

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
 Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
 November 20, 2012

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Monday, November 20, 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: Susan Locks
 Ryan Rogers

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
 Randall Gage, Alternate

The Chair seated Mr. Rogers for Mr. Sinclair. 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 tape is available for further detail.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chairman, presiding:

Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of November 7, 2012

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

Public Hearings

Mr. Librandi read the legal notice into the record.

A. Proposed revision to Business Overlay Zone text, Sections 4-04.12, 4-04.22 and 4-04.3 (ZA #567)

Ms. Savage Dunham presented the item. These are proposed revisions to the business overlay text which stem from the work of the West Street Subcommittee and the West Street Zoning Analysis. The intent is to provide clear guidance to future development along the West Street Corridor going forward. Development is guiding by the zoning map and the zoning regulations.

There is currently a business overlay zone on the West Street Corridor and that zone is guided by parameters laid out in the business overlay zone text.

This ZA #567 is proposed revisions to the text. The intent is to modify development parameters within this area in Southington to allow for greater setbacks, slightly larger lot coverage ratios, to dictate where parking and cross connections should be and to set the stage for larger retail development like a lifestyle center to apply under the SPU process.

These draft regulations are a move toward implementing the vision identified during the West Street process. For example, the greater setbacks will leave room for road widening in the future and change the look and feel of the corridor.

In guiding the parking to the side or rears of the buildings, you will allow for a different aesthetic feel along the corridor and keep the parking in the back where it can be shared between neighboring properties and this goes hand in hand with allowing slightly larger lot coverage ratios and larger buildings.

We've added incentives for shared driveways to reduce the number of curb cuts as we move toward access management. We acknowledge there is a lot of small parcels and without an assemblage we simply could not deny a developer the right to have a curb cut but we can incentivize sharing of curb cuts by allowing slightly narrower lot widths if the driveway is shared between two developments.

It is a step towards saying we prefer to have fewer curb cut to allow the thru traffic to go through and allow the business traffic easier access to the developing commercial properties.

A copy of the proposed regulations were provided to you in the packet. I would state for the record I did receive back from the SCCRPA dated November 9th (read into the town). Letter on file in the Town Planner's office. She also read a letter from CCRPA into the record. Letter on file in the Town Planner's office.

Mr. Chaplinsky added this is the first baby step we plan to take towards the West Street rezoning. A lot of activity and public input sessions have taken place. This is not the be all, end all. We will have further revisions based on what we hear today and work to be

done. More opportunities will be available to come out and talk in the future, as well.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

Monica Cusano, 90 Welch Road. I want to make it clear and make sure it is on record as you are overlaying it on a third of my property, I want to make sure --- I have no objection if this is just an overlay and the property can still be used as an R-40. The Chair explained that is correct. It is not a change, it's an overlay.

Discussion.

Ms. Cusano said she had no objection to the overlay as long as it still stays the R-40 zone. I understand what you're trying to do. I want my land still be used as an R-40 zone. The Chair said that was right.

Ron Tooley, 1570 West Street. I don't understand the map I got in the mail. I don't understand what you are trying to do, except you've ruined my whole street with your progression of making it into another Queen Street.

Discussion.

Spoke about the difficulty of getting out of his driveway.

Discussion.

You haven't sent me about a letter about the building going on in the area; i.e. Florian property.

Discussion.

It's worse than Queen Street. You keep adding stoplights and traffic to the road and it is unbearable now. I'm dead set against it.

I want to make sure my property is safe.

Nelson Merrill, my family owns the Highland Golfing Range. We have not had time to examine the proposed changes and we would like to have the public hearing tabled so we can investigate the legal ramifications of what you are doing.

We object to the change. This disallows restaurants that are able to serve alcohol. Your economic development officer suggested we seek an interview with the reps of Lincoln College to develop dormitory type housing on our property and it conflicts with that. It eliminates a number of possibilities for development which are afforded under the current zoning. We feel it is punitive in that respect.

The Town Planner stated under the text change, I can tell you on the second page you do see under "P" there is a comment about restaurants and eating establishments and it does say not selling alcoholic beverages. If you felt there should be alcoholic beverages in this zone, you can take that language out.

Discussion.

There is section S which says other uses which in the opinion of the commission are in the same general character as those permitted and would not cause a detrimental impact.

Discussion.

The Town Planner advised this item is ready for action should you choose to.

Discussion on the dates of notification and who was notified.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

B. Proposed revisions to Business Overlay Zone area (ZC #541) - West Street.

Ms. Savage Dunham introduced the application. Another element is the commission has to guide you in your development zoning regulations and a zoning map. The map visually shows where regulations are applied. The Town of Southington has an existing business overlay zone currently. That map was provided to the commission in your packet and it was mailed to all the affected property owners and it is posted online and it's in the Town Clerk and Town Planner's office.

You'll see that pursuant to the West Street process, the determination was to move towards a West Street business zone. The intent was not necessarily wiping out the existing underlying zoning and deny people their existing rights, but to add other opportunities for development moving forward.

There was an existing business overlay zone. The boundaries were smaller than the proposed business overlay zone but it was in approximately the same area. The map shows the existing business overlay zone and it fairly narrow in width. Explained.

The proposed business overlay zone does include some properties that were not currently involved, i.e.: driving range. It was in the current business overlay district and it is in the proposed overlay district. But the proposed district does extend to new properties north of the driving range to the north of West Queen Street and it also involves some new property to the south of the driving range. It goes further away from West Street and it does extend closer down to Spring Street. Almost to the new motel that is going in.

Discussion.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Bob Porzio, owner of the property at the corner of West Street and West Queen Street. Conceptually, I have no problem with the change. I don't think it's bad for the area. I want to know how it would affect my property and I am understanding it will not affect me adversely, so I wanted to state that for the record.

For my neighbor who owns the driving range, I am sympathetic to his statement about not having a liquor license. I find that a burden to him. As a good neighbor I thought I'd mention it.

(Those speaking against the application)

Nelson Merrill, on behalf of the Merrill Family, owners of the Highland Driving Range. I object to this and I'm against the second part of this application.

He spoke about the notification process. We got very short notice and have no understanding of what this means. I wonder if it is appropriate to vote on something where the affected people just got notice of what you are voting on.

The company that presented a report to the commission had our property listed as a change to a commercial zone. This is a different situation. I understand it is modification that is different than the proposal from the consultant. In many ways we will be impacted by this.

The current zone allows us to build ½ acre when the underlying zone is one acre zoning. Discussion.

The language of this business overlay zone does not allow ½ acre zoning. In addition to the other restrictions this imposes on us.

(Staff Comment)

The Town Planner read into the record a comment from Joseph Kelpacki who came to her office on November 14, 2012. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.)

The Chair closed the public hearing.

C. Proposed new text for A-frame and temporary wire signs, Section 13-02 and 13-14 (Z #569)

The Town Planner said this application comes out of work of the continuous improvement subcommittee and the proposal has been referred out. The intent of this is to allow some temporary signage for businesses in the form of A-frame and wire signs. Currently, temporary signs are not allowed by our regulations. I did send you in

your packet the proposed language. It is on the website, in the Town Clerk's Office and the Planner's office.

This was referred out and I did get a letter back from SCCRPA dated November 9, 2012. Letter read into the record. (Letter on file in the Planner's Office.)

Mr. Kalkowski, the subcommittee chairperson, presented. The proposal is for two types of signs: A wire frame sign which is really for our service oriented businesses, roofers, painters, et cetera. Also for nonprofits.

- One sign per location of where the work is being performed.
- You can display it up to 30 days prior and it needs to come down 24 hours after for nonprofits. For the services it can go up 24 hours when the service starts and it needs to be taken down 24 hours after the service ends.
- Only be displayed on private property with the permission of the property owner.
- No illumination.
- It cannot be in the right of way of the roadway or obstruction the traffic or sight lines.
- Must be 12' from the property lines.
- Must be registered with the zoning enforcement officer prior to displaying the signs.

As to A-frame signs:

- Allowed with the Renaissance zone and the Plantsville Center.
- Allowed between April and December during the good weather periods.
- One sign per business.
- It must be located at the business location.
- Sign must be registered with our zoning enforcement officer.
- Must be taken in at night.
- Must be displayed perpendicular to the sidewalk and cannot be in the road right of way.
- Must be at least 4' unobstructed walkway.

- We are proposing a fine structure I'll discuss later.
- No illumination.
- Cannot obstruct sight lines or sidewalk traffic.

We will be working with the ordinance subcommittee. We are going to be producing a fine structure for noncompliance with these regulations.

Attorney Sciota stated there is a description for the Renaissance Zone, but he would like the town engineer to give a description for the Plantsville Center zone.

Mr. Grappone advised a map will be prepared. Basically it's to the south at the intersection with Buckland and Route 10 going at the easterly end of the firehouse, westerly to Maple and Grove. Encompassing that area.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Art Secondo, 1048-28 South Main Street Plantsville, president of the Southington Chamber of Commerce.

I thank you all for listening to us on this proposal. We have a cooperation and partnership with the town. We have a central business alliance committee that oversees the districts of Plantsville and Southington which looked over your proposal for regulations. Our spokesman for that is Al Monbaron. He has a couple of concerns, that's all.

Mary, I wish you the best. And, Rob, no matter what happens with the regulations, good luck!

Al Monbaron, Wolcott Street, Southington. He was handed the updated regulations.

In regards to the temporary A-frame signage, we do have some comments and questions from the chamber members. A few months back when the temporary time was given for allowing A-frame signs, they were allowed across town. In the new proposal, they are only allowed in the Renaissance District and Plantsville Center. Any chance of having that expanded to all businesses in town?

The signs are allowed between April 1st and December 31st. We have concerns with not being able to put A-frame signs out in the wintertime. Wintertime tends to be a slower time for businesses. I know the thought was having the sign out with snow removal could present some problems, in light of the fact that the owners are required to bring the signs in each night, do we really need to limit the time frame on that?

The other comment is where it says one sign per business. There are some businesses that have multiple properties, i.e.: the YMCA.

Only being able to have one sign, would any consideration be given to be able to have multiple signs if you own multiple properties?

And, the fine situations is still be fleshed out.

We thank you for your hard work.

Mary, best of luck!

Art Secondo explained the chamber will work with Rob. We will have the power to contact our 600 members through our mailing and notify as many people as possible of the fact they will have to register. I want to make sure we get the word out.

(Those speaking against the application)

Steve Giudice, I'm not in favor or opposed, but I did hear that the signs couldn't be within the right of way, is that for signs, the wire signs and A-frames? I would point out that in your downtown areas most of the buildings are up to the right of way. That would mean all the buildings on Center Street would not be permitted to have the signs. The right of way is basically a foot off the building. You might want to consider that.

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. We do as a town want to be business friendly, but at some point you have to draw the line and ask whether we want to have a classier town or whether we want to have the Berlin Turnpike and New Britain and Meriden. You have to say no somewhere along the line. Look at what has happened in this town in the last couple of years with signs.

Discussion.

Even though we have regs that say you can't have signs that wave, drive by Dunkin' Donuts up on Queen Street. All kinds of wavy signs and gizmos.

The current reg is no A-frame signs. That should stay that way on Meriden Waterbury Road and West Street and Queen Street, but it should also be for the downtown district. An A-frame sign, can you really see them in-between all the outdoor dining down there? Is it a real necessity?

Discussion.

What do we want for this town in the long run? A classier town or do we want a town where we let businesses put up all kinds of signs on the outside of their buildings, A-frames, wire signs and everything else. We have to draw the line and that's up to you guys. Make the hard decisions.

The Chair closed the public hearing on this item.

**D. Kennedy Middle School renovations and expansion (SPU #520)
1071 South Main Street**

Angela Cayhill, Architect with Fletcher Thompson, project manager for the Kennedy School project.

I'd like to say that this evening it is in our best interest to just review the SPU application. I understand under your Business Agenda you have the site plan approvals listed for Kennedy & DePaolo Schools and we would ask those be tabled until your January 3rd meeting. We are currently working with the building committee on potential changes finalization. We will update the applications if any changes are made.

For the SPU for Kennedy, we have a presentation showing a location of the school additions and the basic layout of site plan and we are adding approximately 30,000 sf to the building in two locations. Those will be reviewed with you as well as the use and the site plan.

Barry Blades, licensed landscape architect with Blades & Goven. I will be presenting the site plan.

He showed the survey and it shows the 12.5 acre parcel that exists with the school as well as the 1.1 acre parcel that is being added to the school property.

Discussion.

He gave a brief description of the site plan. He pointed out the existing school and additions proposed.

The vehicular traffic pattern was discussed.

Staff parking area was pointed out.

The back of the school is dedicated for recreational use. Explained how this plan will be eventually changed.

The land being acquired will be used for the staff parking lot and it will remain as is.

The level of buffering between the residential area on this new parcel was discussed. Staff is fairly satisfied. It is similar to what was proposed and installed at Plantsville School. Should you feel that there may be a need for more landscaping you can stipulate that at the time of final inspection it could be asked to be supplemented. However, if you feel there should be more, under SPU is the time to make modifications or conditions related to screening and screening of adjacent residential properties is very important.

Discussion.

Mr. Blades what is proposed for the screening. Dark American Arborvitae planted 6' on center continuous from the front of the site to the corner and then back along this boundary (indicated).

Discussion.

Mr. Champagne asked about the lighting for the staff parking lot. Ms. Cayhill stated the site lighting will be full cut off in compliance with the regulations. Mr. Conroy asked if they would be shielded on the residential side and Ms. Cayhill said yes.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking in opposition to the application)

Greg Curran, 48 Werking Street. Indicated his property. He talked about the arborvitaes in place on the north side of the baseball field and going northerly up. I don't think that would be sufficient. Staff parking is going to be there. In the fall and winter there is men's basketball league and headlights shining. Light pollution.

At the building committee meeting we asked about fencing.

And, what is the buffer between asphalt and my property? Is it 5' or 20' in the regulation?

He spoke about the three curb cuts on Main Street. Spoke about the traffic when school gets out. Are there plans for a light which may affect us at Werking Street?

Suzanne Berfume, 31 Milldale Avenue. She asked about the smaller staff parking lot off Milldale Avenue. Currently there is an exit and entrance. On the new plan, it says the student pick up is on the north side but I'm wondering if parents would be allowed to go in and out there. Spoke about the queueing of cars idling when school gets out. Is that going to be allowed with the new plan?

What will be the calendar time frame for beginning to end of construction?

What will be the times of day of construction? For noise and dust?

Suzie Cresenberry, 38 Werking Street. My concern is more with the buffering issue. I don't think the arborvitaes are going to give us the privacy we have enjoyed up to this point. I'd like to see some sort of a privacy fence put up. You are going to come fairly close to the back end of my property.

Light pollution from the teachers parking area was discussed as taking away from her privacy. That's a concern.

I'd like to see something a little more substantial.

My other concern is what kind of fencing is going to be put up while construction is going on?

For my property, I have an invisible fence that lines my property for my dog. I'm curious how we'll make sure that that doesn't get affected. The Chair assured her they would not go on her property.

I have the same concerns as Greg but would like to know from the end of my property, how close they'll come with the parking lot itself.

Brenda Bunnelle, 1025 South Main Street. Why are we still continuing with the planning & zoning when there is a possibility this may have to go back to referendum because of the cost over budget right now that they haven't settled.

How close is that driveway going to be to the property next door to mine? The egress. Like Greg said, mornings and afternoons, you've got a million cars going in and out. Pulling of Werking Street is touch and go sometimes. I don't even think a traffic light would solve the situation. This is supposed to alleviate traffic but I think it is going to create more headaches. I am really against this driveway design. I don't think you will solve the problem of the South Main Street traffic. You're going to increase it.

Chris Todd, 1033 South Main Street. Most of the questions have been asked. I am curious about a fence along the property line. The corner of my house is maybe 10' from the property line. The closest to it is the bathroom (indicating). Is it going to be a chain link fence?

Spoke about the dumpster location. He spoke about the loudness when they get emptied very early in the morning now. It's going to be louder when the trees are gone. Even bigger problem than it is now.
Discussion.

I'm curious about the hedgerow in the front of my property and if that entrance moves closer to the corner, I'm assuming someone will tell me my hedges have to be ripped up because of the sightline.

And, also the grade changes. My water comes down and flows into that property now that is several feet lower. Is that going to be filled? Will there be drainage allotment for the water coming up? Will it create some sort of problem?

Phil Lousier, 38 Werking Street. Where are the dumpsters going to be? And, what are you going to put up so people aren't going on to

my property like a thruway - kids and parents walking through. There is a fence there now.

Discussion.

Steve Fortin, 16 Werking Street. I am one of the closest, about 125'. My main concern is fairly happy --- when you are fairly happy with budget constraints --- cuts corners at some point.

We have the parking lot right against the fence. My house is about 20' from the fence. My issue is if you have any more issues with the budget, where are you going to cut? Landscaping? Are you going to cut there? That's the first thing they cut. Baseball fields, landscaping, aesthetics. Those are the first things to go. I'm concerned once you don't have any more money, what's going to go then? Will we pay the price? Dumpsters - can they come at 5:00 at night rather than 5:15 am. Common sense stuff.

Discussion.

Greg Curran, 48 Werking Street. Spoke about the arborvitaes. As it is now, the people that take care of the property are supposed to clean between the arborvitaes, et cetera. It's been at least two years since they've cut anything. The arborvitaes are starting to be choked out by weeds.

The BOE is supposed to take care of it. Call Fred Cox. Attorney Sciota said he would call Fred Cox.

It'd be nice if the backstop could be extended on the ball field.
Discussion.

Suzanne Befume, 31 Milldale Avenue. There's a lot of talk about fencing. Are they going to rip out existing fencing around the property?

(Rebuttal)

Barry Blades answered some questions.

Questions:

Light pollution, any plans for an opaque fence or shielding from headlights. Mr. Blades responded not at this time. The BOE administration would like to utilize the vegetative buffer. The opaque fencing is a maintenance problem. Graffiti is primarily the problem.

Discussion.

Everyone is concerned about the amount of buffering. Mr. Blades passed out a photo at the back of the site and show how the arborvitaes have grown up in the area.

Discussion.

The three different curb cuts were discussed. A traffic engineer is doing a study. That has to go through the DOT approval process. There will be no traffic light out there. It'll be thoroughly reviewed at the state level and part of the application for the site plan review.

Discussion.

Ms. Cayhill pointed out the idea of having a traffic engineer is to make the site safer as well as to allow for the expected traffic. Traffic counts have been done and they've calculated existing conditions and future conditions. There is no planned light along that road. We'll share that with you.

Mr. Conroy brought up the three different driveways. Can you explain the reason why for the split entrance? He offered an alternative for consideration. Mr. Blades felt the one way circulation on the site in a loop pattern is always the safest configuration. To have a left and right turn there is problematic and difficult to achieve. We like the separation having a one way in and one way out. We feel it's the best, concluded Mr. Blades.

Discussion.

The south entrance on Milldale Avenue --- is there going to be pick up and drop off at that location? Mr. Blades said there would be some amount of drop off in that location. It exists now. That is also the location for the special ed buses.

Discussion.

The current fence in place is not planned to be removed. If fence is taken down, it will be replaced. No lapse in fencing. The entire site will be fenced.

Time frame for construction: Ms. Cayhill said the project would be bid in the spring and we anticipate construction to start immediately after the students get out for next summer - June, 2013. Different completion dates are being looked at depending how long it will take to remove the hazardous materials. Originally, completion was scheduled for August, 2015. We might need to extend that. I don't have a definite date.

Your regulations for work times and noise will be reviewed. We'll look at traffic routes for the trucks and also plans for soil mitigation and protection of the surrounding area will be analyzed and we'll work with all the local agencies to comply concluded Ms. Cayhill. We will work to make sure all sites are clean and kept safe.

The construction manager is familiar with educational projects. We work closely with the fire marshal, building official, zoning and engineering to be sure all construction workers, materials, equipment, heavy machinery is separate from students and residents and kept safe. We will have a series of phasing plans to show the logistics of jobs

trailers and stockpiling will be and where machinery will coming and out of. All subject to approval by the local authorities.

Discussion of the progression of this project. Safety is always number one when it comes to the children. Timing is done through the ordinance. Safety and phasing is all done and approved by the state and building committee.

Ms. Savage Dunham noted under site plan regulations; you are required to address screening of parking areas.

How far away you have to stay from a resident's property? Mr. Blades said the current plan; the distance from the curb line along the northern boundary to the property line is about 14' to 15'. I reviewed the regs today and it would appear that needs to be a minimum of 20' (property line to curb line) and we'll be revising that at final site plan time.

The location of dumpsters is reviewed at site plan. We'll check with Mr. Cox as to the pick-up time, added Attorney Sciota. The health department will be concerned with this, as well.

The north egress is going to be about 20' from the property line to the curb plus the 18' depth of the parking space, so 38' from the northern edge of the curb line to the property line.

As to drainage, if the properties to the north are draining to the south on to our property, we will be accommodating that added Mr. Blades. No obstructions placed. We are not raising elevations to pond water or anything like that.

Ms. Savage Dunham read a letter into the record dated November 20th, 2012 from Mark Salus. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.)

Hearing no further comments, the Chair closed this public hearing.

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

This is a continued public hearing. The Town Planner read two letters into the record which she passed around to the commission. Both are on file in the Town Planner's office.

- Letter dated November 19, 2012 from the owners of 36 Welch Road. Eric and Kelly Carrier.

- Letter dated November 16, 2012 from the owner of 269 Berlin Street. John Morelli.

For the record, for the commission this was continued from the last public hearing and the proposal is to change the regulations to alcohol to be served at an existing nonconforming restaurant within a residential zone.

Mr. Kalkowski, subcommittee chairperson, reiterated the change to the text Mary had included in our packet:

- the sale of wine and beer at restaurants existing on or before October 1, 2012 provided that the said use is clearly incidental and subordinate to principle use and located within the principle building.

He also handed around a list of proposed restaurants narrowed down to be about 8 properties that would be potential candidates for wanting to move forward with this if desired. Explained there are really one three locations that were found. I have pulled the GIS mapping for each and highlighted the location.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated that the proposed text change is to remove the need for a variance in a residential zone for a business that is existing today --- a restaurant existing today --- and wants to serve beer and wine. If this goes forward, this does not give those businesses automatic approval to serve beer and wine. This allows the businesses to go before the ZBA and gives complete authority to the ZBA to make special exceptions to these eight businesses as they see fit.

Mr. Kalkowski explained the ZBA procedure, being a former member.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

Cheryl Lounsbury, 175 Berlin Avenue. I speak in favor of this and the reason is twofold: one, we have really tied in Southington to encourage economic development and it worked for us. That helps us keep our tax base low for residential and commercial.

Secondly, times have changed. The Blue Laws are no longer in existence. We have the ability to get liquor almost 7 days a week.
Discussion.

With that in mind, Southington has an ordinance that allows businesses, if the proprietor wishes, to allow their patrons to bring in beer or wine on their own. That's been passed recently.

Discussion.

I don't see any reason why we should hinder the proprietor for this small business. I'm a neighbor. I'm a member of the church right near that business. This is a family restaurant that I would hate to see go out of business or I'd hate to see us lose these businesses in Southington. That is what makes us a town --- the

family and locally owned restaurants. I would like us to support them.

Personally, I am in favor. She read two letters into the record.

- A letter from Kathy Kirland who lives next door to Family Pizza (on file in the Town Planner's Office).

- A petition taken with the patrons of Family Pizza. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.)

John Cistulli, 473 Hobart Street, Southington. He spoke in favor of the change. He's been a restaurant patron for about 10 to 12 years. It would be good for the town and help a business improve itself a little bit.

Discussion.

Joe LaPorte, 30 Prosperity Court. I'm in favor of this regulation change. The impact on the citizens of Southington is minimal or nonexistent. There's only a few that could be affected. Times have changed. That it has to go back to the ZBA if there is a change is protection for the existing property owners around there or other concerned citizen. It's a good change and I would like to see it go through.

Discussion.

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. Spoke in favor of the regulation change. This is good for business. This is not their main business. The times are changing. This would help small business. This is a good thing we can do for a good establishment. I approve this.

William Barnes, 73 Oakland Road. Given the constraints for this regulation, I think this is a very good idea, also. Not only for the business but for the patrons of the establishment. For the patrons it would be a convenience and we would enjoy having beer and/or wine to enjoy with pizza.

Greg Curran, 48 Werking Street. I feel it would be a good thing. You can right now bring beer and wine into an establishment. What's the difference if you let the guy make a couple of dollars on the beer and wine. I also think liabilitywise, it would help out that owner. If you bring in the beer and wine, how is he going to tell you to stop drinking it? If you give him the ability to serve, he can cut you off. Keep that safer, too.

Deborah Ford, 109 Highwood Avenue. The speaker before just made my point about the liability. This is a very responsible family restaurant and many of us in the neighborhood enjoy going there. It would be very nice to relax with wine with your meal and not have to bring that in. I think he stated the liability point very well so I won't restate it.

(Those speaking against the application)

David Ryan, 24 Doe Meadow Court. I want to reframe the discussion. I'm hearing passionate people who are proponents for this but you have two main charters: You are an enforcement agency. I question why this is being brought up. Why is this of value to the town and why is it before this board? It doesn't feel like a commission that is enforcing anything as far as I am concerned.

The second part is public safety. If this gets approved I would be most interested in reading on public record how this furthers public safety. This is not an economic development issue. This is a zoning issue. These are nonconforming properties that are not under hardship. If you go forward with the proceeding of approving this, you are raising the standard on the zoning and I'm not sure what that means. It is a nonconforming property for a reason.

Discussion of businesses on the list prepared by Mr. Kalkowski.

The Chair closed the public hearing item on this matter.

6. Business Meeting

A. Proposed revision to Business Overlay Zone text, Sections 4-04.12, 4-04.22 and 4-04.3 (ZA #567)

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

B. Proposed revisions to Business Overlay Zone area (ZC #541) - West Street.

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

C. Proposed new text for A-frame and temporary wire signs, Sections 13-02M and 13-14 (ZA #569)

Mr. Kalkowski went back to some questions that were asked during the public hearing to answer.

- The first one was regarding the A-Frame signs and changing the location of those to the Renaissance zone and Plantsville. The thought around that is the purpose of A-frame signs is really where high foot traffic is involved; i.e.: downtown business zone, CB zone and Plantsville Center. That's why the decision to limit the locations for A-frame signs.

- The second one was why do we want to limit the A-frame signs between April and December 31st when we are asking them to be

brought in on a nightly basis. Quite honestly, I'd like input from the other commissioners around that. We're open to making any changes that are for the better.

- The third one was what if a business such as the Y has multiple locations. Currently, as written, there can only be one sign for that business regardless of multiple locations. I'd like to hear comments from the commission before voting.

Attorney Sciota noted on item E, there should be a period after sidewalk. Most of the buildings do abut.

The Chair commented as far as the time, I don't see why we can't have A-frame signs out year round. It could be 55 on November 20th as it was today. Or 3 feet of snow on the ground. I think we could change that.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said as long as they take them in at night he was okay with it. But also, we should amend it to say also take them in during snow events. This is for A-frame signs, only. No issue with year round on this one.

Mr. Conroy said as far as enforcement, there should be some mechanism for if they're not taken in. We don't want to burden snow removal and the safety of the operation dealing with the signs. Some mechanism beyond a fine.

Discussion.

The one sign per business, like the Y, they have the daycare center, they Y and Sloper. Three different property sites.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy we should probably say one per property and properties with multiple businesses can only have one per business.

Should A-frames be allowed all over instead of just the CB zone, Plantsville Center or Renaissance Center?

Mr. Conroy discussed the moratorium currently on signs and the effects on the zones. Mr. Librandi said it did expand to the business zone and they have had more than one A-frame sign for some businesses.

Discussion.

A-frame signs are pedestrian oriented signs was the topic of discussion by the commissioners.

Mr. Champagne noted that one thing not regulated right now is the size of the sign for an A-frame. After discussion it was decided the size of an A-frame sign should be 24 by 48 inches.

A consensus is that they should remain the CB zone, the Renaissance area and downtown Plantsville, 2 foot by 4 foot in size.

Mr. Kalkowski summarized the proposed changes to the text for A-frame signs:

- Item A. Remove the April to December limitation.
- Item B. One sign per property. Where there are multiple businesses on the same parcel, each business could have one.
- Item D. The sign must be taken in at night or during storm events.
- Item E. Remove the wording "cannot be in the road right of way".
- Add J: The 24 x 48 inches for the size.

Text changes for wire frame signs:

Mr. Conroy noted these things are a pain in the neck and a nuisance. I would probably say we should maintain the ban. I think we should keep the time limit on these only because there are so many more of them and if we get snow they'll end up in the street. I would change it to November 15th for the service signs.

Discussion.

For the charity events, there aren't as many of those and they are better picked up than the service signs.

Enforcement is an issue.

It was decided after discussion to take the dates out entirely.

Mr. Secondo approached the podium and stated that this isn't going to help businesses. Ninety-five percent of the A-frame signs are outside of these zones. You're saying illegal. The reason we came up to fight for our members was for places like Café DelMondo, the glass place, Firestone, members who feel the signs are important to their business.

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

**** Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to add the following items to the Agenda:

M. Thomas C. Downey and Rebecca Romajas, request for first 90-day extension to file mylar, 590 West Street S#1289.

N. Ace Building and Design, reduction of maintenance bond for Honey Lane in the amount of \$47,000 to \$10,000 to cover maintenance bond for Raylene Drive, S#986.4.

Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote. ****

**D. Kennedy Middle School renovations and expansion (SPU #520)
1071 South Main Street**

Ready for action. There has been discussion about screening. Screening is looked at in more depth during the site plan process. The building committee and building and grounds at the BOE has specific parameters with regard to screening. You will look at it again more closely under site plan. The applicant has heard the concerns tonight and will take them back.

Mr. Conroy noted that this school differs quite a bit from DePaulo not being surrounded by residential homes. True of a lot of our schools. I think it is important we document as part of the SPU process that for those areas bordering the residential areas, especially the one where we are now encroaching closer to those homes, I think we should attach a condition that there should be effective access and visual screening for these parcels to the satisfaction of the staff and commission.

Stipulation proposed: For those parts of the property bordering residential uses, provide adequate access and visual screening to the satisfaction of staff and commission.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to approve SPU #520 with the stipulation recommended. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

**E. Kennedy Middle School renovations and expansion (SPR #1627)
1071 South Main Street**

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

F. Request for location approval: Auto Repair Facility, 89 Birch Street (SPR #1628)

Mark Vigenault, 1594 Flanders Road represented the applicant. He is also the property owner. This is for a request for location approval for an auto repair facility on 89 Birch Street. It is an I-2 property bounded by I-2 property and the railroad. The location of this property was once currently approved in 1984 for Bergenty Motorworks on a site plan approved in 1984.

The applicant needs zoning approval to get their license for auto repair and Mr. Cilletti(sp) has had a license in Southington on 1209 Queen Street in 2011 with no incidents.

Staff supports this. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. DePaulo Middle School renovations and expansion (SPR #1553.1) 385 Pleasant Street

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

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

Application is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky asked the Town Attorney to speak about expansion of the beer and wine to a larger use, ie: bar without coming back to ZBA for approval.

Attorney Sciota explained the liquor commission will take into account the local municipalities wants and wishes, but the ultimate authority is always with the liquor control. Where liquor takes place is based on the municipality. How the liquor is dispersed and what type of liquor license would be the liquor control commission. That's been stated on numerous occasions to us and that's how it works.
Discussion.

Transfer of the permit ownership would require going back to the ZBA for a new approval. They have to also go to the police, fire, et cetera for sign off.

Questions and answers by the commission regarding the change in language and ramifications.

Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve. Mr. Champagne seconded. Motion passed 5 to 2 with Mr. Chaplinsky and Mr. Conroy opposed.

Effective 15 days from the date of publication.

I. AA Denorfia Building and Development, proposed 18 lot subdivision, 59 & 77 Summit Street S #1292.

The Chair announced there have been lots of emails received in the last couple of days. I want you to know we've received them and read them and took them into consideration. The lion's share of the concerns had to do with the approval of the IW Commission. That is not this board. And, we do not question why other boards vote the way they do. Lots asked for this to go to public hearing so they can talk about their issues. I imagine the lion's share of the issues

have to do with the IW decision to approve this application. We're not going to entertain that.

In lieu of a public hearing, I'll allow the applicant and the agent to go forward with their presentation. We'll ask questions of the applicant and staff. Then, I will allow folks here tonight to come up and speak - two minutes - on their concerns. Those issues will not center around the IW Commission's approval on this application. If we start going there, I'll have to shut you down.

A concern or question with regard to the IW Commission's decision to approve this application, I recommend you take it up with them and their agents.

No public hearing on this issue as this is not an SPU application.

Stephen Giudice, presented on behalf of the applicant. You've heard me present this twice already. I'll go through what we are proposing and modifications made to the plan and give an overview of where we've been and what's happened and where we're going.

This property is a 9.14 acre parcel and its part of 59 Summit Street and we have a small piece of property from 77 Summit being added to the proposed roadway. It's zoned R-12 and fronts on Summit Street and the end of Plaza Avenue.

It's serviced by public water and public sewers. We have moderate to steeper slopes in topography which slopes from the west to the east. We have an area of wetland (indicated). And, we have runoff from Plaza Avenue that comes through the site which has created a channel, an eroded area, through this area but then discharges to the south over private property towards the drainage system on Knowles Avenue.

We believe these wetlands is created by the runoff from Plaza Avenue. However, it is currently supplied by groundwater due to the erosion.

The site is mostly wooded at the moment. And, the property is pretty much surrounded by residential property with the exception of the Falcon's Club.

There is an existing sanitary sewer main that runs through the property from Plaza Avenue. The Carbone Family had deeded the town an easement in the past and this sewer easement runs through to Knowles Avenue at this location (indicating).

Our proposal is to construct 18 residential building lots along with a road. The new road will be named Walker's Crossing and it would start at Summit Street and end with a permanent cul de sac. We would have a tie in to Plaza Avenue.

All lots would front on the new road. The lot sizes range from 12,000 sf to 28,000 sf. All houses served by public water and sewer.

We are proposing a storm water collection system throughout the site. Our proposal is to install a drainage system that collects water from our new road and also from Plaza Avenue and brings this down to a detention basin located behind the Falcon's Club.

We have proposed a storm drain line to collect water from abutting properties. We know the properties have drainage that goes through our property and goes out in this direction so our design does include a storm drainage system to collect water off site and bring it into our detention system.

The design of the detention basin is in accordance with the regulations. We have achieved ZIRO for the 2, 10, 25 year storms as per the regulations and it is also designed to accommodate the 100 year flow through the spillway.

The detention basin, storm drainage system, sanitary sewers and water all connect through the Falcon Club on Knowles Avenue. We have a looping system with the water line. The upper homes would tie into the sanitary sewer lines and run to this main (indicating) and the lower homes would tie into a separate sanitary line that runs out to Knowles Avenue. The storm drainage ultimately would discharge into the storm drainage system on Knowles Avenue, as well.

We have received comments from the town planner. We've provided revised plans and a letter addressing those concerns and we've received comments from the town engineer and we've met him as well to address some of his concerns and we are in the process of revising those plans now.

The major changes we made based on the town engineer's comments was to shorten the road up slightly, we moved the cul de sac approximately 25' to the west and pulled the houses a little further off the property line away from this pond off site. We have some minor grading changes and we lowered the cul de sac a little bit and made modifications. We are still making revisions. Tonight we will be requesting a table.

Discussed the minimum square on lot 14. The minimum square will be revised to be outside of the conservation easement.

I'll answer your questions.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked staff to talk about the investigation that the IW board did and what their perspective is. I'd like to know about the drainage on the property. How do you feel about the proposal, the wetland, as mentioned goes from Plaza and drains southeast and how the plan will impact the surrounding areas.

Mr. Grappone responded he is not as concerned about the wetlands area because the roadway will choke off the drainage pattern that ran from north to south. The runoff will be brought into the detention system.

I did have a concern about lots 9 & 10. The roadway will be shortened. The plan previously showed runoff going to the east because the roof areas and the impervious pavement areas were draining away from the cul de sac. That is going to be changed under the new plan and now it will be directed to the proposed detention basin to further reduce the increase in runoff.

Also mentioned is the spillway has to be designed for the 100 year storm event. I walked the site at the Falcon Club and there is no formal watercourse or channel beyond leading to the drainage system. That is a bit of a concern to me. There is going to be a plan revision so that if anything leaves the emergency spillway, that will be directed to the wetland area. That's the current drainage patten and I do not see anything downstream, causing any property damage currently. So if the runoff is matched, there shouldn't be any impacts downstream in that system.

I think we can work through the drainage. It seems like there will be plan revisions. I haven't seen them yet. There will be a revised drainage report.

Mr. Conroy had drainage concerns and flooding on the abutting properties. However, has anybody investigated what is causing the flooding in this area? I recall some issue with the town's drainage system that was being looked into. Is the flooding a result of groundwater or is it runoff or is it failure the town's infrastructure that is not handling it? Almost the emails were talking about flooded basements and things like that.

Mr. Giudice said you have to consider the Quinnipiac River is parallel to Summer Street. Many of the homes on Summer Street are within the flood zone or very close to it at ground level.

The new homes proposed are much elevated.
Discussion.

Site drainage was explained by Mr. Giudice in response to a question by Mr. Conroy also explain the detention basin and how it operates when a storm event occurs.

Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of the new roadway.

The connection to the Plaza Avenue is to help create a looping situation.

Discussion of Lot 15. We will slide the driveway to the west and provide some boulders around the limit of clearing. Also a request

for a conservation easement on lots 14 & 15 which was done. The drainage on Lot 15 was explained.

The area of wetlands was indicated and that was permitted by the wetland commission.

Construction times are based on town ordinances that will be followed.

Traffic was explained as this type of use is the least intrusive we would have on this site. This is an R-12 zone and there is the possibility for 40 condo units to be constructed on this site and the traffic would be greater for that type of use. Residential development, there won't be a significant increase on this property as far as traffic.

As to property values, Mr. Denorfia builds a pretty nice house. This will have a positive impact on abutting property in the area. The lots are bigger than most existing properties and the homes will be of high quality.

Mr. Grappone brought up lots 14 & 15. The foundation drains will be gravity and that means the basement floor elevations will be higher than the wetlands.

(Those wishing to speak on the issue)

Stephanie Urillo, 360 North Main Street. Spoke against this item as she did at the IW Commission.

One of the concerns was with the person who does the soil sampling. Is he an independent person or does he work for the developer.

I didn't come to the last PZC meeting because of the storm and I thought the meeting might be cancelled.

Thirdly, it's my understanding that some of these homes will be built with sump pumps in them as the water table is so high. The town attorney told me the fire department will come to pump out people's basements at the taxpayers' expense should they flood. Another added expense the taxpayers face.

We have traffic, school crowding concerns.

Why weren't the residents informed about this until the 11 th hour? Falcon Hall was informed about this.

Where is the spillway coming from the detention system set up? We've always had a high water table on Summer Street with flooding and a sump pump in the basement.

There is a vernal pool behind 82 Summer Street.

There is a drain that comes from #82 through the back yard of #96 to the intersection of #96 and 106 Summer Street that always fills up. Even in mild rain people have flooding. I don't see where the properties - lots 9 & 10 --- even if they move them that it is not going to affect the people on Summer Street.

This just isn't a good idea. The water table is way too high to sustain viable building on this property.

Deborah Whittick, 119 Knowles Avenue. I can't believe this is going on in my back yard. That area floods. What can the developer do to guarantee the building is not going cause damage to our neighborhood and our properties?

Discussion.

How is the developer going to guarantee us that the character of our neighborhood is going to remain? What about the people who still live here.

We already have flooding over there. Who do we go to if this ruins our home and neighborhood?

Discussion.

I think it's a very, very bad idea.

Tom Stang, 119 Knowles Avenue. Why weren't we informed of this? I found out yesterday we were having a meeting here. I suggest you table it for another time so we can look at the plans.

The Chair advised the applicant asked for a table so it is going to be tabled. You can come down to the town planner's office in the municipal center and look at the plans.

Secondly, 119 Knowles Avenue, we have a sump pump and if it goes out, we have 3' of water in the basement. Water table is high. The aquifer is very high. How is the building going to affect us?

Why weren't we informed about the IW Commission meeting? No signs, no letters, nothing in the paper.

The town planner explained the notification procedures for certain types of applications.

Discussion.

Denise Germaine, 62 Plaza Avenue. What is going to be next to me? What about a buffer? Will there be anything in-between.

The Chair advised there are regulations for buffering in between your property and their property. We'll have the applicant answer more fully.

Is Plaza Avenue going to be widened? Paved? There is barely room to get two cars down. The pavement is horrible.

The Chair said at the end there would be repairs when they connect it but I don't know if they'll pave the whole road out to West Center Street but we'll ask the applicant.

I have a sump pump that is going all the time stated the speaker. It pools on my property when there is a lot of rain. The whole front of my property is eroded, too.

Kelly Gallagher, 27 Plaza Avenue. My concern is echoing a lot of what has been said here tonight. We do not have a sump pump in our basement but I feel we probably should. There is pooling in front of the house when it rains hard. I feel that will get worse and affect my property.

I'm concerned about the lack of notification and appalled with the process here. I think the notification rules should be changed. Especially when you are talking about making a major change to a little street like ours with nine homes and 18 cars. We are talking about adding more cars all thru a currently dead-end street. I am concerned about the width --- there is barely room for two cars to pass by each other on the street. No room on the sides. Will the street be widened and what would be the impacts to my property as well as the others'.

Discussion.

Jane Cooney, 41 Plaza Avenue. I am very concerned about the notification process that didn't happen.

The Chair clarified and explained there is no notification process because this is not a public hearing.

Discussion.

Traffic concerns are great with increased cars that may come down our one-way or dead-end street.

Big equipment and trucks and workers while this building is going on. I would like to be sure the town has regulations in place for weight limits and speed enforcement, increased lighting on the street, safety for the children in the neighborhood and the character of the neighborhood. We have plants, trees, animals and woods now.

When Walkers Crossing comes down from Summit Street, there will be trees taken out. What is to prevent more drainage problems? Right now we have water problems. The property is wooded and I wondered if they were going to clear cut and start building and plant tiny trees in front yards or if they'll tag trees that won't be a problem for the building.

Discussion.

Lucky us, we're not having 40 condos, but it is not least intrusive if we have 18 more families using our little one lane street in from West Center Street.

What about the Phase I study required? Is there concerns about contamination on the property?

Attorney Sciota said we require a Phase I before we accept the road. That'll be a little further along. We have that.

Is there a Phase II planned by the developer to go into the other land? The Chair said there is none before us.

Kim Doerfler, 212 West Center Street. I don't have a water issue. My biggest concern is this cul de sac will abut my property and it's going to be easiest way for pedestrians to take short cuts right through.

Discussion.

For me, it's a safety issue. The Chair advised the police department is at our disposal. If you see someone in your yard, contact the police.

Discussion.

Can we have a privacy fence put in to prevent that? The Chair said he would ask the applicant.

Patsy Stonewall, 40 Speechley Avenue. I have water that runs down from Plaza when they built the duplexes. They collapsed some lines in there, the drainage, so it backed up. When he puts in his pipes, is that drainage going to be okay? My backyard is soaked.

Discussion.

My yard goes the whole line of his property. They pinched the line once; I don't want the drainage problem again. The water still is in my yard.

Laura Casale, 43 Knowles Avenue. You think you are fixing our problem with drainage because of the drainage system proposed. That's wonderful. When we bought the land, its wetlands because it is very wet. I live at the bottom of the big hill and the people at the top have a lot of water. Can you imagine what I have? He thinks this is going to fix it, wonderful. If he doesn't, worse for me.

What is the objective for having a wetland committee?

Discussion.

Wetland area was discussed.

Mr. Grappone explained inland wetlands are defined by the State of Connecticut as based on soil type. A registered soil scientist went out and delineated wetlands on the property.

Discussion.

There's wildlife. What about that? Where can they move to?
Discussion.

Is there a policy when you change an area that used to be wetlands to this other?

Discussion.

Delineation of the wetlands was explained by Attorney Sciota.

Tom Stang, 119 Knowles Avenue. What is going to be done about the traffic? You have Summit and West Center Street with a lot more traffic and there's no sidewalks.

Stephanie Urillo, 360 North Main Street. A lot of discussion of where the wetlands location is and the high water table consistent in the area. I was wondering if you can clarify that. The consistent them I heard tonight in additions to traffic, sidewalks and wildlife, which are valid concerns, is the high water table and the homes currently have sump pumps in them.

She spoke about #82 Summer Street. There is a vernal pool back there. She spoke about the piping in that area.

Nancy Cocania, speaking for my Mom, Mary Cocania, tonight. 224 West Center Street. The water table concerns are not as high as some of the others this evening, but we are very supportive and concerned about those individuals that are here and sent emails. Getting approval like that, I don't know about planning & zoning. It just seems logical that if the town is going to allow a development in a wetland area that the people that live in that area should be notified. We just found out yesterday.

She spoke about the traffic on West Center Street. Traffic is fast and doesn't slow down for turning vehicles.

She again spoke about the notification.

She spoke about the surveying done and if it was correct. She'd like to follow up on that as regards her mother's property. People should look into it.

I'm concerned about the traffic, people here with sump pumps, and drainage.

Kelly Gallagher, 27 Plaza Avenue. Made one last point about the traffic. The road is narrow. Taking a right hand turn off West

Center, the turn is difficult and you have to make a sharp turn or wide turn.

Discussion.

Rose Frascatore, 38 Plaza Avenue. I have a lot of runoff, a lot of water coming on to my property and it seems to be coming from Summit Street. It goes between the Germaine property and it's like a river at times. My backyard is always wet, too.

My concerns are the same as what everybody else expressed. I can't say anything more. They all said it very clearly.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Giudice indicated they were all set at this time and had nothing to add.

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

J. Request for release of \$1,100 Erosion and Sediment Control bond S #1127.1, Riverside Court.

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

K. Request for release of \$50,000 Earth Excavation bond EE #132, Pine Hollow Estates.

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

L. Request for Road acceptance - John Street - Pending receipt of maintenance bond in an amount to be determined S #1283.

Staff supports this. The town planner indicated the amount would be \$10,000. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion which Mr. Rogers seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

M. Thomas C. Downey and Rebecca Romajas, request for first 90-day extension to file mylar, 590 West Street S#1289.

Staff supports this. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

N. Ace Building and Design, reduction of maintenance bond for Honey Lane in the amount of \$47,000 to \$10,000 to cover maintenance bond for Raylene Drive, S#986.4.

The town planner clarified it is reducing the subdivision bond which we have which is cash to an amount of \$10,000 which would then be the maintenance bond. Staff supports it. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. Items to Schedule for Public Hearing

A. The Southington Cheshire Community YMCA (SPU #522) December 4, 2012

B. 30 Prosperity Court (SPU #435.4) - December 4, 2012

The Chair indicated these could be scheduled.

8. Administrative Reports

None this evening.

9. Receipt of New Applications

Mr. Librandi passed around the list of new applications as of 11/20/12:

- 464 Queen Street, LLC site plan modification, SPR 1564.1.
- Town of Southington site plan modification, DePaolo Middle School, SPR 1553.1.
- Anthony Cillitti, location approval for motor vehicle repair license, SPR 1628.
- Southington-Cheshire Community YMCA SPU #522.

Mr. Sciota asked, if available and only if available, would you like to have your December meeting at the municipal center? The Chair said if available, he'd like to move to the municipal center.

The Chair added as an aside that he firmly believes that commissions that have regularly scheduled meetings --- planning and zoning is the first and third Tuesday of each month --- if we're going forward to the municipal center, it should be our meeting.

Attorney Sciota pointed out there are times when there are holidays on Mondays and the Council then meets on Tuesdays. I don't get involved in how it's going to go. The conflict lies with the Council as it is our regularly scheduled meeting.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky commented on the West Street Subcommittee, we had a meeting, posted the meeting Minutes yesterday. Small meeting where we had some additional input and suggestions on the types of businesses we see entering the proposed zones on West Street. We have a few local professionals making some suggestions for us as to types of items we would like to include in future regulation revisions as we go forward.

My hope is by the 1st meeting in January to have some more specifics. We talked about the size of the typical businesses, having certain types of businesses, restaurants or no drive thrus. Where do we want access management to lie and we contrasted with that with the mixed use transitions. Talked about mix of retail and residential as well as the interchange commercial zone.

I hope to report out more to you on that.

Thursday, Thanksgiving Day, at half time they'll do the ribbon cutting at the new turf field.

HAPPY THANKSGIVING TO EVERYONE AND BE SAFE!

10 Adjournment - Mr. Rogers made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 o'clock, p.m.)