

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
March 15, 2011

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing and regular meeting on Tuesday, March 15, 2011. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:01 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

James Sinclair	Steve Kalkowski
Kelly Kennedy DelDebbio*	Paul Chaplinsky
Zaya Oshana, Jr.	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Lisa Conroy
 Randall Gage

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mary Savage-Dunham, Town Planner
Anthony J. Tranquillo, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney
Garry Brumback, Town Manager

Absent: Francis Kenefick, Commissioner
 Patrick Saucier, Alternate
 James Macchio, Alternate

(*Left the meeting where noted.)

The Chair seated Lisa Conroy for Fran Kenefick. A quorum was determined.

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

The Minutes are being prepared summary style and the video and audio tapes are available for further detail.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chairman, presiding:

Approval of Minutes - Regular Meeting of March 1, 2011

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve which was seconded by Ms. DelDebbio. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

The Town Planner read the legal notice into the record.

A. Special Permit Use application of Dennis Repoli to construct multiple buildings on one lot, Parcel 70, Queen Street (Map 133, Parcel 70) (SPU #492).

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, representing the applicant presented the application.

This is a 3.4 acre piece of property. It's across Queen Street from the Oakhill Cemetery, south of the Penteck Building and north of the intersection with Flanders Street.

This is a special permit request to have multiple buildings on one parcel. Explained the site plan with three proposed buildings and associated parking. We're proposing a mixed use of professional office and medical office buildings. Total square footage for the site is 16,000 sf. It's 8,000 sf per floor. We're proposing 84 parking spaces.

He showed a rendering of the proposed buildings and the three buildings would be basically identical. Explained.

He explained the different scenarios they had considered for this site and we felt the scale of this proposal works well with the transition from a more commercial end of Queen Street to a more residential office section as we start to head south.

We're still working with staff on comments. We'll be requesting a continuance of this public hearing. If you have questions for me or the architect we'll be happy to answer them.

Location of the buildings on the site was discussed in response to a question by Mr. Chaplinsky. To keep a reasonable distance away from the wetlands and still outside of the sewer easement, this was the best location for the buildings.

Traffic in/out of the site was discussed. Mr. Giudice said a traffic engineer was working with them and they were also working with the state.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

The Chair continued the public hearing as more information is coming.

B. Special Permit Use application of Borghesi Building & Engineering Co.Inc., (applicant) T own of Southington (owner) for the

continuation of government use in a residential zone, 196 North Main Street (SPU #494)

Ms. Savage Dunham briefly framed the application before turning the presentation over to Dr. Erardi. She would then make a few more statements and then the traffic consultant would speak.

She this is a special permit use application for continuation of municipal uses in the form of offices at North Center School, 196 Main Street in accordance with Sections 3-051A and 8 of the zoning regulations. This property is currently zoned R/O and it has been in municipal use since when it was constructed for that purpose back in the late 50's.

Dr. Erardi commented everyone or nearly everyone in the room has heard the presentation. Approximately 18 months ago, thru the action of the school board and through the work of central administration, we recognized that the North Center School would be nearly vacant. We recognized that the BOE office at Beecher Street is rounding to year 99. And, we also recognized that ALTA was placed at the Pyne Center temporarily. We looked to resolve those three issues.

We did that in partnership with the Town Council, the Board of Finance and with Town Staff. This work continues in partnership with the PZC membership recently added to the facility committee.

What it all came down to was trying to be efficient, trying to create partnerships with town entities and trying to minimize costs as we consolidate.

I will speak specifically to the issue you have this evening. All of the commissioners are aware that we've gone through the past three or four months in conversations with you and that we have unanimously endorsed a Town Center with the town staff. What that means is I believe the work in front of you is the continuation of office use at North Center School.

There was a document prepared by Mary Savage that I believe you received on March 8th and that document does a terrific job illustrating the use of North Center School particularly over the past ten years. Explained the document is 100 percent accurate and that the office space that back in the 1950's started at North Center School continues to go forward in 2011.

I know the project continues to be highly endorsed as we see the future of where our BOE needs to be in partnership with the town offices that will be moving in with us.

I'll answer questions.

(No questions)

Ms. Savage Dunham reiterated this is a special permit use application and so I'd like to briefly run through the general considerations for your review as you consider the appropriateness of the continuation of a municipal use at this facility.

Referred to and explained Section 8-02.1. She noted this property is zoned R/O which in itself is an endorsement of the appropriateness of the site for office uses. It's consistent with both the future plan for that area as well as the zoning. It is an established location with over 71 years of ongoing municipal use. In fact, the facility was constructed for municipal uses originally.

With regard to property values, we've had an analysis and statement from our Town Assessor who determined that there are no negatives effects foreseen on property values with respect to this project.

Referred to Section 8-02.2. The proposed use and buildings are in harmony and character with the surrounding property and does not discourage the development and use of adjacent properties. The area is basically built out. The municipal use in place. The site is functioning appropriately at this point. In our opinion, we will be improving the situation.

We're not proposing the change the structure in any way as far as the physical bulk. There may be improves to the façade or a new sign. It's not going to get taller or smaller. It's going to be much as it seems today.

Section 8-02.3 & 8-02.7 were discussed. The aesthetics will improve after this project is done to the benefit of the neighbors and the streetscape. She explained the improvements being proposed; i.e.: removal of fence and guardrails, access drive will be relocated to be opposite Hobart Street. Impervious surface overall is going to be reduced. We are going to improve the pedestrian connectivity both within the site as well as along the roadway.

Discussion.

Section 8-02.4 - the site is designed to accommodate emergency vehicles.

Section 8-02.5, 8-02.10 and 8-02.15 were noted as all being in compliance.

Our traffic consultant will speak about the traffic.

With regard to the Plan of Conservation and Development, I would say that during your planning process when you prepared your future land use plan that envisions development patterns that respect existing development, protect sensitive lands and the town's aesthetic assets and provide for expansion of the town's economic base. This proposed site is identified as a general commercial neighborhood area.

Both your future land use plan and your zoning essentially codify the fact that office and commercial uses are indeed appropriate in that location.

Section 8-02.6 the lot is appropriate and consistent with the zoning district.

Section 8-02.8 will be complied with. We hold our plans to the same standards we hold everybody else to.

Section 8-02.9, compatibility. She stated municipal, government and office use has been operating in this location for 71 years. It is an acceptable and appropriate location for this use.

This proposal, with the site improvements, improves the aesthetics and traffic and pedestrian circulation at this location.

You need to make a finding because this is in a residential zone. You need to speak to the appropriateness of the proposal for this zone.

8-02.13 will be complied with. We've been through the wetlands process.

We do have adequate public utilities as noted in Section 8-02.14.

I've already covered Section 8-02.12 that we are not going to impact the groundwater but I would state there is almost no work near the wetlands or floodplain. We're increasing the amount of open space. We're preserving existing trees. And, we are not affecting the groundwater.

I'd like to ask Jim Bubarus to come up and brief you on the results of the traffic analysis.

Jim Bubarus, principal in Bubarus Traffic Associates. We're traffic engineering consultants located in Cheshire.

He went over his traffic analysis which is on file in the Town Planner's Office.

Our recommendation to the town was that the driveway be put opposite Hobart Street. There's a signal there now which would be revamped to provide signalized control for the driveway, as well.
Discussion.

Spoke extensively about the Route 10 Corridor as it exists today and the narrowness of it. He spoke of different options to improve the flow of traffic.

This development will maintain the level of service that is there today.

Discussed the survey the Town Engineer's office did of the 65 proposed employees to be relocated to this facility and the results. (See traffic analysis)

As shown in his report, this use is going to be a lower impactor than what was there before and it will have less of a constraint than it had before since there won't be the pedestrian volumes you had before and you won't have the buses.

Traffic signal modification was discussed.

That covers what I had to say and I'll take questions.

Discussion of whether an advance left turn treatment on the signal will be beneficial in response to a query by Ms. Conroy.

(End of Tape #1, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #1, Side B)

Discussion of using the existing mast arm.

Discussion of the distribution percentages was had in response to a question by Mr. Oshana.

Mr. Bubarus explained the ITE Trip generation manual as a data source.

Ms. Savage Dunham noted this has not been referred out for a peer review as it is redundant. Mr. Bubarus is the town's consultant for this project and he performed the traffic corridor study for Main Street and we're comfortable that he is more than capable to do the job.

Mr. Sinclair asked if there was a plan for when Mill Street is flooded. Mr. Tranquillo explained that happens very little and it is only for a duration of six to eight hours.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Dianna MacDougall, 86 Williamsburg Drive and I am an owner of 276 North Main Street where I house my office. I'm speaking in favor of it because I think overall this is a very good use for that site. My main concern is traffic. I would like to see the town try to do something to alleviate the problems.

Discussion.

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. This section passes the test of Section 8 and all the way up. A special permit use doesn't determine

what departments go in there. That has nothing to do with Section 8 or the special permit use. Even the site plan will not determine which departments go down there. You look at the outside of the building and not what goes on inside.

I am in favor of this project. It's the best alternative we have.

Brian Goralski, 80 Buckland Street, Plantsville. Spoke in favor of the project. I am excited about the opportunity for the building which was once a school become something even more successful for the community as a whole. You are the planning experts of Southington. I see this working well into the future and solving some of the problems our community faces. No solution is perfect, but I think this is one of the best solutions for a building and the town issues and problems.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

BUSINESS MEETING:

A. Presentation on Activate Southington.

John Myers, Executive Director gave an audio visual presentation on Activate Southington. He offered opening remarks noting that this is a community based initiative representing the various community sectors. Our overall mission is to improve the overall health and wellness of Southington and decrease childhood obesity by providing opportunities for active living, healthy living and physical activity.

We want to do that in three ways:

- increasing awareness of our community needs and challenges
- supporting healthy eating and active living initiative here in town with our time, our resources and financial support
- promoting an environment where active living and physical activity is part of everyday life.

We hope to inspire you to find ways to improve our life style in town and at the end of the day to share our vision of being the healthiest community can be.

(Presentation offered)

Mr. Myers explained mini-grants the program had to offer for up to \$500 that can be applied for.

Mr. Riccio spoke about the community interest in community gardens and open space.

B. Special Permit Use application of Dennis Repoli to construct multiple buildings on one lot, Parcel 70, Queen Street (Map 133, Parcel 70) (SPU #492).

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table. Mr. Oshana seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. Dennis Repoli, site plan application to construct 3 two-story medical office buildings, Queen Street (Map 133, Parcel 70) SPR #1579 request for 65-day extension.

Mr. Giudice said he would be asking for a 65-day extension. He briefly went over the site plan as mentioned in the public hearing.

He noted sidewalks are being proposed along Queen Street. We are working with the staff on comments regarding traffic and parking stipulations. We've incorporated underground stormwater storage for runoff and level spreaders for discharge. We have IW approval. We have a very extensive landscape plan proposed for the site.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to grant the 65-day extension. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

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

D. Special Permit Use application of Borghesi Building & Engineering Co.Inc., (applicant) Town of Southington (owner) for the continuation of government use in a residential zone, 196 North Main Street (SPU #494)

The Town Planner advised procedurally this plan, once it passes this board still does need to go to the DOT for their review. She referred the commission back to Section 8-02.11 because this is an R/O zone and there is office uses adjacent to it.

Mr. Chaplinsky passed out a couple of handouts for the commission's consideration. These are basically an output of one of the subcommittee's work, some investigations that were done with respect to the impact that could possibly take place by moving certain departments or entire Town Halls away from the town centers. He then reviewed the handouts pointing out pertinent comments relative to

discussion. (Hand outs on file in the Town Planner's Office for review.)

These are concerns that were raised by Commissioner Kalkowsky and me at the subcommittee meetings.

I guess there are questions that I've asked all along:

- What is the impact to the CB zone by moving one or more of the town hall departments away from the Town Hall;
- How does staff efficiency be effected by moving, essentially splitting the Town Hall into two locations; and

Another question I have is:

- If we move the primary land use from the Town Hall to North Center School, what happens to the customers who have to visit both of those locations for business?

I haven't heard any data with respect to these questions and this plan and it still concerns me that we have these questions unanswered.

He then referred to the letter he wrote to Ms. Krumholtz(sp) and what she had written back to me. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.)

Mr. Oshana had a couple of comments about the presentation tonight for the record. We have North Center School and looking at Section 8, it is an important section as it is the section where we talk about special permit uses. This is a special permit use, not a normal run of the mill site plan.

The statement was made this is a continuation of an office use at North Center School. That isn't 100 percent accurate. It isn't, it wasn't an office use. It was a school, an educational institution. It is a significant change, at least in my opinion. It's going from a school transforming into offices.

Municipal use is consistent or is it a change from a school to office use? I think it is a change from what it was intended to be, a school, an educational institution changed to office use. Intense office use, multistory office use as opposed to an educational use which it was when it was first set up.

Aesthetically it sounds like an improvement. Explained.

It was stated it is found to be a low traffic generator. We have brought in a second eye to look at traffic many, many times, especially on a major application. I think it would have been nice to have a second set eyes look at this because it is in such a congested, problematic part of town.

Discussion.

Neighborhood compatibility, 71 years as an acceptable use. I question the 71 years. It's not 71 years of the same use. It is 71 years and now we're doing it differently. A dramatically different use from an educational institution to multistory office use.

Spoke extensively about traffic problems. Went over the figures in the traffic study. I think a school's traffic pattern is dramatically different than a Town Hall's traffic pattern.

Discussion.

I have some concerns. I don't think we have completely satisfied Section 8.

Ms. DelDebbio spoke regarding the traffic. She spoke about school traffic being a high congestion use at one time. It doesn't seem to me the BOE would be the same intense congestion that you would have with a school.

The parking is going to be much more than what we have at Town Hall now.

If we could move the sidewalk at all, just a little, to have a turning lane would be good. Explained.

Can someone look into making the access from Mill Street a two way access as that would help alleviate the congestion on Route 10? Mr. Tranquillo said there will be two way access on Mill Street. That'll be converted to two way.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he agreed with some of the comments made here by fellow commissioners. I agree with Commissioner Oshana that there has been a long legacy of educational use and while there was some limited office use, I don't believe that was the main use of the facility at North Center School. I also do believe that the proposed use is significantly different than the previous 71 years.

With that, I am going to make a motion to approve this SPU with stipulations. And, I am going to stipulate for the reasons that we spoke about here on the commission and in the subcommittee with respect to the intensity of the use. My stipulations that I am going to put on the table are:

- The departments for the intended use that's permitted at North Center School would be the Board of Education, the Registrar of Voters, Finance Department, Youth Services, Probate and storage of other Town assets, as well as a meeting center as proposed.

Those departments for the intended use that would be stipulated NOT permitted at North Center School and the related activities of

these and uses of these departments is: Parks & Rec, Economic Development, Town Manager, Town Attorney, Town Clerk, Tax Office, Assessor, Town Planner & Assistant Planner, Zoning Enforcement, engineering, sewer and sanitation, building department and health department.

And for the record, I am going to cite the following regulations as reasons for making the motion:

Section 8-02.1, the proposed use of the excluded departments are not consistent with the purpose as operation of these departments at this location would be detrimental to surrounding property values and negatively impact the values of properties and existing businesses in the CB zone around Town Hall and are not consistent with the orderly development of the Town of Southington.

Section 8-02.2, the proposed use of the excluded departments are not in harmony and character with the surrounding properties.

Section 8-02.9, the proposed use of the excluded departments will alter the essential characteristics of the area and will adversely affect the property values in the neighborhood. And, it will also adversely affect the CB zoned properties from where the departments will be located.

Section 8-02.10, the proposed use of the excluded departments are not consistent with the policies, goals and objectives of the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development as described in the earlier meeting. You know the land use plans cites that the future land use plan which envisions development patterns that respect existing development and that existing development would be around the Town Hall. Again, the intensity of this proposal would create two Town Halls and create development patterns that would not respect the existing development.

And, finally, Section 8-02.11, the proposed use and the intensity of the operations of the proposed use of these departments at this location are not compatible with the development and use of the neighborhood and adjacent properties.

Mr. Kalkowski seconded the motion.

Mr. Sinclair asked the Town Attorney if the commission could stipulate to that. Attorney Sciota said he has never seen a stipulation like that. To answer your question, I don't know the answer to that question. My gut reaction is no you can't because what you are doing is you are usurping the powers of the administration which is the Town Council and the Administration to do that.

In front of you today is: Is municipal offices appropriate under your regulations. You're saying some are and some are not. That is not a PZC choice; it's the choice of the Council and the Management. Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he looked at it as the intensity of the use of the specific property. That's the way I interpret the regulations.

Mr. Brumback said that the stipulations are a mistake, they may be legal. But they are going to sub optimize this to the point where it's now much more arguable whether or not it's functional. This was a very creative, adaptive use given the fact that we all agree ideally one of the referenda would have passed that would have allowed us to keep City Hall united. But as a Manager to manage in communities where there are separate departments in multiple buildings, that is relatively easy to manage thru.

But I, quite honestly, have never been in a position where I haven't at least been offered the opportunity to work through those things as effectively as my professional training would allow.

Further discussion on whether the motion is legal is not.

Mr. Chaplinsky said his motion would stand. He likes the concept of the plan. I believe it is sound and I support it. However, the plan as proposed, I think there are other people here who probably would say that they would deny this request. What I am trying to do is create a middle ground for the commission, town staff and all those involved to work towards. My motion stipulates which departments are permitted and which are not. It's up to you guys within those confines to determine which ones you want to send over there and which ones you don't.

Discussion followed regarding a question by Ms. Conroy which asked Mr. Chaplinsky, about how stipulating that some can move there but some offices can't move there relate to the preface of everything saying it's not good for any of them to be away from the downtown area.

The Chair commented you must understand that if those go forward, I don't think it's feasible for the town to up this building with just the BOE in it. It'll be back to the drawing board to figure out which departments would go there.

Discussion.

(End of Tape #2, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #2, Side B)

Discussion of studies that could be done to move some of the departments that have been excluded.

Attorney Sciota suggested allowing us to move forward with the studies knowing that we can make modification at that time. Everything is going to freeze at this point with that stipulation. We'll have to relook at this whole thing.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky responded the data had been asked for previously in subcommittee and not provided.

Roll Call:	Chaplinsky:	Yes
	DelDebbio:	No
	Kalkowski:	Yes
	Oshana:	No
	Sinclair:	No
	Conroy:	No
	DelSanto:	No

(Motion fails 2 to 5)

Mr. Oshana made a motion for a table in accordance with the points he made on the record for further discussion. Mr. Sinclair seconded.

Roll Call:	Chaplinsky:	No
	DelDebbio:	No
	Kalkowski:	No
	Oshana:	Yes
	Sinclair:	Yes
	Conroy:	No
	DelSanto:	Yes

(Motion fails 3 to 4)

Ms. DelDebbio said she would like to see this move forward. I understand the stipulations but I think it is more crippling than maybe what was realized to begin with. I would like to make a motion for this to go ahead without the stipulations and take our Town Attorney up on what he had said previously about getting some more information before it comes before us again.

Mr. Kalkowski asked specifically about the information.

Attorney Sciota said he would contact CCM to see what's out there. Our goal is to facilitate the movement. We understand that there may be ways that we have something down there at North Center School understand the downtown area, ways to facilitate that. We feel very strong about the movement itself and the departments.

What can the town do with a study at North Center School to make sure that someone goes there, a visitor or whatever, that does not abandon the downtown area. We're talking about four-tenths of a mile.

That's what I was talking about. We can do that. If there are ideas, we can put those ideas in place.

We are saying it on the record and the Town Manager is saying it on the record. I don't think I've ever said something that I never did. We're both pledging that to you. There's time while this is going on to do studies and get ideas on how to get information to the people on how to get to the downtown. If there is such a study, we can get some ideas. IE: kiosk down there showing the downtown area or putting pamphlets of the downtown shops. We're willing to do that.

Discussion of why the studies were not supplied before when they were asked for in response to a comment by Mr. Chaplinsky.

Ms. Conroy seconded the motion by Ms. DelDebbio to approve without any stipulations.

Mr. Oshana repeated his statements he made on the record.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he opposed the motion. We've had promises on this project before and I don't see how promises are going to come through just on word of mouth. If we had a stipulation that insured that this was going to get done, it will get done. I don't think we're there, yet.

Discussion.

Ms. DelDebbio understood Mr. Kalkowski's and Mr. Chaplinsky's passion, but she did not want to see the project go down the drain. I think it's a good project and I also that our Town Manager and our Town Attorney will do their best to get the information that we're asking for.

The Town Attorney said he and the Manager would have no problem with that as a stipulation and we would go forward with a study and incorporate any ideas to have people and the employees down at the North Center School, including the BOE employees, incorporate them somehow to make sure that the downtown area is not abandoned by people who visit and work there. That's my point.

Ms. DelDebbio amended her motion to include the stipulation and comments of the Town Attorney. Ms. Conroy amended her second.

The Chair commented Mr. Kalkowski and Mr. Chaplinsky have their hearts in the right place. A lot of data has been collected throughout the past two and a half to three months. I don't think that the data that has been collected by Mr. Chaplinsky has been even looked at or associated with making a decision for the arrangement that has been put in place for the departments to move over. If that data is looked into and used the way it is supposed to be used, I think you'll find some pretty incredible results.

Discussion.

Mr. Sinclair said we are voting on a stipulation to look into information and then possibly do something with it. The PZC is looking at maybe approving something on a promise to do something maybe. I don't think the stipulation holds much teeth. And, I can't vote for it.

Roll Call:	Mr. Chaplinsky:	No
	Ms. DelDebbio:	Yes
	Mr. Kalkowski:	No
	Mr. Oshana:	No
	Mr. Sinclair:	No
	Ms. Conroy:	Yes
	Mr. DelSanto:	Yes

(Motion fails 3 to 4)

Mr. Chaplinsky put his motion on the table one more time with the stipulations previously mentioned. This is the opportunity for the commission to have a binding agreement with the town to do the studies do the due diligence and come back with changes if necessary. I'll remake my motion.

Hearing no second, the motion was withdrawn.

Mr. Kalkowski offered a compromise. I fully support everything you're trying to do. We have to move forward tonight with this. I want to get information and data as passionately as you do. Perhaps we could stipulate something more formal where you or you and I would work with the Town Attorney and the Town Manager on constructing the data collection process that would be acceptable to both us as well as town staff and we drive what the necessary output would be from that.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he was concerned there was nothing binding there.

Discussion.

The Town Attorney reiterated: What is before today is are municipal offices in that zone appropriate. If you're saying that the two of you want to work with the Manager and I as to what more information is needed --- the problem is you're making it a stipulation which makes it difficult because what we're saying here is you're saying that the departments themselves won't be decided to some future date. What I'm saying is that the department part of it, the way I see this regulation, the department part of it is from this particular board's standpoint is not the relevant aspect of it.

You're worried about the downtown area. What we can do to facilitate the use of North Center School and how it's not detrimentally affecting the downtown area. That's what I was talking about doing. You're talking about putting a stipulation and saying, we'll approve of this and down the road the four of us will come back

to this commission with some recommendation of what departments are going down there. We're in that same boat again.

Mr. Chaplinsky put his motion back on the table with the previous stipulations as stated. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Brumback stated there is data out there that could support either side of this argument. There isn't any data that we're going to be able to provide that's going to refute what Mr. Chaplinsky is stipulating other than the fact that from my perspective it under utilizes what I think is a very significant investment by a town that is noteworthy in its frugality. And, so when you're talking about now under using an investment of this magnitude, there are other better ways to spend that money. I've got to go back and rethink what I'm going to recommend to the Town Council.

Mr. Kalkowski said a course of action could be that you recommend to the Council to do some data analysis and then come back for an amendment to the SPU.

Discussion.

Mr. Brumback explained the time limitation. He further explained the movement of the folks that we're proposing and the Council has approved to move down there is going to have a positive impact on the downtown.

Taking a parallel path to study how best to optimize that, I would support and applaud and we'd probably do anyway without the stipulation. To stipulate the departments that I'm responsible for managing, I think is unfortunate.

Mr. Kalkowski appreciated the comments; however a worst case scenario would be moving town offices to North Center and then significantly impacting the CB zone and seeing our businesses boarded up. There is no data to support either case. We owe it to the town to make data driven decisions and not gut feel decisions.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated there could be rippling effects that we just don't have the data on. We have zero data; I just don't feel comfortable moving forward.

Roll Call:	Mr. Chaplinsky:	Yes
	Ms. DelDebbio:	Yes
	Mr. Kalkowski:	Yes
	Mr. Oshana:	No
	Mr. Sinclair:	No
	Mr. Conroy:	No
	Mr. DelSanto:	Yes

(Motion passes 4 to 3)

E. Floodplain filling application of Town of Southington to excavate within floodplain for installation of rip rap plunge pool, 196 North Main Street (FF#225)

And

F. Site plan application of Borghesi Building & Engineering Co.,, Inc., (applicant), Town of Southington (owner) for the renovation of former town school into future town offices and add new parking, 196 North Main Street (SPR #1582).

Mr. Tranquillo presented both minor applications. He explained the two access points, one on North Main and one on Mill Street.

The traffic engineer presented the traffic data which doesn't change with this plan. The traffic plan will stay the same and the development stays the same.

Explained the layout of the parcel as good in terms of the circular parking area. A total of 123 parking spaces, well above the zoning requirement.

It's a 20,000 sf building with two floors. Explained.

At grade access at the side is convenient for handicapped access. Once inside there'll be elevator access to all the floors.

The Rails to Trails is west of the property. That will allow some synergistic use by the people parking here and perhaps walking the Trail to the downtown.

On Mill Street, there is also the Water Department Park which was built recently and there is a nice sitting area in that location which is readily accessible.

The dog park is on Mill Street, also.

Excellent sight distances at each driveway. Truck traffic is designed for the standard delivery van access at both access points.

He pointed out the flood line. That is a very short term flooding condition about 6 to 8 hours, generally. We don't anticipate that as being an issue.

The drainage system was discussed. ZIRO will be achieved.

The landscaping was talked about. We feel it will be far more attractive when we're done than the site is now. The façade and large

windows will be cut back, somewhat. This building will have all new mechanicals, electrical, air conditioning and heating making it very efficient.

(End of Tape #2, Side B)

(Beginning of Tape #3, Side A)

Meeting room at the facility will hold 125.

This will be far more convenient for residents and employees.

Mr. Sinclair asked about the flooding and where it was coming from. Mr. Tranquillo responded the flooding is coming from the river.
Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said if we are going to make an extension of our Town Hall, put significant departmental activity down there, I think we need to make the building an extension of downtown and carry the theme of our downtown along with the surrounding areas. Do we have any plans for the exterior of the building to make it look like some the facilities downtown, make it part of the Renaissance theme, expand the downtown a little bit more. Facades, pavers, granite curbing, light post them.

Discussion.

Mr. Tranquillo explained because this is outside the Renaissance Zone, there are no plans to do any of that. We will consider that, but a lot of that depends on the money available.

Mr. Oshana explained when the building is sold for \$1; the new owner is responsible for doing the development, so it really shouldn't be our money to do the improvements. We should ask them to do what we're asking other developers in that area to do.

Discussion.

Mr. Sinclair said he agreed with the comments by Mr. Chaplinsky and Mr. Oshana.

Ms. Savage Dunham reported as far as site plan regulations; the material before you does meet the regulations. We have prepared check lists. As far as site design and the floodplain filling application, wetlands recommended that favorably.

The site information is all consistent with regulations. With regard to aesthetics, I believe some of that information is constrained by the funding available which was approved by higher powers than us. We don't have control over the funding. Staff hasn't asked the developer to spend money that wasn't approved by the Council.

From our perspective it meets the regulations and it is ready for action. In order for the project to move forward as we've heard tonight the commission is very supportive of and in order for us to capitalize on the bids that are in place and secure our contract should the Town Manager think that is still a good idea, it's important to keep the process moving. We feel this application is ready for action.

Re: E. Floodplain filling application of Town of Southington to excavate within floodplain for installation of rip rap plunge pool, 196 North Main Street (FF#225)

Ms. DelDebbio made a motion to approve the Floodplain application #225. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 5 to 2 on a roll call vote with Mr. Oshana and Mr. Sinclair opposed.

F. Site plan application of Borghesi Building & Engineering Co., Inc., (applicant), Town of Southington (owner) for the renovation of former town school into future town offices and add new parking, 196 North Main Street (SPR #1582).

Mr. Chaplinsky stated there are some concerns on the table about the look, the feel, sidewalks, carrying the theme that we have not just with the Renaissance area but outside the CB zone that we did with the bank and the dentist office. This to me again seems like the only opportunity for this commission to have some input into those, so our option is to either table or stipulate. We should give the applicant an opportunity to come back and show us a rendering.

Mr. Oshana agreed that if we are going to hold other developers accountable for consistency, we should at least ask somebody who is building something for the Town of Southington to be consistent.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion carries 5 to 2 with Ms. DelDebbio and Ms. Conroy opposed.

The Chair recused himself on the next two applications. Mr. Gage was seated for him in his absence.

KELLY DELDEBBIO, Acting Chair:

G. Simone DelBuono, site plan application for proposed restaurant, office and storage building, 122-130 Center Street, (SPR #1581)

Andrew Quirk, Professional Engineer and Principal with Kratzert, Jones & Associates, representing the applicant, handed out revised plans.

He explained the revised site plan. He noted they have secured the variance for a minimum lot area from the ZBA to perform the lot line revision.

We've revised the building; it's the same square footage, same concept on the footprint with a restaurant on the first floor and office and attic space above. We've looked at the shape of the building as to how to accommodate the onsite resident parking.

We've picked up some additional area between the two buildings and moved the back line of the building north. That allows us to fit four spaces behind the building, one space towards Liberty Street and then we've worked with 136 Center Street to come up with a lease agreement for two overnight resident parking spaces there. The two parking lots would be connected with a stockade fence between the two.

The benefits are the desire and feedback from the Parking Authority and staff to get all the resident parking spaces as close to the building as possible, on site. Five of the seven are on site and the two are with the lease agreement.

There is a 7' pass way to 136 Center Street, just to the west; it's a narrow access point to the resident parking that exists there. This would give an alternate access to that area and Liberty Street.

We did respond to comments which were just provided tonight. We'll work with staff to go over those between now and the next meeting.

We have the Parking Authority meeting to seek the 60 space waiver to accommodate the restaurant / offices on the site.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if the addition of these parking spaces would meet the requirements for the parking for this application. The Town Planner said the plans were just handed to me five minutes ago so I am not prepared to comment on how they meet or don't meet your regulations.

We heard of a lease tonight for the first time. I don't believe the Town Attorney or I have reviewed that or know the terms. I'm not prepared to comment.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

H. Simone DelBuono, site plan modification application, 142 Center Street (SPR #1543.2)

Mr. Quirk requested a table. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table which Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. DelSanto re-entered the meeting and was reseated.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, resuming the Chair:

Ms. DelDebbio left the meeting. The Chair seated Mr. Gage for Ms. DelDebbio for the remainder of the meeting.

I. Strollo Brothers and Sons, Inc., site plan application for a 3,840 sf industrial building and parking area for a towing and repair facility, 22 Triano Drive (SPR #1583.

Steve Giudice presented the application on behalf of the applicant. This is lot 2 of South Farms Subdivision. This lot is a little under an acre. We're proposing a new building for 3800 sf. The primary use would be for repair of large tractors/trailers and towing and such. We have a small area inside the building for some sales of snow plows and items like that.

We are scheduled to go before the ZBA for a special exception for the motor vehicle use on this application.

Explained the site plan pointing out parking, drainage and landscaping.

Hopefully at the next meeting we'll be in better shape. I'll answer questions.

Mr. Sinclair motion to table which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. Request under 8-24 for the proposed realignment of an AT&T easement off of Lazy Lane, (MR#455)

Attorney Sciota explained the request with a map on the bulletin board. This request to move the A T & T easement to the west. But to do that, they've got to cross Rails to Trails. They're asking for permission to sign an easement with the town. They are abandoning the old strip on the Rails to Trails.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the 8-24. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. Format, LLC, site plan application for proposed bank building, 301-303 Main Street (SPR #1580)

Michael Early, Jones Engineering, presented the application. He reviewed the application which was here two weeks ago to introduce a proposed bank building on Mr. Florian's property at 301 Main Street.

We spoke with town staff and given the constraints of the site, we feel that the canopy really is in the best position as far as the point of transaction. It allows for the maximum amount of cars to stack along the north side of the building before it interferes with two way traffic on the south side of the building. Each lane can stack at least 6 full six pickup trucks, each almost 20' long, before interfering with the two way traffic.

Employee parking was pointed out and discussed. Customer parking was pointed out and discussed.

Town staff agreed this is the most appropriate layout for the constraints of the site.

The owner did research and the market is looking for banks with three lanes. ATM lane and two teller drive thru lanes.

Discussion.

Explained a survey the owner did regarding congestion and traffic circulation on site using two local banks. Stacking at teller lanes was also observed.

The Town Planner added this application is currently under consideration by you and by the Town Council under 8-24. You can't approve this until the 8-24 is fleshed out because that may change the design. I would recommend a table and let the Council finish their process.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table which was seconded by Mr. Sinclair. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

L. Request under 8-24 on property known as 979 Meriden Waterbury Road to discover whether it is in the Town's best interest to lease the strip of land to the property owner so that the property owner can establish additional parking for development use (MR#\$56)

Mr. Sinclair recused himself on this matter.

Ms. Alina Farago, 550 Darling Street. I am requesting 16 spaces along the side of my building which belongs to Parks & Rec for extra parking which is required by town zoning so that I can get a second restaurant in my plaza. I need the spaces to keep my plaza leased

and it is beneficial to me and my tenants and the town to keep business thriving and prosperous.

The property along the side of my building is all grass and I've been maintaining that for years and I am now requesting to use it for extra parking spaces so the restaurant can come in.

Also, Saturday nights, the Parks & Recs have had drive in movies and it has been a great success for the town, families and charities that it helps out. Explained the benefit of the drive in movie night and how successful it is. The overflow parking has to use my plaza parking which has never been an issue for me.

The additional spaces that I am requesting will be more dedicated parking for the drive in movie night.

Discussion.

It is a win/win situation for everybody and I think for the Parks & Rec and for my plaza to have another business in there.

The entire time that the town has owned the property, I have been mowing and maintaining the property, so I am asking for a favor.

(Chuckles)

The Town Planner noted this is just one part of the process. The applicant is also working on a site plan modification and there'll be additional legal documents for insurance, leasing. The Town is supportive of the project.

Attorney Sciota stated the applicant understands she is responsible for building the parking area, insuring it and maintaining it. It is a non-exclusive which means people going to the drive in can also parking there.

(End of Tape #3, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #3, Side B)

Mr. Chaplinsky spoke in favor noting this is going to spur economic development in the town.

Discussion.

Mr. Oshana made a motion to send a favorable 8-24 to the Town Council. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The Applicant noting the success of the drive in suggested the town think about adding another night: Friday. Then you would have Friday and Saturday night.

Mr. Sinclair re-entered the meeting and was reseated.

M. Request under 8-24 for easement, flow rights and grading rights over 301-303 Main Street (MR #457)

Michael Early, represented the application. What the owner would like to do is --- the town approved a parking lot for the library just to north of this site here. In that approval, there is an underground storm water detention system that discharges into Main Street. Now that we're moving forward with the development of this site, we're proposing to store the increase of runoff underground and we would like to tie into the town's pipe which is already approved to connect to the drainage system that is in South Main Street. By sharing this, you are saving two full saw cuts on Main Street that run east to west right next to each other.

Discussion.

The grading rights, they follow the northern property line here. The reason being because these two sites were developed, or the grades on these two sites so far were developed together. The grades on the bank are very, very close to the existing grades that are out there. Since the paving is going to be so close to the property line, it would make for a neater construction to have the grading rights on the town's property just to allow a little bit of wiggle room for construction.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24. Ms. Conroy seconded.

The Town Engineer added to make sure he doesn't cause a problem with our storm drainage; we're going to put a stipulation that they'll supply us with the storm drainage computations and proof ZIRO.

Mr. Sinclair amended his motion and Ms. Conroy amended her second.

Mr. Tranquillo noted they will have to wait for the town to do their storm drainage. We will charge a \$1 per square foot for the easement.

Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

N. Request for release of \$73,000 public improvement bond and \$214,000 subdivision bond (S#1211.1) 149 Lazy Lane, Southfarms Subdivision

Staff suggests a table. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

O. Dean's Stove and Spa, request for Extension of the Bond in Lieu of Site Plan compliance for a term of 90 days, to June 18, 2011, 120 West Main Street (SPR #1558.)

The Town Planner commented staff is supportive of this but I believe the applicant wants to update you on the project.

Dean Michanczyk, 120 West Main Street, advised the signs are up on the municipal lots. All we're waiting for is the nice weather because CL&P can't run their wire underneath. All the ground work is done. The pipes are all done and we have to just pull wire and we have to wait for CL&P to do that.

Everything is moving forward. We're very much ready on our end. I believe we're waiting for an inspection from the town and my electrician in the next couple of days and then it's all CL&P.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the extension for 90 days. Mr. Oshana seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

P. Ace Building and Design, LLC, request for release of \$ 83,000 subdivision bond, Fox Hollow II (S#986.3)

Staff supports this. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

1. 2095 West Street, proposed place of worship in an R-40 zone (SPU #469.1) April 5, 2011

The Chair said this could be scheduled.

The Town Planner advised there is a parent/grandparent apartment for 94 Pratt Street. I believe we can handle that at the same meeting, if that's acceptable.

The Chair agreed.

The Chair reported the April 19th, 2011 meeting has been CANCELLED due to lack of quorum.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

The Town Planner had nothing to report.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

The Town Planner passed around the list:

- 142 Center Street which you tabled tonight
- Prayer House & SPU for the parent/grandparent apartment which you scheduled for public hearing at your next meeting.

COMMISSION COMMENTS:

Ms. Conroy advised she is the representative for the PZC on the facility advisory commission. She met with Dr. Erardi last month to talk about the position. He regretted that weren't having this conversation a few months prior. But he brought me up to speed on what they've accomplished so far and what their goals are.

The next meeting is going to be on Monday, April 4th at 7:00 pm at Plantsville Elementary School. She went over the Agenda items. (Agenda on the town's website)

She will report to the Commission at their meeting on April 5th.

The Chair brought up the four way intersection at the high school. Someone has got some furniture out on the lawn and it's been there probably since November. The Town Planner said she would have staff look into that.

Mr. Sinclair advised he has a compliment for the Ass't Town Engineer, Jim Grappone. We all got the email about the tree. The gentleman called me up and I advised him to call Tony and if you can't get Tony, call Jim. Whereas he didn't like the answers, he liked having his questions answered and he thought Jim handled himself very professionally. Mr. Tranquillo said he would pass that along.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: pending litigation

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn into executive session barring the press and the public. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Attorney Sciota added it is for pending litigation including the commission and all four staff members.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned to executive session at 10:00 pm.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Southington Planning & Zoning Commission entered executive session immediately following their regular meeting with the following in attendance in order to discuss pending litigation.

The following Councilpersons were present, viz:

James Sinclair	Steve Kalkowski
Paul Chaplinsky	Zaya Oshana, Jr.
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Lisa Conroy
 Randall Gage

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mary Savage-Dunham, Town Planner
Anthony J. Tranquillo, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney
Garry Brumback, Town Manager

No motions were made or votes taken during executive session.

Mr. Oshana made a motion to adjourn from executive session. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

(Executive session was adjourned at 10:12 o'clock, p.m.)

REGULAR SESSION

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed unanimously.

(Meeting was adjourned at 10:13 o'clock, p.m.)

Mary Savage Dunham
Acting Secretary