

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
June 2, 2009

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing and regular meeting on Tuesday June 2, 2009, 2009. Chairman Zaya Oshana, Jr., called the meeting to order at 7:03 o'clock, p.m.

The following Councilpersons were present, viz:

James Sinclair	Francis Kenefick
Michael DelSanto	Patrick Saucier
Kelly Kennedy DelDebbio*	Dawn Miceli
Zaya Oshana, Jr., Chairman	

Alternates: Dennis Vachon
Paul Chaplinsky
Lisa Conroy

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mary F. Savage, Town Planner
Anthony J. Tranquillo, Director of Public Works/Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney
John Weichsel, Town Manager

Absent: Steve Kalkowski, Alternate Commissioner

(*Arrived with meeting in progress.)

The Chair seated Mr. Chaplinsky for Ms. DelDebbio. A quorum was determined.

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

ZAYA OSHANA, JR., Chair, presiding:

Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting of May 19, 2009

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. DelSanto and passed on a majority voice vote.

Public Hearings

A. Proposed changes to Section 3-08.4, 3-08.5A3 and 3-08.5A3b of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations (ZA #548)

THE CHAIR: For the record, our public hearing this evening which was a continuation of our public hearing from our last meeting, the applicant has withdrawn his application, so we are going to close this public hearing and we are no longer going to move forward with that.

Business Meeting

A. Proposed changes to Section 3-08.4, 3-08.5A3 and 3-08.5A3b of the Town of Southington Regulations ZA #548.

THE CHAIR: This is the application for that public hearing, ZA #548. That public hearing has been closed and we are looking for --- that has actually been withdrawn, so we don't have to take any action on that at this point. So that item has been withdrawn.

B. Donald A. Sirois, site plan application of proposed restaurant, 1032 Meriden Waterbury Road SPR #1545.

MR. SIROIS: Good evening.

THE CHAIR: Good evening. Can we get your name and address for the record?

MR. SIROIS: Donald Sirois, 36 East Ridge Court, Cheshire.

I assume you guys have everything you need in front of you. I'm looking to build a small restaurant on Route 322 in Southington. I'm sorry, my engineer could not be here this evening, so any questions, I will try to answer for you the best that I can.

THE CHAIR: Okay, I understand, the plans, the final plans came in yesterday, is that correct, Ms. Savage?

MS. SAVAGE: Yes, we got revised plans in yesterday. Staff did review them today. This application has been in for a while. In fact, it already got a 65 day extension. That 65 day extension will expire at the end of June, so either the commission acts in some capacity at the next meeting or the applicant has to withdraw because it's completely out of time.

We did review the revised plans this afternoon. And, very quickly, I will just call out the things that are outstanding at this point in time.

Comment 1: About the drainage report. The drainage report was reviewed today. There are still some discrepancies in the drainage report at this point in time.

Comment 2: All set.

Comment 3: All set.

Comment 4: Staff has repeatedly called out the need for a sidewalk easement. The sidewalks is within the Connecticut state

right of way. And, the engineer replies that no easement is required with the state.

In situations like this, we get a sidewalk easement to the Town of Southington. Just like we do at the travel centers. State of Connecticut does not take sidewalk easements but the town does. So we're still waiting on that.

Comment 5: Extend sidewalk on the west to the bridge and extend proposed easement accordingly. The engineer says it's not possible. Staff's position is it is possible. It should be extended to contour 124.

Comment 6: Encroachment permit is required. The response says: see attached letter. We didn't get any letter attached.

Comment 7: Planning Department at this point in time is still not in receipt of a landscaping plan. The engineer says owner will provide landscaping plan. Staff would note that that we don't have it. The application is incomplete without it.

Comment 8: All set.

Comment 9: All set.

Comment 10: It's about discharge from the roof drainage system. It was previously going into subsurface galleys. Those are now reviewed. The response says that the drainage system discharges in the bioretention pond. However, the drainage calcs don't correspond with the engineer's response. So the drainage report doesn't bear out what the answer is.

Comment 11: Staff's only comment with regard to the exit is that the exit from this property should have the double lane configuration with the arrows. It's going to be one exit, line one way in and one way out. And, staff would like to have the exit out painted with a divider line between the two lanes and the arrows showing that it's not just a one lane exit.

We have concerns the flood elevation is 124 and the regulations require any openings in the foundation in the building below the flood elevation to be protected or flood proofed. And, we called out that the designer should identify any openings below the elevation. Architectural plans and drawings were not submitted with the revised plans. Engineer responded: owner to submit architectural drawings addressing slab on grade construction. But we still don't have those to look at.

Comment 13: Fine.

Comment 14: Fine.

Comment 15: Fine.

Comment 16: With regard to the tracking pad, the engineer should call out the thickness of the tracking pad and the type of material and the detail.

Comment 19: Remove galley system note on Sheet 3 of 5. It's left over and extraneous.

Those comments should be fairly easy for the engineer to address. At this point in time we wouldn't support action until those items are cleared up.

But we are supportive of the project and it needs to be acted on at the next meeting.

THE CHAIR: The applicant has a copy of this?

MS. SAVAGE: I just handed it to them.

THE CHAIR: So you are going to share this with your engineer?

MR. SIROIS: Yes.

I also brought my landscaper tonight to address any questions or concerns you guys might have. I don't know if you want to present the plan now?

MR. ALI: I do have one of the items, the landscaping plan.

(Passed in to Ms. Savage)

MS. SAVAGE: I can pass this around for the commission, but it is my only copy, so ---

MR. ALI: It's fairly simple. I mean, it's not a large parcel of land. It includes a plant list and a sketch.

ATTORNEY SCIOTA: Greg, could you identify yourself for the record?

MR. ALI: Greg Ali, Ali's Nursery, 421 Buckland Street, Plantsville.

MR. SINCLAIR: Mr. Sirois, I know your engineer couldn't be here tonight but it looks like you have a drive thru on this building?

MR. SIROIS: Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: How many cars can you stack in there?

MR. SIROIS: I think it was four.

(Pause)

I think it was four.

MR. SINCLAIR: Four cars to stack in?

MR. SIROIS: Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: And, what is going to be the nature of this restaurant?

MR. SIROIS: Uh, it's hot dogs and hamburgs.

MR. SIROIS: Hot dogs? Okay. I do know that are does, if you have cars backing up into Meriden Waterbury Turnpike it adds to the congestion that's already there.

Is your engineer going to be here at the next meeting?

MR. SIROIS: Yes.

MR. SINCLAIR: Okay. I'll hold off any questions for him.

THE CHAIR: Any other questions at this point for the applicant?

(No response)

I think it's important you take this and share it with your engineer as Ms. Savage said, they're not major issues. But it seems like there is a whole bunch of stuff that needs to be addressed and taken care of before we can move forward with this application.

MS. SAVAGE: And, I would just say, looking very quickly at the landscaping plan, it doesn't meet the regulations and so we'll definitely be making some comments on it. And, it's dated March 4th. So I don't understand why we're getting it two weeks before we have to act on the project but we'll certainly find some time this week to review it and give you our comments.

MR. SIROIS: I think you had copies of that. It was just the revised, the pictures was new. I think that was mostly for the inland wetlands.

THE CHAIR: If what you are hearing now is that it's not meeting-- - and this is the first time we're seeing it - but if it's not meeting the regulations you might want to take some time in the next week to come on down and meet with staff and make sure that by the next meeting you get it up to code.

Okay?

Any other questions/comments?

MR. SIROIS: Great.

MR. SINCLAIR: Move to table.

MR. DELSANTO: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

MR. SIROIS: Thank you for your time.

C. G & A Industries, site plan application for a 6,000 sf industrial building, 120 Industrial Drive SPR #1552.

MR. GIUDICE: Stephen Giudice with Harry Cole & Son. Good evening. Tonight we have site plan for a 6,000 sf building located on lot 10 of Industrial Drive. This is the new industrial subdivision off of Captain Lewis. This is another lot, but we have an anxious person who wants to build a building and move his machine shop into this structure.

It's a pretty - and I say this all the time --- it's a pretty straightforward application. We have a 6,000 sf building. We have associated parking. We have a limited drainage here. We just have one catch basin with a pipe connected to the road. We have an accessory storage building for material and lawnmowers and such on site.

And, a paved parking lot. The main entrance will be located here. Proposed sign would be located on the building. The ZIRO has been handled by the subdivision detention basin as part of the subdivision approval we allowed 70 percent impervious coverage per lot. This lot is way below that. It's only about 40 to 50 percent, I believe. I don't have the exact numbers but plenty of room for expansion if he decides to.

We do have a landscaped buffer in the back of the parcel against the residential zone. We're proposing to maintain the existing vegetation in that area. I think the comment from the staff was they wanted to take a look if we needed additional supplemental planting. The applicant has agreed to that, as well.

We have some landscaping around the front of the building. Our landscaped trees as required by the regulations and some plant beds around the building.

Loading zone, this area here and a dumpster in this corner of the parking lot.

The site balances out pretty well as far as cut and fills go and we think it's a good application. We're looking for having them get in there as soon as possible.

I believe we have addressed all the comments from staff and I'll be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

THE CHAIR: Just for the record, Commissioner DelDebbio came in right at the beginning of this application, so we'll seat Commissioner DelDebbio back in.

Are there any questions for the applicant?

MR. KENEFICK: I have a question. Probably for the Town Engineer. They're doing a real nice job up there. That whole industrial area looks really good.

The only thing that caught my eye that really messed up is the amount of telephone poles up there. Why do they have power on telephone poles and not underground?

MR. TRANQUILLO: Well, the most residential subdivisions - all residential subdivisions prefer to have the underground electricity. Industrial subdivisions, it's their choice. We don't require underground because the aesthetics isn't really the prime issue with industrial.

MR. KENEFICK: Does it cost that much more to put them underground than -

MR. TRANQUILLO: It does cost more, yes.

MR. KENEFICK: Because you know, the area is a nice area and its being well built out and everything. But the telephone poles are --- they just seemed like there's more telephone poles up there than there should be.

MR. GIUDICE: If I may, there was a substantial increase to go with underground. I don't think the applicant had any clue the number of poles that C L&P was going to put on the site. It had something to do with the way they want to --- the road loops up and loops back. Maybe Tony can explain it better than I can. But it has something to do with providing a continuous loop for the entire road.

And, there is a telephone pole for each user that --- I think he was, he couldn't believe it when they started delivering the poles and putting them in. He was just beside himself.

And, I would agree with you. But it was a very substantial difference.

MR. KENEFICK: The area is great. I mean, they're doing a nice job and they seem to moving pretty good and everything.

MR. GIUDICE: I knew what you were going to say before you said it.

(Chuckles)

Because I did the same. I went WOW! I drove up there and I said boy, I've never seen so many telephone poles. But it has something to do with the CL&P new policy the way they service industrial properties.

MR. KENEFICK: Probably we should look into this and be able to do anything with the regulations. I mean, you guys got to really take a look up there.

MS. MICELI: I'm just curious what would be manufactured up there.

MR. GIUDICE: You know, he has a small machine shop. He just does small machining of metal items. I don't know the exact use. But he's pretty much a one, two man operation. He doesn't have a huge staff but he has quite a few computer machines that he operates. So that is what I can tell you.

THE CHAIR: Anybody else?

Ms. Savage?

MS. SAVAGE: The application is ready for action.

MR. DELSANTO: Move to approve.

MR. SINCLAIR: Second.

(Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.)

D. Salvatore Geremia, dba Geremia Gardens, site plan modification 1720 West Street SPR #995.4 request for 65 day extension.

MS. SAVAGE: Correct. This is a new application. Staff was working on this. This is for the corner property.

ATTORNEY SCIOTA: This is a different property.

MS. SAVAGE: Correct. This is the corner property, not the same property. It's the adjacent property. And, um, the long and short of it is staff was working with the applicant administratively for a site plan modification, however, due to the length of the time of processing it, we've flipped it over to be an application before the commission.

At this point in time, it requires a 65 day extension. I have the written request. I support it. And, it's ready.

MR. DELSANTO: Move to grant a 65 day extension.

MR. SINCLAIR: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

E. Donald Santarsiero, request for 5 year extension of subdivision 70 Long Lane S #1040.1.

MS. SAVAGE: Staff supports this.

MR. SINCLAIR: So moved.

MR. DELSANTO: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

F. St. Paul's Housing Corp., dba Wheeler Village Apartments, request for release of \$1,000 erosion and sedimentation bond, 82 Berlin Street SPR #1202.

MS. SAVAGE: Staff supports this.

MR. SINCLAIR: So moved.

MR. DELSANTO: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

G. Beverly R. McKay, request for release of \$1,000 Erosion and Sedimentation bond, 181 Queen Street SPR #1206

MS. SAVAGE: Staff supports this.

MR. SINCLAIR: So moved.

MR. DELSANTO: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

H. Merit Oil, request for release of \$1,300 Erosion and Sedimentation bond, 181 Queen Street, SPR #1206.

MS. SAVAGE: Staff supports a table on this one.

MR. DELSANTO: Move to table.

MR. SINCLAIR: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

I. Hines Sudden Service, Inc., request for release of \$4,300 Erosion and Sedimentation Bond, 866 Queen Street SPR #1205.

MS. SAVAGE: Staff supports this.

MR. SINCLAIR: So moved.

MR. SAUCIER: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

Administrative Reports

None this evening.

Receipt of New Applications

Ms. Savage outlined four applications on a sheet she passed around the original of which is in the Town Planner's Office.

THE CHAIR: Real quickly, at our last meeting we had the report that the Planner brought up about the West Street evaluation that she had begun. The gathering of data and the information that she presented.

We talked about the development of a committee to look at the West Street information and then to develop a study to present to the committee.

What I'm doing right now is I have not had an opportunity to speak to everybody and I'd like to speak to each of the commissioners before we actually put that committee together, the final committee together.

So, we're not going to put that together tonight. But what I would like to do is just really briefly talk about what the objectives of this committee are going to be and ultimately what we'd like to do as this committee. AS we start looking, going forward into the next couple of months, as we begin the process of collecting data and studying the data and then presenting the data, it's going to be very, very important we start getting some public input.

Holding public hearings. Bringing together and inviting people from the community to come in and join us. West Street is - a lot of people are saying they don't want to see West Street become the next Queen Street. This committee is responsible for the land use, although it appears recently - editorial comment - some judges don't think this committee is the one that does that but this committee is land use committee in the town.

We need to do this and do this right. So what we need to do is look at each other's schedule, look at our own schedules and see how our schedules look over the next couple of months. How we look in terms of timing, availability for extra meetings, so that we can hold some public hearings, invite other boards and other commissions to join us in the public hearings, invite the public to join us, invite developers to join us, and invite citizens to join us to come and give their input on what's going on.

Collect that data. Very very important to work with staff of the town, the Planner, the engineering department, the economic development department, the overall staff of the departments so that when we put this information together, taking all that input and putting that final report out and then as a total Planning & Zoning Commission looking at that and implementing whatever comes out of. Because that's what this board is going to do.

We do the right thing for the Town of Southington. So that is going to be coming up shortly.

Anybody have any other comments they'd like to make at this point?

(No response)

Looking for a motion to adjourn.

MR. SINCLAIR: So moved.

MR. DELSANTO: Second.

(Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.)

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 7:22 o'clock, p.m.)