



# Town of Chaplin, Connecticut

Incorporated 1822

495 Phoenixville Road, Chaplin, Connecticut 06235

Website: [www.chaplinct.org](http://www.chaplinct.org) Telephone: (860) 455-0073 Fax: (860) 455-0027

August 11, 2020

To: Chaplin Planning & Zoning Commission

From: Jay Gigliotti, Zoning Enforcement Officer

RE: Application Review: **SP19-115**- 64-66 Willimantic Road, Bestway Food & Fuel, plans dated 10/18/19 revised through 7/25/20

I have the following comments relating to application SP19-115:

1. Section 8.5 Requires a 50' Buffer strip be installed where a commercial district adjoins a residential district to the side or the rear. The outside third (1/3) of the buffer shall consist of trees and shrubs. Section 2.2 defines a buffer strip as vegetative screening used to visually and acoustically isolate neighboring properties. The submitted plan includes acceptable plantings in the outside third of the 50' buffer, but also stormwater facilities and several areas of pavement as well. **The applicant has offered an explanation and a position on the minimal intrusions into the buffer. The applicant has stated these intrusions will not have any measurable effect on the buffer and its purposes. The commission should make a determination on this issue.**
2. Section 8.3 Minimum Parking Space Requirements- The regulation does not set a standard number of parking spaces for the proposed use as a gas station. A drive thru restaurant requires 1 space per 4 seats and 1 space per 2 employees and a retail business requires 6 spaces per 1000 sq ft of floor area. The proposed building is 5,040 sq ft and 25 spaces are provided (23 Regular Spaces and 2 Handicap spaces). **Addressed.**
3. Section 5.9- Corridor Overlay District- The purpose of the Corridor Overlay District is to ensure the uses & improvements to the land promotes village nodes and community character, while discouraging strip development. The regulation also ensures excellence in site and building design. The commission has much discretion in this regulation. Refer to section 5.9.D.3.a-k. The application is compliant with all setback, height and lot size requirements specified in section 5.9, 6.2 & 8.2. **No response needed. However, commission should review these sections of the regulations as they relate to the application.**
4. No fencing has been proposed for the project, however, this project may benefit from the installation of fencing along the abutting residential properties (protection of abutting properties from wind-blown trash, noise, glare...etc.). **5' High stockade fencing and additional plantings have been shown on plans. Addressed.**
5. The stormwater basins do not appear to provide an access for the maintenance of the basins. An access should be provided into and around each of the stormwater basins. **Addressed.**
6. The Eastern Highlands Health District has generated a list of review comments on the proposal. One of the comments requires additional test pits to be performed in the area of the septic system. The applicant should also conduct test pits in the area at the lowest point of the stormwater basins to ensure grading is not into the groundwater. **Addressed.**
7. This project shall require approval from the CT DOT for the work in the CT DOT Right of Way (ROW). Has CT DOT District 2 been contacted? **Addressed.**

8. The town GIS parcel mapping differs from the existing conditions survey provided with the application. Why is this? Was a lot line revision done in the past? It also appears that some of the bearings and distances are not consistent with the map references. **Addressed.**
9. The emergency overflow from the southern stormwater basins outlets within 2 feet of the abutting property. Can this be redesigned? There is a drainage system within the Route 6 ROW, has any thought been given to discharging overflow into DOT drainage system? Is there a possibility to eliminate the entire southerly stormwater basin by discharging into the DOT drainage system? **Addressed in the 7/25/20 revisions, however, the emergency overflow from the southern basin is now proposed to be piped to the western basin near the wetland. The wetland commission shall have to approve this revision. Also, staff has witnessed emergency overflow from this wetland discharging onto the abutting property. This wetland overflow is conveyed under the driveway through a 10" CMP pipe. It may be beneficial to replace the existing pipe with a larger diameter as to ensure the driveway is not washed out.**
10. The landscaping plan does not take into account the southerly stormwater basin overflow. How will the plantings be completed in this area? **Addressed.**
11. The stormwater drainage from the roof areas are piped and discharged into the stormwater basins. Has any thought been given to put the roof drainage into underground galleries? This will eliminate the mixing of potentially contaminated parking lot runoff with clean roof water drainage and potentially reduce the size of the basins. Also, there is no roof drainage shown discharging from the diesel canopy. **The canopy roof drain connection has been shown the plans. The applicant has offered an explanation to the above inquiry.**
12. It appears that a new utility pole shall be installed to carry the underground utilities from the site, overhead to existing pole AT&T 5210. This will cross over the driveway 46 Willimantic Road. The owners of #46 should be notified in advance. **Addressed.**
13. The submitted architectural plans indicate the plans are for a new convenience store in Ledyard. **The applicant has stated the plans are consistent with proposed site and the label will be changed for final approval.**
14. Will there be indoor/ outdoor restaurant seating? **Addressed.**
15. What is the estimated total number of employees to be working at the facility at any given time? **Addressed.**
16. The application is proposing 14 pole mounted and 12 building mounted LED lighting. Is there a specification for the pole mounted lighting? Per Section 8.7.H.7 the direction of illumination must be shown. **The applicant has submitted a photometric plan from a project in Marlborough, to demonstrate the proposed lighting. This has been addressed, see Towne Engineering comment #4 in 4/6/20 review.**
17. Is any screening proposed for the refrigeration units? **The applicant has proposed a 5' high by 5' long stockade fence to screen the refrigeration units from the street. Addressed.**
18. Will the 40" oak tree located at the southern property corner need to be removed for sightline? If not, please provide a note on the plans indicating the tree shall remain in place. **Addressed.**
19. Is there a detail for the dumpster pad & enclosure? **A detail has been provided for the dumpster pad, but not the enclosure. Addressed**
20. Please indicate the location of the temporary pavement pad for construction equipment. **Addressed.**
21. An As-Built should be required upon the completion of the development and submitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission. **Addressed.**

In addition, I would like to highlight the following concerns from either the public hearing or Towne Engineering's 2/24/20 review:

1. Have any revisions been made to address the concern regarding headlights, as discussed at the 2/13/20 Public hearing? **5' High stockade fencing and additional plantings have been shown on plans.**
2. During the hearing the applicant indicated an exterminator would be hired before the demolition of the abandoned structures. A note should be added to the demolition plan. **Addressed.**
3. Towne Engineering comment #4 and comment #3 on 4/6/20 review comments, relating to the proposed signage. **The submitted sign detail does not match the sign detail on the 3/21/20 revised plan set. Addressed.**
4. Towne Engineering comment #9, regarding a cost estimate for erosion control. This relates to the requirement of an erosion and sedimentation control bond. **Addressed.**
5. Towne Engineering's comment # 11, relating to the stormwater system. **See Towne Engineering review dated 8/6/20.**