

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting  
March 16, 2010

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing and regular meeting on Tuesday, March 16, 2010. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

James Sinclair	Edward Pocock, Jr.
Francis Kenefick	Kelly Kennedy DelDebbio*
Paul Chaplinsky	Zaya Oshana, Jr.
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Patrick Saucier  
Edward Costello  
Steve Kalkowski

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  
John Weichsel, Town Manager

Absent: Lisa Conroy, Alternate Commissioner

\* Arrived with meeting in progress where noted.

The Chair seated Mr. Costello for Ms. DelDebbio until her arrival. 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 February 2, 2010

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

## **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Ms. Savage Dunham read the legal notice into the record.

A. Recko Farms Homes, LLC, application for parent/grandparent apartment, 42 Empress Drive SPU #481.

Mark Lovley, President of Lovley Development for Recko Farms Homes, LLC.

I'm here tonight seeking approval for a parent/grandparent apartment for Lot #7 Recko Farms. Working with town staff, we have issued a copy of a letter from the purchaser stating it is her parents and they'll be living there with a copy of the contract which has their names on it.

We supplied a copy of the floor plan of the home showing only one front door and the in-law apartment is behind the garage which has a total of 714 sf which is under the 800 sf threshold.

We also have supplied a copy of a site plan that shows that there is off street parking for more than four cars.

I'll answer questions.

(No questions)

Those speaking in favor of the application:

(No response)

Those speaking in opposition to the application:

(No response)

Ms. Savage Dunham reported nothing further.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

Mr. Chaplinsky read an addendum to the meeting. He made a motion to add Item J: Request for five year extension West Pines Drive, S 1213. Mr. Oshana seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

A. Recko Farms Homes, LLC, application for parent/grandparent apartment, 42 Empress Drive SPU #481.

Ms. Savage Dunham reported the staff had reviewed the application and it is ready for action. Explained they fulfilled all the conditions.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the application. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Queen Street, LLC, site plan application of to remove existing building and construct new larger retail/convenience store, 464 Queen Street, SPR #1564.

Mr. Costello recused himself and left the room. Mr. Kalkowski was seated for this item.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones representing the applicant. At the last meeting we discussed the proposal and described the operation. You were concerned about the curb cut and some other issues that Mary was going to stipulate. On the point of the curb cut, Attorney Denorfia addressed the commission and I understand he has communicated with Attorney Sciota so that was resolved.

Questions?

Ms. Savage Dunham noted there were a few minor technical details at the last meeting we were going to stipulate to. They were design items regarding the drainage and the applicant did agree to all of them on the record. With the stipulation of the curb cut question off the table, this application is ready for action.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve. Mr. Pocock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The Chair reseated Mr. Costello.

C. Mariani Construction, Inc., site plan application for proposed 3,968 sf retail building with drive through, Meriden Waterbury Road, assessor's Map 019, Parcel 008 SPR #1565.

Scott Porienda, engineer, Consulting Engineers in Meriden, CT, representing the applicant.

The site is located on the south side of Meriden Waterbury Road. (Indicated location on the map) It's a little under  $\frac{3}{4}$  of an acre in a B zone. We are proposing a 3968 sf building with 21 parking spaces. Site is serviced by sewer and water and we are extending the water main approximately 130' up to service our site.

We are providing on site underground retention to handle the increase in runoff.

Right now it is being built for spec --- commercial building.

Ms. Savage Dunham had laid out for the commission tonight a checklist which was provided to the engineer today. We received these revised plans about 11:00 am this morning. Also there is a letter I received from the applicant and he's saying for the commission and for the record that they intend to market the property as office space, possibly dentist or medical, and they have a potential client for a computer electronic repair business.

Their written responses are attached to our first set of checklist items. The applicant has been working to address staff comments. The Engineer looked at the outstanding comments and he has no problem with them.

Discussion.

Point of order, the applicant is requesting a sidewalk waiver. That motion for action needs to take place before any motion for action on the application.

We feel the staff comments are very minor. It is ready for action, and we ask you to stipulate the March 16, 2010 checklist.

Discussion of whether there are sidewalks in the area or not presently.

Mr. Oshana was in favor of having the application go forward as it is now with sidewalks.

Mr. Porienda suggested a sidewalk covenant. The Town Attorney said those were taken out of the regulations years ago.

No drive thru proposed on this property.

Mr. Oshana made a motion for approval with the stipulations as outlined by the Town Planner. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Central Connecticut Contracting, LLC, site plan application for proposed 171,293 sf sports complex, Spring Street and Smoron Drive, SPR #1566.

Stephen Giudice, from Harry Cole & Son, representing the applicant.

This is a proposal for a 171,293 sf sports complex. It is permitted per your regulations (cite). The properties are owned --- p parcel one is owned by Smoron Property, care of John Nugent, Trustee and the second parcel which is the location of the building is owned by Rockwood Hills, Inc.

The property consists of approximately 83 acres. It's located at the corner of Spring Street and Smoron Drive in an I-2 zone. Named the abutting properties to the north, south, east and west.

He gave an overview of the topography of the property, parcel 1 and parcel 2.

There are a considerable amount of wetlands (indicated).

Parcel two is currently vacant and contains approximately 20 acres. There is a small area of wetland (indicated).

It is encumbered by a water line easement to the City of New Britain. And, both parcels are encumbered by a CL&P easement.

Discussion.

Our proposal for these two properties is the sports complex. Our facility would contain three indoor soccer fields with a track around those three fields. We have an inline skating rink. We have some batting cages, pitching tunnels and other accessory uses i.e. party room, pro shop to support the facility.

We are proposing 121 parking spaces. Regulations require 100 and we have 121. We have additional overflow space with an additional 60 spaces, if needed. We're proposing to pave the 121 spaces. And, just put gravel down for the overflow.

Access to the facility is proposed along a roadway that we will construct on Parcel 1. It terminates at a traffic circle at this location here (indicating). The circle is proposed to keep the traffic moving and allow for the drop off and pick up of kids that are there using the facility.

The facility will be serviced by public water. The current proposal before you now is for an onsite subsurface disposal system. Explained.

We also designed a sanitary sewer connection, a dry system that we constructed on the roadway and up Smoron Drive. The applicant is working diligently with the town to provide sewers up to this location.

Discussion.

The septic system is there because of the timing perspective. We don't want the sewers to hold up the opening of the facility. We are pushing forward for a fall opening to be ready for the next winter season.

The septic system is being reviewed by the health department. It will be abandoned once the sewer connection is made.

The storm water collection system was explained.

He explained the pre and post peak rate of runoff were looked at and the post development rates are at or below what was pre construction.

The proposed roadway will be a 30 foot wide road constructed to town standards for an industrial zone. The reason for that is that our next application before this omission will be a subdivision application for parcel one. We're working on that now.

He explained the very small wetlands impact because of the road.

The application includes a detailed landscape plan which he described. The erosion and sedimentation control plan was discussed.

He showed a preliminary rendering of what the building is going to look like. Explained.

It is a rather large building, however, we will work with the topography and along 84 is actually on the high side and the building will be constructed into grade along the property line (indicating). We designed it this way to work with the topography of the land and not to do any major grading in the area.

We are currently before the Conservation Commission. Explained there has been a site walk. We are revising plans to meet their comments and we received some comments from staff here. We are looking to address all of those issues.

The Town has also hired a traffic engineer who is here tonight, as well. Our traffic engineer is not here this evening. We did submit a traffic report with our application.

We're hoping to have our plan revised shortly and we are in the process of doing that now. I just wanted to explain what we're doing and answer any questions or concerns that you had.

The applicant, Carl Verderame, is here, as well, if you have questions for him.

Colors of the metal building have not yet been chosen.

Mr. Sinclair asked for the next time if the applicant could bring an elevation of what it's going to look like from 84. Mr. Giudice said that's not a problem.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if the applicant would be willing to do a site walk for the commission for those who are interested. The Town Attorney asked they go in groups of three or less. Mr. Giudice said that's no problem.

Mr. Kalkowski brought up the parking. He indicated he didn't think, even with the overflow spaces, there was enough.  
Discussion.

Bus parking was brought up and discussed briefly.

The width of Smoron Drive is an issue and the applicant is working on it. Wetlands is our biggest problem.

Mr. Giudice added they have applied to the STC and the comments that came back are not overwhelming. And, he thought they were in good shape there.

(Ms. Del Debbio entered the meeting at 7:40 pm.)

The Town Planner added with regard to staff comments, she wanted to state that Mr. Kalkowski had a good point because we like to see some kind of a more detailed explanation about the uses of the different area within the building. There weren't really seats called out with the arena area. I've heard there may be a restaurant, a pro shop and inline skating, three sports fields and I'm still not sure that the entire picture has been fleshed out. I think the commission needs to see the full scope of the use because we had 181 spaces accounted for just with the soccer. We're not talking about the referees or the employees of the facility, et cetera. Employee parking and people directing traffic are going to be there. Possibly buses. I think that it is important to get a whole handle on the parking to be sure that they're accounted for.

Discussion.

The site does have floodplain and wetlands involvement. They're before the Conservation Commission. It's in the early stages of review.

It's on the Agenda for the commission to get a look at it and voice your concerns.

Mr. Hilson, traffic engineer, is here.

The Chair asked him to come up and give a synopsis of what his findings were.

Bruce Hilson, Traffic Engineering Solutions and I reviewed the traffic impact study and the plans associated with this development. I'm here tonight on behalf of the town.

I would like to address the parking issue only because it's one that seems to be of concern to the commission and the question of how many spaces you can actually put on the site. I think the parking

issue relates as much to the scheduling of activities at the facility as anything else.

Explained.

Mr. Hilson then reviewed his March 2<sup>nd</sup> memorandum which is on file in the Town Planner's Office.

Discussion.

(End of Tape #1, Side A)

(Beginning of Tape #1, Side B)

Discussion of the improvements on Spring Street and Queen Street and they should be in place before BJs opens, added Mr. Hilson added, regarding BJs.

Ms. Savage Dunham asked if the intersection will be able to accommodate this traffic if the fourth lane is delayed for a while. Would you anticipate just simply longer queues?

Mr. Hilson said the delay he would anticipate --- we would want and I'm sure the state would want Route 10 to function as well as it could. They would then Spring Street will have to suffer all the consequences which means any low level service, any lengthy queues would occur on Spring Street.

Mr. Pocock brought up the flow of traffic going westbound to West Street. Was a study done on that? Mr. Hilson said the applicant's traffic study anticipated a percentage of traffic going to/from West Street. This is based upon their assumed distribution of traffic.

Discussion.

Mr. Kenefick asked who was responsible for the fourth lane. The Town Planner said that would be discussed more during the BJs application. Attorney Sciota said there is a lot of stuff going on that's really not relevant to this application. The town and the applicants are dealing with DOT. The overall goal is to obtain the fourth lane. The applicants are responsible for it but the bottom line is the town has to be the facilitator for this. The fourth lane would be on the south side.

Explained.

Ms. DelDebbio asked the percentage of traffic going westbound in the report. Mr. Hilson responded it was: 28% to/from West Street.

Mr. Oshana asked Mr. Hilson his thought about an 18 foot road leading into a 30 foot road leading into the facility. Mr. Hilson responded giving the volume of traffic that's anticipated, an 18 foot width is probably not appropriate for that volume of traffic combined with the other traffic on the road. Certainly, a 30 foot width would be much more appropriate.

Discussion.

Mr. Costello asked the Town Engineer: if we were to put a 24 foot road in there, would we in fact need 8' shoulders on either side? Mr. Tranquillo said they would just do 24' of pavement. We wouldn't require the shoulders. It'd be 24' curb to curb and a snow shelf behind that. We try to get a 5' show shelf if we can and if we can't get that, we can eliminate that. The absolute minimum footprint would be 24' to 26'.

Mr. Giudice advised they would get the information and answers to the questions the commission had regarding the facility and scheduling, overlap, buses, parking, et cetera.

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

The Chair reseated Ms. DelDebbio.

E. Twinco Corp. site plan modification (BJs Wholesale Club) for a revised storm water control basin and re-establishment of access to rear lands, Spring Street, Assessor's Map 169, Parcel 015 SPR #1551.1.

Attorney Anthony Denorfia, representing the applicant, presented the application. We are here to modify a previously approved site plan for the BJs site on Spring Street. I'll list the five main changes and then I'll have Phil Doyle of LADA who is our site Planner and Kevin Clark, our professional engineer address those.

(1) Change the drainage in the site by creating one detention basin the rear to allow the potential of a pad site in the front. The wetlands commission wanted us to put the drainage in the front of the site on our first time there. We did reapply to the wetlands and put it in a better location.

Explanation.

(2) We are steepening the grade in the parking lot as requested by the Town Engineer.

(3) We are providing a rip rap bank along the northerly property line instead of along the Pratt & Whitney site and the access drive which goes to the back. Originally we had a wall which was designed there, but rip rap banks we think would work better, especially in the event of future development that site.

(4) One of the main impetuses of this application is the retention of historic access to the rear parcel which Mr. Doyle will go over.

(5) Modification of the planting plan provided for ground cover and removal of some of the trees.

Attorney Denorfia, bringing the commission up to date on their traffic application, we have received approval from the STC. My understanding is that the major change that they made in the application from the original you saw is that our original application called for at the intersection of Spring Street and Queen Street, that we would have two lanes exiting Spring Street on to Queen Street. The STC were more concerned with getting traffic off of Queen Street and they didn't mind the queue on Spring Street. So they wanted two lanes of traffic going from Queen Street into Spring Street and one lane going out. That's the way that it was approved.

The town and police chief weren't too happy with that. There was a letter of conditional approval which the police chief sent and we are going to abide by that. One of which is to fund, which we believe with the prior applicant who is going to help us, the improvements to make it four lanes. That is what the town is diligently working on and has made substantial progress in the last 30 to 60 days.

We have met and continue to meet our condition of approval. When you approved it, your condition was that we continue to work with the town diligently to get a level of service C. Once those improvements are done, then we will be seeing level of service c.

We do disagree with one of Bruce Hilson's comments and can't adhere to it. We have to start construction fairly soon and he mentioned that BJs would not open unless the level of service c were met. That is not our understanding of the approval. And, in addition to that, if the improvements are not met by that, then we will, if the police chief finds there is a problem, we will provide police there to direct traffic.

Phil Doyle, Planner with LADA on behalf of the applicant. Showed and explained the plan that was originally approved by the Conservation Commission.

He touched on two of the five points that were explained:

(1) Realignment of the storm basins. We made a modified application to adjust the drainage on the property and

(2) Maintain access to the rear of the site.

He reviewed the details of the property. Twenty acres zoned B. Explained the pan handle of the property for a larger piece to the rear.

Historic access along the northerly property line overland to the woodworking shop on the property was discussed

The discharge from the storm water basin interrupts that access per your approval. We had been hoping over time that we could find another access means through that land, but have not been able to, as yet. At the time of approval, the developer was under contract with the town to take the fill from the library site and use it for the BJs pad. He was trying to find a new means of access and at the same time to try to make sure the fill was in place. He's working under the earth work permit and bonds are place and has created the fills for the pad.

Gave the history of the wetlands application and what was found on the site; i.e. vernal pools. Through the process, Wetlands asked us to remove a storm water basin and move it to the front of the property and to diminish the size of the basin at the rear to get away from the wetlands. We accomplished that.

Discussion.

Our environmental expert prepared two reports and we've met with IW for a number of months. We asked them to amend their permit so that we could take and take this basin (indicating) and realign it so that we could enlarge our basin and stay away from the vernal pools and at the same time maintain access to the rear. They did approve that application on March 5, 2010. Those plans were submitted to you.

The utility and grading and drainage plan was explained.

We told IW we wanted to maintain an existing gravel drive that goes to the rear. They told us to show that as paved so you don't have to come back to us. We modified the plans and they approved the plans with a 24' wide driveway extending to the rear property line. We are permitted for that, whether or not we do that, I'm not sure at this point in time.

Discussion.

We were asked to steepen the grades in the parking lot to 1.5 to 2 percent and we've also added additional drainage. All this results in the fact that this piece of property here, which is undeveloped at this point, that would be reserved for future use for the developer.

Discussion.

We had originally proposed a retaining wall along the property and it is the feeling of the property owner at this point is he doesn't know what's going to happen on the adjacent piece of property. And, if there was ever any development connection to the site, it would be easier to do that if we were able to not have to be able to retain the wall in the area.

The last piece has to do with the planting plan. My client and BJs emailed me and they asked me to come back to you and modify the planting plan. They said I have too many trees and not enough shrubs

in the parking lot. I took each tree out and turned it into ten shrubs. For them the benefit is they've ground cover at eye level but also it opens up the view of the building more long term.

Discussion

Mr. Saucier discussed the rear access, what is the justification for requesting that rear access? Mr. Doyle responded it is only access to the rear 40. If we don't maintain that access, we have to get access in some other fashion. Mr. Saucier brought up the existing easement that runs along the southerly portion of the property to that lot. That would provide access to the rear lot.

Discussion.

Mr. Doyle explained if they built a 24' wide driveway, we'd be filling about 15,000 sf of wetlands. And, we'd have to go through the largest vernal pool. For IW we looked at alternate routes, as well. A route through the middle and a route through the top and the wetlands disturbance was a minimum of 7,000 sf.

Explained.

We believe that the only access that exists presently is - practical access the driveway that exists. We need to maintain that practical access for the use of the tenant.

Mr. Saucier pointed out if we have an industrial use in the back we should not have the traffic access it through the BJ's parking lot.

Discussion.

Ms. Savage Dunham commented for the record, just a point of reference, the tenant that keeps being referred to in the back, I've spoken with the property owner, there is actually no approved plans or no site plans or approvals at all for the tenant back there. It is a violation and I have had that conversation with the landowner. That's a separate issue from the matter of maintaining the easement as a historic easement for access to the back.

At the last approval you had required they extinguish that and they're now back to have that restored. The applicant did represent to the IW Commission that it would be paved. The drainage discharges directly into the wetlands and to achieve the appropriate storm water treatment, it should be paved.

In the responses to comments that we have in front of us --- I just got revised plans this morning --- for the record. We have not looked at the revised plans. Responses to comments were emailed to me after the end of business yesterday. I actually haven't read through them all. Staff is looking to pave the access drive. The plans that the IW Commission approved had them paved.

A response to comments that we have here is that the property owner doesn't desire to pave the access to the rear land. They just showed that to the IW Commission to show they could build it.

When they reviewed those plans, I believe they were anticipating it would be paved and the drainage system is going to work better with it being paved.

Discussion.

A number of loose ends are being work out, which I won't get into. I'll talk with the applicant about it at a later date.

Mr. Hilson did review the project. The Town is working on the offsite improvements which will help the traffic both for this site and the previous site we heard about as well as future development in that area.

Discussion.

Staff checklists were reviewed.

Discussion of the planting plan and the applicant's reason for changing was related as being they were maple trees and they would obscure the view of the building.

Discussion.

Staff is happy to review the plans and if the commission wishes us to, see where accommodations can be made. We have not had time to do that, yet.

There are some questions regarding the sewer connection and Mr. Tranquillo indicated he had a discussion with the applicant and there are still some unknowns in terms of the sewer connection, discrepancy about how to make the connection and that has not been resolved, yet.

Bottom line is we haven't had much time to look at the plan submitted.

Discussion.

Changes needs to be reviewed by staff to be sure they'll work before the commission approves the plan.

Discussion.

Staff is very supportive of the project.

Attorney Denorfia noted under the STC approval, they have to widen the road a little bit. You'll want fee on that.

Discussion.

(End of Tape #1, Side B)

(Beginning of Tape #2, Side A)

Discussion about the timeline for receipt of information for the meeting. The Town Planner indicated staff does accommodate people whenever they can.

Discussion.

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

F. Request for approval under 8-24 for the purchase of property at 447 Canal Street for open space (MR#449)

Attorney Sciota explained on behalf of the open space committee and the Town Council, we are requesting a favorable approval of an 8-24.

This is property at 447 Canal Street. It's the old freight station in Milldale. This property is something the open space committee has looked at for quite a long time and staff has looked at for probably 8 months.

Staff applied for and received a grant for ancillary property to our Rails to Trails. The grant is for \$65,818.76. We worked with the owner and he has been very good and very receptive to the town and we have signed a contract with the gentleman for \$130,000.

It's a half acre piece of land. It houses the rail depot. Very attractive building. We are excited with it. The total cost to the taxpayers of the town will be \$64,181.24.

We're hoping for a favorable 8-24 to send back to the Council.

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

In response to a question by Mr. Kenefick, discussion was had as to what the property would be used for. It does have sewer & water hook up. It could be used for a rest station. There has been talk about using it for a kiosk.

Discussion.

Ms. Savage Dunham added it is eligible for the National Register once the town owns it. We'll be researching that to determine if there is any funding for the restoration of the building.

And, staff thinks it is a great opportunity to have an at grade handicapped access to the Rails to Trails. So as part of the parking and possibly a restroom facility, we'd like to have a handicapped access.

A Phase I environmental report has been ordered.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Southington Country Club, request for 5 year extension of approved subdivision, Savage Street and Meriden Avenue S #1225.

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

H. Mark Saucier, request for reduction of \$5,000 erosion and sedimentation bond to a new amount of \$1,500, 113 Wedgewood Road S #1207.

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

I. Carpenter Construction request for 90-day extension for filing Mylar, Lot #3, Strawberry Fields S #1259.2

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

J. West Pines request for a 5 year extension S#1213.

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

7. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING.

A. Paul Bucchi, special permit use application to allow 2 principal buildings on one lot, 154 Town Line Road SPU #482.

Scheduled for April 6, 2010.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

None this evening.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

None to report this evening.

Mr. Oshana asked about the memo on Mountain View Estates that was in the packet. The Planner concurred there was a memo. Mountainview Farms Subdivision #1241, as you know, you authorized the calling of the bond for this subdivision in 2009. At this point in time, we mailed a letter to the applicant on 2/25/10 and we informed them that due to inactivity at the project, we are considering it abandoned.

And, since we have already called the bond, we told the applicant they had 15 days to contact the town, otherwise, we are going to go to bid and finish the public improvements. That is the roadway, sidewalks and the detention basin. Not any undeveloped lots. We have barely enough money to finish it. This is a good time to go to get quotes. We are getting responsible quotes on that.

We expect to do that work during this construction season after which point those roads will then be accepted and be town streets. There are a number of people living up there and that way they'll be able to get school buses and mail delivery and the town will plow the streets. Right now they are kind of in limbo.

Discussion followed about whether 20% is enough contingency.

Procedures for bond reductions were discussed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: To discuss pending litigation: Primus vs Town of Southington

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to adjourn into executive session barring the press and public, but including Attorney Sullivan, the Town Manager, the Town Attorney, the Town Engineer and the Town Planner. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Meeting adjourned to executive session at 9:01 o'clock, p.m.)

#### **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

The Southington Planning & Zoning Commission entered executive session immediately following their meeting with the following in attendance in order to discuss pending litigation, Primus vs Town of Southington.

The following Councilpersons were present, viz:

James Sinclair	Edward Pocock, Jr.
Francis Kenefick	Kelly Kennedy DelDebbio*
Paul Chaplinsky	Zaya Oshana, Jr.
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Patrick Saucier  
Edward Costello  
Steve Kalkowski

Ex-officio members present were as follows:

John Weichsel, Town Manager  
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney  
Anthony J. Tranquillo, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer  
Mary Savage-Dunham, Town Planner  
Timothy Sullivan, Esquire

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 9:17 o'clock, p.m.)

#### **REGULAR SESSION**

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

(Meeting was adjourned at 9:20 o'clock, p.m.)

---

Mary F. Savage Dunham  
Acting Secretary