

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
October 2, 2012

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, October 2, 2012. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

Steve Kalkowski	Kevin Conroy
James Macchio	Paul Champagne
Paul Chaplinsky	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Jennifer Clock
 Randall Gage
 Susan Locks
 Ryan Rogers *

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

David J. Lavallee, Assistant Town Planner
James A. Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer
Gregory Klimaszewski, Assistant Town Attorney

Absent: James Sinclair, Commissioner
 Mary Savage Dunham, Town Planner
 Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Mgr/Town Attorney

(*Arrived with meeting in progress where noted.)

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 September 18, 2012

Mr. Kalkowski so moved a motion for approval as submitted. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Chaplinsky abstaining.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated that he read the Minutes and reviewed the video of the meeting.

Public Hearings

Mr. Lavallee read the legal notice into the record.

The Chair reiterated if there is anyone here tonight for the Carpenter Construction application, that application has been withdrawn.

A. Request for zone boundary change, a portion of 243 and 253-255 Prospect Street from R-20/25 to R-12, ZC #540.

Mr. Lavallee explained this application is a request to rezone the entirety of property known as 253-255 Prospect Street and a portion of 243 Prospect Street from R-20/25 to R-12. The property at 243 Prospect Street is currently a parcel that has split zoning and that half is zoned R-12 and half is zoned R-20/25. If you approve this, the property at 243 Prospect Street would no longer be a split zoned parcel. It would have uniform zoning. The owner of 253 Prospect Street would have the ability to subdivide the parcel and sell the surplus land as an R-12 building lot or sell to his neighbor who has expressed in purchasing it for a backyard area.

We have not received any calls or concerns from abutters.

Bob Lariviere, owner of 253 - 255 Prospect Street. I am applying for rezoning because it is a good sized lot and all I can say is that I'm pretty well destitute and it is my only hope that I can subdivide the property into two lots and use that for collateral so I can repair the house I'm in. I've looked all over and to go anyplace else I'd be going from the frying pan to the fire. I like my town very much and I like my neighbors. They all seem to be in agreement with it.

The primary thing is that financially I am in a strapped situation. I'm 75 years old and I'm having a tough time. This would help me a lot of I could subdivide and use it as collateral for now. That's all I really want to do.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

The applicant indicated his neighbor was supposed to be come and Billy hasn't shown up and Chas across the street was supposed to show up.

(Those speaking against the application)

(No response)

The Chair passed this public hearing for the time being and moved to the second public hearing.

B. McRealty Dev., LLC, special permit use application for child day care services for more than 13 clients, 2003 West Street (SPU #490.1)

Mr. Lavallee advised this application is a proposed 10,000 sf day care facility at 2003 West Street also known as map 191, Parcel 53, proposed zoned B. A similar application at this location was formerly denied by the PZC in 2010.

Attorney Andrew Denorfia with offices at 133 Main Street, represented the applicant. This is for a special permit for a child day care on the property known as 2003 West Street. Here with me tonight is Sev Bovino from Kratzert, Jones and our traffic engineer Scott Hesketh as well as the representatives from Mc Development.

This is approximately 1.23 acres in a business zone. It's bounded to the west by West Street, to the south by the existing roadway that services Ridgeview Condominiums as well as another commercial parcel. It is bounded to the east by Ridgeview Condominiums.

He gave a history of the approvals at this location: a 60 unit condominium project with two commercial parcels in the front as part of a mixed use development.

This subject property is one of those commercial properties that was approved in 2003. It also received a site plan approval for a 13,000 sf retail use.

The other parcel to the south received site plan approval for a 10,850 sf bank.

Back in 2010, the applicant came before you for a larger daycare consisting of 11,000 sf with 190 children and 20-30 staff members.

During the public hearings, the applicant reduced the number of children proposed to 181 and 19 employees. That application also had 44 parking spaces proposed. That was denied by this commission.

Since then, the applicant has taken your concerns to heart and has worked on improving the application. The present application is for a 10,000 sf daycare facility that would have a maximum of 149 children and a maximum of 19 employees. The parking has increased from the 2010 application to 49 spaces. Therefore, the application is for a smaller facility with less children and more parking than the 2010 application.

The facility will be the Learning Experience Daycare which is a nationally run daycare that operates in 16 states.

I'd like to go over how we believe this application meets the zoning regulations.

Under Section 3-01.2F a daycare facility is allowed in a business zone with special permit approval subject to the satisfaction of Section 8.

Section 8 sets the standards that the commission must look at as to whether to approve this application.

- The proposed use and location does not have a detrimental effect on public health, safety, welfare, property values and is part of an orderly development. Sev and Scott will go into further detail in terms of how the property is designed to make it safe for the children, parent, staff and neighbors but I do want to discuss the pickup and drop off schedule that I believe was brought up extensively during the 2010 application.

(Mr. Rogers entered the meeting at this time.)

A pick up and drop off schedule was submitted as part of the application for 105 children. This number is based on the Learning Experience's national average of having 70% enrollment. I had them do a study for pick up and drop off times for 149 children which would be the maximum they would have. He submitted the report for the record and went through it audibly for the commission.

The hours of operation would be Monday thru Friday, 6:30 am to 6:30 pm. Any celebration would be held during those hours.

As to the property values, I'll read into the record and then submit for the record a report that was done by Century 21 Realtors who found that the daycare would not have a negative impact on the surrounding property values. (Submitted for the record)

The next requirement that Section 8 has is that the proposal must be in harmony and character with the surrounding properties. As previously mentioned, 2003 West Street was approved for a commercial use as part of the mixed use development and is in a business zone. The commission wanted to have a commercial use in front of the project to balance the condominiums and we believe the daycare fits that goal. The daycare is only open from 6:30 am to 6:30 pm Monday thru Friday and we believe it is a better fit for the area than a business that could be open more hours such as a convenience store.

I'd like to read into the record a letter dated September 20, 2012 from Attorney Martin Rizzy, Ridgeview Condominium Association Director in favor of the proposal (on file in the Planner's Office).

Section 8 also requires that the size, location and height of the structure must be suitable. Sev will go over this in more detail but I want to point out that this site was approved for a 13,000 sf building and we are proposing now a 10,000 sf building.

There must be adequate emergency access and streets for use. Our traffic engineer will go over that in great detail.

Section 8 requires that the lot must be suitable. Again, this is a 1.2 acre site that was approved previously for a larger use and we're proposing now a 10,000 sf building.

The property needs to be suitably landscaped. Sev will go over all the increased landscaping and buffers that the applicant is proposing.

Finally, Section 8 requires there must be adequate parking. We are proposing 49 spaces for a 10,000 sf building that will only have a maximum of 149 children and 19 employees. The Learning Experience has found nationwide they for a 149 child facility they would require no more than 40 spaces and we are providing 49. And, it appears that 49 spaces for 149 children at maximum is as much or more parking than any of the other facilities in town.

Sev Bovino, Planner, from Kratzert, Jones representing the applicant. He reviewed the details of the property as had Attorney Denorfia previously.

It is a 10,000 sf building, slab on grade with no basement. I have a floor plan to submit for the record. (Submitted)

There are multiple exits from the building for safety purposes so the children can get out in a hurry if there is a problem. That's why we have a sidewalk around the periphery of the building in addition to the sidewalk along the roadway system.

One story building that will match the architecture of the condos up gradient from us which is masonry with wood siding.

The parking required is 40 and we're proposing 49. The first 4 spaces as you enter the driveway on the left will be dedicated to the employees as well as the ones along West Street. Explained this will create no back up at the entrance which was a concern last time.

The lighting will be wall pack units with full cut off fixtures all around the building. No light bulbs.

The state took ownership of the traffic signal and I have a letter to submit for the record together with a map associated with that. It was May 16, 2008. (Submitted for the record)

The play area proposed is 5012 sf. The surface will be wood fiber based for children's safety.

The landscaping is supposed to 980 sf and this plan provides 1004 sf.

As to the buffers, we are proposing a buffer on the north side next to this multifamily unit. We have a proposed 6' fence in addition to a row of evergreen at that location. There's a slight berm proposed there where the fence will be put on and the evergreens planted.

Additional buffering is provided along the easterly side of the development and the detention area is slightly to the east. There are some areas where we can add some trees. And, we propose additional trees along the roadway going up the driveway on the left side.

Showed pictures of how the landscaping has improved and provides shielding for this first building across the street. I have photos for the rest of the development which shows the extensive landscaping around the buildings (submitted for the record).

The lot coverage allowed in this zone is 25% and we are proposing 19%.

Property is served by sewer and water. There are sidewalks internally and externally.

He showed and explained the architectural. Pitched roof to match the existing buildings.

The original SPU had a rendering for the development of the two parcels in the front and this map shows the top rendering shows the two building pretty much matching the condo project.

The 500' radius map was provided with the appropriate neighboring property owners names and notification was sent out.

This parcel was approved as Phase IV on the overall project when we did the condominiums. It had mixed use, residential/commercial. (Showed original map submitted and approved).

Discussion of the increased landscaping.

Between this commercial parcel and the units in this area, there is a detention area in between (indicating). So there is a tree buffer in the back of the units already with additional trees. Also there is a very big drop in grade from this area to that. I.e.: the floor elevation of the daycare is going to 251 and the condo floor elevation is 284. And, closest building to us which is 125' away, that floor elevation is 269. Explained.

The future development of the parcel to the south was approved for a 10,800 sf two story bank. It is now contemplated to be 5,400 sf. Mostly retail with the possibility of a drive thru for either a coffee shop or fast foot operation which would entail less than 2,000 sf overall.

Mr. Champagne asked if on the playground side there would be access for emergency vehicles. Mr. Bovino explained where you could enter the driveway and pull right up to access that area. If you're talking fire protection, the truck will probably stop in the road. If you're talking about an ambulance, they can pull in and park right here and access this area.

Mr. Bovino submitted for the record the copies of the reduced map of the overall condo project that was approved.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the circulation on the parcel. Mr. Bovino explained it would be a one way circulation. You would go north and either park in these parking spots and turn around and come out or go north and west to look for additional spaces and come out.

The dedicated parking spaces for employees was discussed. Fifteen along West Street and our in the parking area as you enter on your left.

The drop off area was noted.

Scott Hesketh, licensed engineer with the firm of FA Hesketh & Associates. Our office is in East Granby, CT. We have authored a traffic study dated October 1st, 2012 and copies were submitted to the staff earlier this week. He then reviewed the report. (On file in the Town Planner's Office)

He concluded by saying based on all the information we believe that the existing site driveways and signalized intersection at West Street and Ridgeview Estates can certainly accommodate the volume of traffic projected for this development and for the future development on the opposite side of the driveway.

We believe that the proposed site plan provides more than enough parking for the proposed facility.

It is for the commission to review this information and decide in the positive.

Mr. Chaplinsky questioned the levels of service. Discussion followed. Mr. Hesketh stated we revised this report from previous reports we had done. My recollection is that the overall intersection levels of service were the same generally speaking in the range of C & B. Those are exceptional levels of service and I am not concerned.

Mr. Champagne questioned the queuing and discussion followed. Mr. Hesketh pointed out a reduction versus what the commission approved previously. We are reducing the volumes of traffic coming in and out of the driveway with this proposed development. We are talking about 95 percentile queue. Will it be exceeded sometimes?

Certainly. We are talking averages and fluctuations. A significant portion of the time it will be less.

Mr. Conroy said he would ask for an extension as we just got this report right now so I can review it. I do have some questions:

- This application had an STC permit in 2004 and what were the uses approved? Mr. Hesketh said 60 units of age restricted housing in the rear and a total of 24,400 sf of retail development.

Do you intend to go back to the STC for change in use? Mr. Hesketh explained why he did not plan to go back to the STC. All uses in the report are included in retail development (strip mall, daycare center, dry cleaner, restaurant, bank).

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said he didn't see any discussion of the existing volumes or how the background was generated. I'll ask these questions:

- Existing counts were taken when? Mr. Hesketh explained the original report was done in 2004 updated traffic counts were taken in the interim both for the development across the street and may have been done also for this development. I don't have my file with me. Our information was that traffic counts had been decreasing since 2004. No reason to update the counts to reflect the new lower volumes. We have an intersection designed for the higher volumes and we left the higher volumes in place.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said he didn't see where it indicated the volumes had gone down. I don't see any counts; I don't see any growth projections. Mr. Hesketh will provide that information to the staff.

Mr. Conroy discussed the drop off and pick up schedules. That's just a guess. The peak hour trip generation based on your report is 58 cars in the AM peak and 66 in the PM peak. That is the number we should be basing the parking calculation on. Is that what was done or was something else done?

Mr. Hesketh explained for the trip generation he used the ITE trip generation report. The parking analysis, we used the information provided by the Learning Experience.

Mr. Conroy wanted to see the parking demand for the full peak hour trip generation.

We'd like to see the peak hour 15-minute trip generation for a facility like this. I would ask that information be provided.

Mr. Conroy noticed the counts for the other daycare centers were done the week of Christmas. Is that appropriate?

Mr. Conroy asked as far as the queue, he didn't see any information as a queue analysis. Mr. Hesketh said there is about 40 pages of information at the back which includes it all.

Mr. Conroy reiterated his basic concerns would be the queue analysis for the driveway and the approach at the intersections and that would include the background condition based on all the development that has happened since 2004. An eight year old traffic count is worth very much for something of this level of detail in my opinion. I ask you look at that. Mr. Hesketh said he would provide the information.

The Chair brought up the ESPN growth since 2004. Have you taken that into consideration? Mr. Hesketh said his recollection is that all the counts indicate the traffic volumes have been decreasing on Route 229 in this area since that time. We will provide all the count data that we have.

Mr. Bovino added that staff provided us with a checklist. We responded to the checklist in writing. One question was the view of the building from West Street and where it says east elevation, that means looking east, so that is the view from West Street. And the one that says north is the front door, basically.

As far as the counts, we did take them on the dates in December, but I don't see that people take their kids out of daycare for Christmas. There was a lot of activity that was recorded.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Mr. Lavallee reported a letter from the Greater Southington Chamber of Commerce President Art Secondo which he read into the record. (On file in the Town Planner's Office)

Martin Rizzi: Unit 39. He noted Attorney Denorfia read into the record the letter he wrote on behalf of the association and he circulated for the purpose of making sure no one changed their mind. I did not receive any responses from anybody who was opposed to it or any responses from people who had gone on record as being in favor. (Submitted for the record)

He spoke about queuing. With very exceptions, the only time there is one car waiting at that light is when my wife and I leave to go to work in the morning at the same time.
Discussion.

I want to speak personally in support of the proposal as well as on behalf of the association.

Mr. Conroy asked the speaker, do you feel that a daycare center is compatible with your residential use? Mr. Rizzi explained why he felt it was. He preferred the hours of 6:30 am to 6:30 pm than to have any other type of use.

Discussion.

He is not bothered by the fact the children will be out playing during the day.

In response to a query by Mr. Gage, Mr. Rizzi stated he conducted a survey as a resident director and the result of that was that he was prepared to cast a vote in favor of supporting this application. No formal action was taken, though.

Discussion.

The poll results as a result of circulation among the 34 residents, and of those 34: 18 responses. Eleven were in favor, 5 were against, 1 took no position and 1 took a position I couldn't understand.

Discussion.

(Inaudible): Unit 42. Knowing what could go on that type of property, as a resident there I would be much more in turn to having a daycare as to many of the other commercial buildings that I have been part of.

I was in a condo that bordered a daycare previous, and they by far were the best tenant out there. Hours were good.

I believe a lot of the other things that could go up there wouldn't even have to come before this board as it is approved for commercial business. We could get an eyesore.

This ties in and is an asset to our community. It will help raise property values.

Barbara Bisson: Unit 21. My husband and I are both in favor of this plan. We don't see any negatives compared to some other choices and we would be more than happy to have a daycare there that only runs 5 days a week instead of weekends and nights.

Discussion.

We are in favor of it.

(Those speaking against the application)

Rich Drouin. My wife Erin is with me. We're Unit 58. I have prepared some information and it's important that you spend the time to review it. Described the contents of the pamphlet. (Submitted one for each commissioner.)

It should be noted this real estate broker is the broker of record to sell the units. I feel there is a possibility of a conflict.

A few comments my wife and I have are:

- We like this beautiful community.
- We were here for the 2010 public hearings. We did write a letter of approval for the complex but since then a lot of things have happened.
- We weren't involved in the survey. We were on vacation and our stand was known from before.
- We visited the Learning Experience in Cromwell. (See pictures in booklet) To me, it looks like a clown town. Really does not fit in with the character and harmony of the Ridgeview Estates.
- There is a beautiful 7-11 downtown. Discussion.
- Traffic patterns on West Street were discussed.
- Massive high lights that would be detrimental as far as the aesthetics and peace and quiet of the community. Unit 1, which the daycare would be within 100', it would hurt the aesthetics of those individuals who are there to retire.
- We all thought it was going to be a bank or office complex.
- A daycare center was a surprise to all of us. Objection and dismay in 2011.
- ESPN is growing at such a rate, within walking distance of where we live there are constructing another building or it's going to be a massive parking.
- Peak hour times the traffic is atrocious.
- With development across the street and their traffic and that of ESPN and the daycare center and Lowes, it is a massive traffic jam at certain times.
- The amount of accidents are a problem. Fire trucks, ambulances, screeching tires, et cetera.

There should be an up to date study done on the traffic for the commission.

Gas station has diesel trucks and underground flammable liquids. Again, a lot of weaving in and out. Queuing is a problem.

As residents, we want some answers.

I encourage you to take the time to read the details presented to you. Especially the harmony section. My own person opinion is it is going to worsen the economic value of the homes regardless of what the developer or studies say. An independent realty study is needed. Discussion.

Mr. Conroy asked: given the zoning regulations allow for a variety of uses in the business zone and you're not happy with the daycare center use, what type of use would you be expecting?

The speaker said he had no problem with a 7-11 that's downtown. Attractive, hardly any use. A small medical type facility. Dental office. A small strip mall if permitted.

Discussion.

This is going to be huge and very stark in appearance. All asphalt with high lights lit most of the time. And, children playing around most of the day yelling and screaming. We're a retirement community.

Discussion.

Richard Norris: Here with my wife Jeannette. We're unit 8. We're the one right across the street from the proposed daycare center. I just can't believe they are going to allow a daycare center. We are an adult community. We moved there to be in a 55 and over complex that is quiet, no kids. This is going to be right in my backyard.

I am concerned about the traffic. The fact is there is going to be nightmare traffic. I know that. Speeds on West Street were discussed.

I agree with what Rich said.

I'm not concerned about what else could go in there. If it's a 7-11, we'll deal with it. I don't think it will generate the amount of traffic the daycare center will generate.

Discussion.

I am against it.

Arthur Cyr: 103 Berlin Avenue. I'm very familiar with this whole area and I am amazed at each application that comes up for this property. Spoke about half truths presented to this commission.

Discussion.

Gave a history of the approvals on this property in 2003 & 2004.

And, there is no way the traffic count has gone down on West Street.

Discussion.

Discussion on the queuing.

Drop off and pick up time traffic was discussed.

Ridgeview is only half done.

Traffic speed on West Street was discussed.

Noise from the daycare was discussed.

Spoke of the drainage problems on the property.

Theresa McAllister: Unit 59. She was told the commercial property would be a bank or a hair shop. My condo will overlook the play area. I don't think that is a good use for that property. This is an over 55 community and a daycare center is just not the right fit for it.

(Rebuttal)

Attorney Denorfia said Scott will get the additional traffic information and submit it to staff.

I want to point out this is a mixed use business zone property. We're talking about a use that is open between 6:30 am and 6:30 pm five days a week.

There is no chance that we can tell you what's going to happen at 11:00, 12:00 in terms of lights flashing. The applicant can do their best in terms of screening.

We believe and the applicant believes that this is the best fit for the area. He still has 26 units to sell. He's not going to build some monstrosity as they won't be able to sell all their units.

The whole point of this is to fit in with the surrounding units to look similar and be something that is not going to be obtrusive to the surrounding property.

We will get all the information we can.

Mr. Conroy clarified on the traffic that what he was looking for was something more in line with what you present to the STC. I'm looking for existing counts, when developed, how developed. Were they adjusted seasonally? New counts should probably be adjusted, i.e.: Lake Compounce has a Halloween event. We want the growth projections for the appropriate year when it will be fully operational. We want the background trip generation from any proposed developments approved by this commission as well as in the general vicinity of Bristol. And, the combined analysis, level of service, queuing on the site driveway as well as all four legs of the intersection.

The Chair left the public hearing open.

Barbara Bisson: Unit 21. Correction in the numbers that Mr. Rizzi had for those that had no problem with this facility versus those who voted against it and the one abstention and the one that was crazy, Mr. Drouin stated he and his wife were out of town but I know for a fact their names were on the list as they didn't approve of it.

Returning to the first public hearing:

A. Request for zone boundary change, a portion of 243 and 253-255 Prospect Street from R-20/25 to R-12, ZC #540.

The applicant indicated additional folks were not present to speak.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

The Chair closed the public hearing item at this time.

6. Business Meeting

A. Request of zone boundary change, a portion of 243 and 253-255 Prospect Street from r-20/25 to R-12, ZC #540.

This item is up for action. Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve as requested. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. McRealty Dev., LLC, special permit use application for child daycare services for more than 13 clients, 2003 West Street SPU #490.1.

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

C. McRealty Dev., LLC, site plan application for 10,000 square foot daycare facility, 2003 West Street, SPR #1578.1

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

D. 8-24 referral for abandonment of remainder of ESPN Drive MR #475.

There is a map in the packet for your reference. It is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The Chair at this time seated Ms. Locks for Mr. Sinclair. *

E. Lovely Development, In., request for 90-day extension to file mylar, 17 Pavano Drive S #1288.

This would be the first extension so it's ready to go. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the extension. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

F. Burger King, request for release of \$1,300 E & S Bond, 800 Queen Street, SPR #1602.

This is ready to go. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

G. Hubeny Farms Estates, request for release of \$1,500 E & S bond, Mt. Vernon Road S #1253.

This is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

H. Sandy Ridge Estates, request for release of \$5,000 E & S bond, Amber Lane S #1235.2.

This is ready to go. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Reports have been distributed through the packet.

8. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

- Subdivision application - 59 & 77 Summitt Street
- Site Plan for 357 Captain Lewis Drive
- ZA for beer & wine sales at existing nonconforming restaurants

9. PZC SUBCOMMITTEES

- **West Street subcommittee**

Mr. Chaplinsky said there'd be no substantial discussion tonight but he did want to reinforce what the Town Planner has provided in our packet the last couple meetings.

- Initial draft regulations with respect to a proposed business overlay for the West Street Business Zone.

- Access Management Information.
Discussion.

Please review that. I'd like the Town Planner to, for the next meeting, come back and tie in specific proposed regulation change recommendations she's put together for us with the specific recommendations that the subcommittee put forth. If there is a front set back text revision being proposed, tie that into the recommendation and what the advantages of doing that is and kind of put this together for us to see as a whole.

We'd like to have a healthy dialogue and more detailed explanation from the Planner at the next meeting.

Mr. Gage brought up the access management scoring system in Bristol. Maybe we could understand a little bit more about that. Mr. Conroy explained briefly.

Mr. Conroy suggested looking at the planned development called Great Pond in Windsor.
Discussion.

The Town Planner will be asked to look at the scoring system from Bristol and Great Pond in Windsor.

Mr. Champagne brought up the YMCA and Liberty Bank. Maybe staff can work with them about the access management we talked about at the back of the Serafino parking lot.
Discussion.

The turf field looks good as far as the drainage noted the Chair.

Mr. Kalkowski stated in the packet Mary had included a copy of the text amendment for the ZBA. This is to allow the sale of beer and wine for restaurants specifically within the residential zones. We want to keep control within the ZBA which makes sense. This will be coming before us formally when Mary has this referred out and it's back from the state agencies.
Discussion.

This is not hardship oriented. Control will be in the hands of the ZBA to insure that it makes sense to allow this within a restaurant. The Town Planner will discuss further at the next meeting.
Discussion.

Mr. Kalkowski said on the temporary signs, we are very close to having a final for temporary signs. In Monday's meeting we'll be going through the feedback and we should have it all locked down and then it is up to Mary to draft the final ones and get them to you for the next meeting.

We definitely are positive about signs. We really want to focus on a couple of different type of signs: the A-frame and the wire signs you see around. We do want to limit where they can go, how long they can be up and for how many times they can be up. It has to be enforceable.

Discussion.

As far as some of the key points, we want to allow a service oriented business to have a sign in front of the location where they're conducting their business. Only one sign per location. Nonprofits, we'd like to have them, too.

As far as the A-frames, are more aligned to pedestrian traffic than they are to driving traffic. We'll ask those be in the CB zone and probably like the downtown Plantsville area. You'll see some wording around that.

Mr. Chaplinsky said we do need more meat on the bone with respect to the regulations, but one concern I heard was that our current regulations require the resources to enforce. I can't see how revising our regulations are going to lessen that. Is it just going to allow more of them to be in compliance?

Discussion.

The Chamber has approached us to talk to us and they represent a fairly significant portion of the town's businesses. Working in harmony with them --- we gave them relief in the last meeting, temporarily, until we could finalize these. Working hand in hand with the business community I think would be the best approach. Let's listen and understand their concerns and constraints. Let's put regulations we all agree on right up front.

We are business friendly and we are going to support our businesses continued Mr. Kalkowski, but we have to support the safety and look and feel of our community. It's a balance. I'll be looking for staff's guidance on enforceability and what is really going to make sense to bring forward.

Discussion.

There is probably a lack of clarity on what the regulations are and are not, added Mr. Kalkowski.

Mr. Macchio pointed out in conversations with Art and Charlie; it seems as if certain people were being picked on, so to speak. Selective enforcement. This way if the chamber can get the

information out to their members, then it won't be a problem and we won't have to worry about selective enforcement.

Discussion.

Mr. Kalkowski lastly commented on poultry and livestock regulations. Once we finish the temporary signs, we'll wrap that one up.

Mr. Conroy commented he agreed we need to stress the sign regulation as something that is enforceable. I would ask the subcommittee to ask town staff for information on the methods of enforcement. I know it is currently complaint driven. I don't think that is the way we should go. It should be something more active on the part of the enforcement. That is really kind of the key issue. Enforcement or lack thereof seems to be more of an operational thing than the regulations.

With respect to the beer and wine. I requested some information from Mary. I'd asked for a map. Mr. Kalkowski said he had the map. He'll get him to Mr. Conroy.

My other concern is can they then take that new allowance and expand and become a sports bar or a larger establishment than some of the smaller restaurants. I don't think the residents around these would be too happy about something that was once a small little eatery now becoming a bar.

Mr. Kalkowski explained when the ZBA grants permission, they grant permission for the current use and the current plan of the building. If there is any change, they always have a stipulation where they have to come back for approval from the ZBA. We are proposing this is a ZBA call.

There is a ban on alcoholic sales in residential zones noted Mr. Conroy and there is a reason for that. What is the compelling reason to change that at this point? The Chair said there are some areas in town where there are restaurants or delis that are near a church or school and they are in a residential zone.

Discussion.

The Chair said he felt the regulation was antiquated. We need to look at it and if it is doable, do it. I know Mary is working on it and the subcommittee is working on it.

10. Adjournment

Mr. Macchio made a motion to adjourn and Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 o'clock, p.m.)

