone can take a look at that. I had a conversation with our economic development division and he had some questions regarding this regulation. If you can, for the next meeting, try to take a look at it and reach out to Lou, if at all possible, and talk to him about some of the concerns he has with regards to this.

He thought it was a little too stringent with regards to the size of the number and location of the number on the addresses. Lou can better explain it, I think.

For our next meeting, take a look at it and reach out to Lou so he can discuss with you his chief complaint/concerns with regards to it.

Mr. Phillips added the actual language in many cases we borrow from others and that is what I did in this case. I didn't focus on the size and location of the number. It's something I would consider a normal sign. What's the right size and location, there really isn't one. It is a policy decision.

Mr. D'Angelo asked to have Lou send an email out addressing his concerns and some recommendation so we know what to look for.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to adjourn which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 7:51 o'clock, p.m.)