

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
November 7, 2012

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Wednesday, November 7, 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
Paul Champagne	Paul Chaplinsky
James Macchio	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Randall Gage
 Susan Locks

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mary Savage-Dunham, Town Planner
Robert Librandi, Zoning Enforcement Officer
James A. Grappone, Acting Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney

Absent: James Sinclair, Commissioner
 Jennifer Clock, Alternate
 Ryan Rogers, Alternate

The Chair advised Commissioner Champagne is on his way. We'll seat Mr. Gage for Mr. Champagne. Mr. Sinclair did not think he would make it this evening, so we'll seat Ms. Locks for Mr. Sinclair. Mr. Rogers and Ms. Clock were unable to attend tonight's meeting.

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

A. Regular meeting of October 16, 2012

Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion for approval which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Macchio did note that he was not here last time; however he did read the Minutes and watch the video.

5. Public Hearings

Mr. Librandi read the legal notice into the record for the public hearings.

The Chair advised tonight we would take the first public hearing and then go into the business meeting and vote on that application and then go back into the public hearing to move things along for the Castners.

A. Pamela A. Casner, special permit use application for parent/grandparent apartment, 99 Defashion Street (SPU #519)

Pamela Casner, 99 DeFashion Street, explained when applying to refinance the house, an appraiser came out. I've lived in the house 19 years and my mom has been with me for 17 years. When they went downstairs they followed up at town hall and said that the in law apartment was not listed at the town hall.

Everything is in place. There are no additions, nothing structurally being changed.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

No staff comments.

The Chair closed the public hearing and went into the business meeting.

* * *

A. Pamela A. Casner, special permit use application for parent/grandparent apartment, 99 DeFashion Street (SPU #519)

The Town Planner noted the application is complete as laid out for you. The required notes are on the plans and have been initialed by the applicant. The affidavit is in the file. It is ready for action and staff is supportive.

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

* * *

(Return to public hearing items)

B. McRealty Dev., LLC, special permit use application for child day care services for more than 13 clients, 2003 West Street (SPU #490.1), public hearing continued from October 16, 2012.

Attorney Andrew Denorfia with offices at 133 Main Street, Southington, CT representing the applicant. We come before you tonight for an SPU for a child day care located at 2003 West Street. Here with me tonight is Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones and our traffic engineer, Scott Hesketh.

At the first public hearing there were questions regarding the traffic so we'd like to begin with Scott's presentation and then answer any other questions.

Scott Hesketh, licensed engineer with the firm of F.A. Hesketh & Associates. We presented a traffic impact report dated October 12, 2012 and a supplemental report dated October 25, 2012 which hopefully addresses some of the concerns of the commission and staff from our previous public hearing.

(Mr. Champagne entered the meeting.)

Mr. Hesketh stated it has been our position from a traffic impact standpoint that the proposed day care center is a less intensive use than the current office/bank facility on the site and that the intersection that services the site was designed to accommodate the higher volumes of traffic.

He then reviewed the October 12th, 2012 report.

He then reviewed the supplemental report dated October 25, 2012.

He then answered specific questions by the commissioners regarding information in the reports.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones answered questions in regard to the playtime schedule. He had a copy of the schedule that he submitted for the record. What it comes down to is the children will be playing for about 1.5 hour in the morning and 1.5 hour in the afternoon. Different classrooms. There is a Make Believe Boulevard inside the building so those children, preschool 1 & 2 will be playing inside and not outside. (Submitted schedule)

Last time I submitted a floor plan and I have for submission another copy indicating where the Make Believe Boulevard is and I've highlighted the number of classrooms which I believe is 9 total for the facility. The total number of children at any given time will be a maximum of 40.

In regard to holiday events, all holiday events are held during classroom hours and are staggered on different days and times based on

class groupings. These would be for no more than two classes at a time. Holidays celebrated are: Halloween, Christmas, Hanukkah and graduation. And, graduation programs are solely for the children going on to kindergarten. The holiday programs are for the enjoyment of the children since it is difficult for working parents to attend. (Submitted copies for the record)

I would add that this building is smaller, 10,000 sf and there is more parking and less children.

The large playground and small playground were noted on the east side of the building in the rear and they are fenced in. Multiple exit doors on the facility and a sidewalk all around the facility in case of emergency to get children and employees out quick.

Attorney Denorfia stated we believe this application meets the regulations, specifically: 3-01.2F and Section 8.

Section 8 requires the proposed use and location does not have any detrimental effects on the public health, safety, welfare, property values and is part of the orderly development. Both our planner and traffic engineer have shown how the project was designed to make it safe for the children, parents, staff and neighbors.

Traffic information and testimony from Scott show that acceptable levels of service will be provided for the intersection of West Street and the Ridge View Estates driveway as well as the potential development of the parcel located to the south.

In terms of property values, last time there was a licensed realtor that submitted a report stating that the development would not have a negative impact to the neighborhood. We also had an appraiser, Daniel J. LaPorte and Associates, submit a letter regarding property values stating this would not have a negative impact on the residential property values in the neighborhood. (Read the letter into the record and then submitted the letter for the record.)

Section 8 requires that the proposal be in harmony and character with the surrounding property. As has been discussed previously, 2003 West Street was previously approved for a larger use and now the applicants are coming in front of you for a smaller building with restricted hours of 6:30 am to 6:30 pm, Monday thru Friday.

Section 8 requires the size, location and height of the structure be suitable. As has been discussed this is a smaller building of 10,000 sf where 13,000 sf was previously approved.

Section 8 requires that there are adequate emergency access and adequate streets for the use. Our traffic engineer has shown that there are adequate emergency as well as service levels are acceptable.

Section 8 requires that the lot must be acceptable. This is a 1.2 acre site. We are proposing a smaller building than previously approved.

The property must be suitably landscaped. Sev Bovino previously went through and showed how we are doing extensive buffering around the property to buffer the property from the neighbors as well as the road.

We believe this application is a good fit for the town, a good fit for the surrounding properties and will be a benefit for all involved.

Thank you.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. Just because they say "we believe" doesn't mean you have to believe it.

Discussion.

You are the first and last line of defense for this town for development. Anyone who believes that traffic in that area is suitable for a day care center right on the road, you need to go park up there any afternoon and you'll find out about the traffic.

Parking spaces for staff, they say they need 11. Per state law they have to have one teacher for every four children and that means a minimum of 13 staff.

Discussion.

As to the events they spoke about and there being no increase in traffic because everybody's working, I can tell you I went through day care for the last two years and when they have their events, they fill the entire parking lot at 11:30 am.

Discussion.

How many banks do you know of that are doing the kind of volume - 60 to 100 trips per hour - that a day care center is going to generate. They are not generating anywhere near the traffic this day care center is going to generate not only in the peak hour, but the hours on the other side.

Discussion.

Proponents tell you it is in harmony with Section 8. I tell you that this is not in harmony with the neighborhood. If the day care center goes in, it is absolutely not in harmony with the current 30-

some odd units that are in that complex and it definitely will not be in harmony with the maximum of 60 units in there. It looks down on the day care center. Go up there and stand by the first building and look. Unless they put in 100' trees to buffer it, you are not going to buffer the sight or the sounds of a full day care center Monday thru Friday.

Discussion.

I request you reject this proposal again.

Thank you.

(Rebuttal)

Attorney Denorfia explains the shifts and parking for the employees. Staff members do not work 12 hours a day and that is why there are 11 parking spots allocated.

I just want to point out that this is not a property that is residential zoned. This is business zoned. Something is eventually going to go there. We believe that the property is a better fit for the area than some of the more intensive uses. The applicant is also the developer and has multiple units to sell in the back. They're not going to do something that is going to negatively effect and hurt their ability to make sales in the back.

The plan from the very beginning was to come up with a village type feel. They think this is going to be a good fit for the area. It meets all the requirements set out in Section 8. We've had a traffic engineer come and tell you not only what the numbers said in the past but also the most recent numbers with brand new counts show. In the grand scheme of things, this is a better fit for the area in a business zoned property and it is smaller than has been previously approved.

Mr. Bovino addressed the bank issue. The proposed bank at the time was 10,000 sf. Very large. Now banks are like 25,000 to 3,000 sf. Different approach. That's why the numbers Scott Hesketh was carrying was based on a 10,000 sf bank.

Mr. Librandi read a letter into the record from Richard E. Drouin, 1985 West Street, Unit 58. (Submitted for the record.)

Discussion of the ESPN project and their traffic being included in the traffic counts.

The Chair closed this public hearing item at this time.

C. Proposed revision to Section 3-01.3 of the Zoning Regulations (ZA #568)

Ms. Savage Dunham explained the application before the commission is a proposed zone reg change to Sections 3-01.3 and the substance of that zone change was sent to you in your package. As was a copy of the South Central Connecticut Regional Planning Commission letter which I will read into the record.

Very briefly, this proposed revision is intended to eliminate the need for a nonconforming restaurant in a residential zone to obtain a variance prior to obtaining special exception approval to sell alcohol. To that end, the proposal is to add the following language:

"Section 3-01.31, the new language would be section H: The sale of wine and beer at restaurants existing on or before October 1, 2012."

That would be a special exception use in a residential zone. Currently a restaurant in a residential zone is nonconforming. Our regulations for allowing the sale of alcohol would require a variance and then the special exception approval which all places that want to sell alcohol have to go through.

We referred this application to CCCRPA and the SCCRPC. (Read letters into the record.) Letters are on file in the Town Planner's Office.

This zoning regulation change came to me through the continuous improvement subcommittee so I'll turn it over to Mr. Kalkowski to discuss it further. I have two letters from residents that needs to be entered into the record during the public hearing. (Passed around the letters.)

Steve Kalkowski stated if this does go forward after the public hearing, I am going to request the following language be added to the text:

"Provided that the said use is clearly incidental and subordinate to the principle use and located within the principle building."

This is similar language under Section 3-01.31.

For the commissioners that received the packets from Mary, we received a nice four page list of restaurants and other entities that have requested food service permits within a residential zone. Doing an analysis of this information my findings are:

- there are currently 5 existing restaurants, 3 of which are the golf courses in a residential zone that currently serve alcoholic beverages.

- There are 7 restaurants that would be potential restaurants in a residential zone that would come before the ZBA and request this if so desired.

Not every entity on this list of four pages would be what would potentially be coming before the ZBA for this particular approval.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked what does it mean if this goes through and somebody does get approval through ZBA special exception and then they sell to a new entity, does the approval transfer to the new entity or does the new entity seek approval again?

The Town Planner stated regarding liquor, the new purveyor has to come back to the ZBA. If the site were to be changed, the site would come back here for site plan, which is not a public hearing.

Discussion.

Mr. Kalkowski stated that he felt very confident with this additional language and with the control being in the ZBA's hands, that the introduction of this proposal, if we move it forward, we have the right controls to protect the citizens in a residential area. For the record, the liquor license is transferable and has nothing to do with the town. It has to do with the liquor control commission. However, the ZBA will want to see the new applicant, coming before the ZBA again, and that's the process.

Discussion.

The Chair emphasized this is **beer and wine**.

Mr. Conroy asked Mr. Kalkowski why the change? The commission has previously decided that it is not a good idea to have a restaurant in a residential zone and we don't want to have alcoholic consumption or establishments in residential zones. Why does the committee feel the need to make this change at this time and why does the committee feel the need to advocate this responsibility to the ZBA?

Mr. Kalkowski said it was taken under advisement within the committee as one of many items to be discussed. The reason why we feel so strongly about this is the businesses we are talking about, we feel are losing business and customers to competition of establishments that can have alcohol. And, we do want to be business friendly. We think these folks are at a disadvantage. They've been asking for this and we decided to take this up.

Secondly, why does it come under ZBA? That is the current regulation for this. Our regulations are very clear in Section 3-01.31. This is a natural fit and where town staff recommends that this particular text amendment goes. It makes sense.

Discussion.

The committee did discuss the pros and cons of allowing this and we felt that truly the small number of these potential restaurants, where they're located, they've been in business for years. We feel this is the right thing to do. This is our proposal. This is showing we continue to be business friendly and take away disadvantages for some businesses.

Attorney Sciota explained the difference between a special exception and a variance granted by the ZBA. The special exception means that the use is allowed in a particular zone but it has to go through a little bit higher degree of scrutiny. Under the current regulations because this is not allowed at all, alcohol in a restaurant in a residential zone, they first must vary the regulations by asking for a specific modification. That means they have to prove a hardship. With this new regulation, it would take the proving of a hardship out.

Discussion.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. After discussion, he stated that he felt the reason for this restriction is valid and he didn't believe they should be changed.

David Ryan, 24 Doe Meadow Court. I live in proximity to at least one, if not two of the businesses affected. As to the Charter, with your group, your duties and responsibilities are that this is an enforcement commission to establish and approve regulations. Secondly, you are to insure and promote public safety. Those are the two fundamental points I saw based on this Charter.

My two points are:

I am not even sure why this is in front of this board. I think its clear cut and there is no reason to look at a change to be brought through an enforcement commission.

I believe that by you even proposing this may move forward, you are moving this from a nonconforming property to a higher use property. I assume there are some limitations you'll have on zoning going forward if that is authorized.

And, if this is true the ZBA will hold the fort for us, if this is approved, I would ask you to make sure that the notes clearly document how serving alcohol in a public restaurant in a residence

(sic) does lead to your higher charter of promoting for the Town of Southington public safety. I'd like that noted on your approval to the ZBA.

The Town Planner read two letters into the record. One is from STEPS, November 7, 2012, Kelly Leppard. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.) The second is from Lucille Cusano, Jude Lane, Southington, CT. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.)

The Chair stated that because of the storm, this public hearing will be kept on until the 20th of November, 2012.

The Chair closed the public hearing portion of the meeting for tonight.

*** The Chair at this time seated Mr. Champagne. ***

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to add items, M, N & O to the Agenda. Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

6. Business Meeting

A. Pamela A. Casner, special permit use application for parent/grandparent apartment, 99 DeFashion Street (SPU #519)

Acted on earlier in the Agenda.

B. ESPN, site plan modification to revise parking lot and entry drive and construct welcome center, ESPN Drive (SPR A#1435.5)

Michael Joyce from Milone & MacBroom, professional engineer introduced the project. With me from ESPN is Biff Longfield, Director of Campus Planning.

He described under the original approval we were constructing a new campus parking lot and we were considering Phase I of the development project. We received all approvals. Two parcels still under private ownership at the time have now been acquired by ESPN. We also sought and received approval for the abandonment of ESPN Drive. Explained.

We were then able to put in motion another Phase of the Master Plan, Development Plan. We are proposing a formal building in Southington at this point. A Welcome Center. The driveway is a relocation of the old intersection for ESPN Drive. Explained.

The larger loop road project ESPN has been pursuing was discussed. The northern and southern entrances were discussed.

The building is a 5,500 sf building. It mimics the current guard house and lane arrangement at the northern entrance at Ronzo Road. This is to help control and separate some of ESPNs site traffic.

Discussion.

Where the Welcome Center is located is where the western bay of the regional parking lot was proposed. The middle parking bay was the eastern bay of the original application approved earlier. This project is an expansion of that parking facility to the east and also by shifting the alignment of ESPN Drive to the new entrance east; it allows them to expand the parking lot for building 9 to the north and west.

The original application proposed 263 parking spaces. This represents in total an additional 110 spaces.

A traffic report prepared by Bubaris Associates has been submitted. It is an amendment of a report approved by STC earlier this year when they updated their certificate for the previous parking lots. It includes all campus development onsite including the buildings referenced tonight.

This is not a proposal to add more staff or redirect traffic. Explained the report findings. Level of service remains A & B. We will be back before STC to receive our certification update.

The detention basin was designed and sized to accommodate all improvements. We received site plan and earth excavation approval. They've completed 99 percent of the basin construction and the earth excavation is completed.

Discussion.

Improvements you see on the plans at the north of the town line in Bristol were approved previously by both Southington and Bristol. This application has been referred to Bristol because of the close proximity. There are no changes to those improvements in that area.

We did receive staff comments and we feel they are minor in nature and don't require substantive changes. We'll be happy to make those.

Phasing and timing was discussed.

Landscaping and lighting plans were discussed.

Floor plans have been provided in your package. Architectural renderings have been provided for the building.

Erosion and sedimentation controls were discussed.

Mr. Grappone discussed the drainage and a couple of housekeeping items. He is correct that the basin is oversized. I did look at the previous report and there is a slight increase for the two year storm event so there is going to need to be some tweaking of the basin and the outlet control structure to meet the regulations.

Discussion.

Mr. Grappone asked if it would be served by Bristol or Southington water. Mr. Joyce said there has been some discussions about the possibility of Bristol or Southington serving this. There is an ongoing discussion about interconnection between the two agencies to help back up each other in terms of emergencies. At a minimum, this can be served from Southington's water system. There may be some slight adjustment to that as dialogue continues.

Mr. Librandi advised this is ready for action.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion for approval per the stipulations of the town engineer and the checklist. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Stipulations: There is a slight increase for the two year storm event so there is going to need to be some tweaking of the basin and the outlet control structure to meet the regulations.

There is an ongoing discussion about interconnection between the two agencies to help back up each other in terms of emergencies. At a minimum, this can be served from Southington's water system. There may be some slight adjustment to that as dialogue continues.

Checklist.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

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

Mr. Librandi read the following regulation into the record, Section 8.2.11. Special Permitted Use. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.) That is something in terms of this application you would need to look into.

Ms. Savage Dunham added in considering this, you would need to do two steps to this proposal should you choose to act tonight. As Mr. Librandi said, you would need to make a finding regarding the

compatibility. This is also a special permit, so all of the different criteria you should be looking at and considering under special permit use you should think about and discuss.

In addition, and in your packet memo, you need to make a special motion for a two third vote to accommodate more than 25 children per Section 3-01.2.F1C. (Read into the record.)

Staff feels the special permit has had three public hearings and it is in your arena now, concluded Ms. Savage Dunham.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he would like to hear from the commissioners on how they feel. He said he was satisfied with the information presented today with respect to the traffic. They did a good job of clearing up in my mind the traffic concern.

For me, the issues I'd like to talk a little bit more about are emergency access in and out of the facility. Obviously, I am interested to know what you feel about the consistency with the neighborhood and adjacent properties. We heard a concern that they are an over 55 community and this type of business is not complimentary to the purpose of an over 55 community.

Mr. Champagne said he was really concerned about the safety aspect for the children and the traffic itself. And, also for the safety of the people up the street if it is blocked. Safety concerns are my big issue on this one.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy explained he had a tough time with this one. A lot going on and a lot of different opinions. Discussed the traffic reports submitted and the revised report satisfies my concerns regarding traffic. I don't feel there are any significant safety concerns with regard to traffic.

Discussion.

My other concerns were twofold. As far as compatibility, this is actually kind of the preferred form in my vision. Explained he found it appealing.

Contrastly, the use being proposed here, a fairly large day care center, that is a bit of concern of compatibility with the adjacent housing. I would probably feel differently if it was not age restricted housing.

This is really about the noise that is generated by the kids playing outside and how it impacts the residents nearby.

Mr. Gage discussed the compatibility issue. This was approved with the business pad. Now we have a use Monday thru Friday that is a day care. At what point does it become compatible or non compatible.

The concern is here is something that seems to compatible and we are looking at age restricted housing versus children playing. Maybe that is compatible when you look at the alternatives.

(Pause, pause)

The Chair advised the motion would be to approve, deny or table.

(Pause, pause)

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to deny based on a few issues. Section 8.02.2, not in harmony or character of surrounding properties, not consistent with 8.02.6. I also don't feel that it is possible to adequately screen for those people who have expressed concern who live in the adjacent properties due to the contour of the land, Section 8.02.7. I don't think you can adequately screen that. It's not just the sound, for some people, it's sight as well. I hate to say it but some people want to live in an over 55 community because they don't want to have kids right around them. I would also cite Section 8.02.11, not compatible and consistent with the development and use of the neighborhood and adjacent properties.

Mr. Macchio seconded.

The Chair commented that when this came in, condos were approved and the two pad sites down below. I think what this application has going against it is timing. Bad timing. Economy tanked right after they started building these. If the economy was better, the condos would be built and there would be a thriving bank or other type of business below. Timing is bad. I just don't think this is the best place for a day care. When you 149 screaming kids, these folks are living in this facility because there are no kids. I have a hard time understanding and realizing how 149 kids are going to be in assemblance with an age restricted housing complex. I just don't think these two things are compatible.

There are other businesses that could come in without SPU. And, then we're looking at lights, possibly 24 hours a day. I find myself conflicted but I don't see children so close to a 55 years and up facility.

Roll Call:	Locks:	Yes
	Macchio:	Yes
	Kalkowski:	Yes
	Conroy:	Yes
	Chaplinsky:	Yes
	DelSanto:	Yes
	Champagne:	Yes

Motion to deny passes 7 to 0.

D. Mc Realty Dev., LLC, site plan application for 10,000 square foot day care facility, 2003 West Street (SPR #1578.1)

A motion to deny based upon the fact the prerequisite was denied was made by Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Proposed revision to Section 3-01.3 of the Zoning Regulations (ZA #568)

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

F. John Susco, proposed 1,500 square foot industrial building, 537 Captain Lewis Drive (SPR #1626)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones presented the application. We discussed this addition last meeting. We had a few items to address.

- Note on the plan with regard to ZIRO, the 42,253 sf of impervious area applied to both lots as a total and not individually. Note #27 under standard notes.

- The drainage calculation for roof drainage which we plan to provide underground. We provided that to staff.

- Deputy of the utilities. Actually it was a stipulation requested whereby we would have utilities coming from Captain Lewis Drive instead of the new road that is facing our lot. The applicant has a buyer for this lot. And, he does not want any additional easements on the lot. He will utilize the property at the highest use. I provided a map to the town engineer of the depth of the utilities and it shows they are 4' to the top of the sewer line. The applicant is willing to do anything that needs to be done when the cut occurs in the road to repair the road appropriately.

We are asking you to approve the site plan and also possibly reconsider the stipulation placed on the subdivision where we need to provide an easement on this property (indicating) for that building.

Ms. Savage Dunham clarified staff simply requested that the property owner provide a letter they do not have to comply with this stipulation. I do have the letter. It was signed by him and staff is satisfied with that.

Discussion.

Mr. Librandi advised this is ready for action and staff supports it.

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

G. AA Denorfia Building and Development, proposed 18 lot subdivision, 59 and 77 Summit Street (S#1292)

Stephen Giudice, represented the application. This is a 9.14 acre parcel. It's zoned R-12. Has frontage on Summit Street and a connection to Plaza Avenue.

There is an existing house at 77 Summit Street and we have an option to purchase this house.

Property is serviced by public water and sewers.

Topography is moderate to steeper slopes from the west to the east. Mostly wooded.

We have an area of wetland soils which were flagged. Explained.

Plaza Avenue ends at this location. There is no storm drainage on Plaza Avenue and most of the water runs uncontrolled into this property and runs overland which overtime has created a channel which runs to this point.

It is surrounded by residential properties on all sides except for the Falcon Club at this location on Knowles Avenue.

There is a sanitary sewer easement over the property which runs from Plaza Avenue out to Knowles Avenue (indicating).

The proposal is construct 18 residential building lots fronted on a new road called Walker Crossing. We are proposing a connection to Plaza Avenue. The lot sizes range from 12,000 sf to 28,000 sf.

He described the storm water management system.

The retention basin was discussed.

We received staff comments. We anticipate a few more in the next week or so.

We approved IW approval. We have a small impact of wetlands, 100 sf, at this location (indicated).

We are here to answer questions tonight but we will be requesting a table.

Mr. Champagne asked the size of the homes. Mr. Giudice said between 1800 to 2500 sf.

Mr. Conroy asked about the building square requirements. Ms. Savage Dunham clarified.

Lots 14 and 15 were discussed as to the conservation easement.

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

H. Request for 90 day extension to file mylar, Cocomo subdivision, South End Road (S#1290)

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

I. Request for 90 day extension to file mylar, 314 Summer Street (S#191)

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

J. Lazy Lane Industrial, request for release of \$ 4,000 E & S bond, 172 Lazy Lane (SPR #1538)

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

K. Acceptance of Rahlene Drive, 250 linear feet, pending receipt of a maintenance bond in an amount to be determined (S#986.4)

The amount of \$10,000 and the amount of roadway being accepted is 250'. Staff supports this. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

L. Adoption of 2013 Meeting Schedule.

Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion to approve which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

M. Jensens, release of \$6,900 bond in lieu of, Town Line Road (SPR #1577)

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

N. Jensens, release of \$15,300 erosion and sedimentation bond, town Line Road (SPR #1577)

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

O. Don Florian, release of \$1,700 erosion and sedimentation bond, Riverside 2, Curtis Street (S#1127.2)

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

7. Items to Schedule for Public Hearing:

A. Proposed revisions to business overlay zone text, Sections 4-04.12, 4-04.22 and 4-04.3 (ZA #567) November 20, 2012

B. Proposed revisions to business overlay zone area (ZC #541), November 20, 2012

C. Proposed new text for A-frame and temporary wire signs, Sections 13-02M and 12-13 (ZA #569), November 20, 2012

D. Kennedy Middle School renovations (SPU #520), November 20, 2012.

All scheduled.

8. Administrative Reports

None this evening.

9. Receipt of new applications

- ESPN site plan modification #SPR 1435.5.
- Prosperity Park Condo Association SPU 435.4
- Prosperity Park Condo Association SPR 1497.2
- Town of Southington SPU #520
- Town of Southington SPR 1627.

10. PZC Subcommittees

Mr. Chaplinsky noted on the West Street Subcommittee we have a public hearing for November 20th. It's on the language previously published. We'll look forward to comments.

Mr. Kalkowski stated next meeting we have the public hearing for the temporary signs. One last time we'll try to fit in before the end of the year is on poultry and livestock.

11. Adjournment

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to adjourn which Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:22 o'clock, p.m.)