

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
December 4, 2012

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, December 4, 2012. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m in the Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

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

Alternates: Jennifer Clock
Susan Locks
Ryan Rogers

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

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

Absent: James Sinclair, Commissioner
Paul Champagne, Commissioner
Randall Gage, Alternate

The Chair seated and Ms. Locks for Mr. Sinclair and Ms. Clock for Mr. Champagne. 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 November 20, 2012

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

Ms. Clock noted for the record she did review the Minutes for the November 20, 2012 meeting.

Public Hearings

Mr. Librandi read the legal notice into the record.

A. Proposed modification of approved Multifamily Development to reduce required buffer and modify private drive and add curb cut - 30 Prosperity Drive (SPU #435.4)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert & Jones represented the applicant. The property is located at 30 Prosperity Court. It is the southerly portion of the project. We're here to request a waiver of the 20' buffer to reduce it down to 15'. The reason for that is that the old easement is located in an area where the grades are a little steeper than what you would prefer. And, also the easement is near one of the end units so the driveway will be located 10 to 15 feet away from that unit. The new location is parallel to the existing property line. We will maintain a 50' buffer and we will be adding additional plantings as needed once the driveway is constructed.

The wooded area opens up exactly where the driveway is proposed. The existing trees will remain to the left of the access drive and additional trees located to the north of the driveway will be left in place. There will be additional plantings to beef up the area.

Pointed out the change on the map.

I have a letter from the neighbor that abuts the 50' that we are proposing has submitted a letter and I have a copy for the record (submitted). They have no objection to the reduction of this easement.

The request is made under Section 3.04.2B.10 which calls for a 20' landscaped buffer and a mix of evergreens and deciduous trees. The detail at the bottom of the sheet indicates the planting schedule as required. And, we are proposing additional shrubbery buffering those areas. The existing 20' buffer will be kept just west of the proposed driveway (indicating). Explained.

The submission was made by the condo association to make this change. And, the neighbor to the south has no objection to it.

I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Bovino indicated his presentation was complete.

Mr. Librandi read a letter into the record from the Milo Family, LLC. (On file in the Planner's Office.)

Those speaking in favor of the application:

Joe LaPorte, 30-1 Prosperity Court. I would be the one most affected if this is not granted primarily because the old as its written up now, the driveway would come approximately 20' down a fairly steep grade right by the corner of my condo. The way it is proposed, we can have it up and out of the way. The new developers are in favor of doing it. The old developers are willing to help. And, we in the condo association are in favor of it.

If it is built the way it is on the map, it'll go right across our walking path.

If this is not approved, I would be here today asking for a guardrail, fencing and everything else I could to protect me.

I have many of our condo people here and rather than have a parade of people coming up saying they're in favor, if we could have a show of hands. (About 20 persons)

I also have a list of 13 people that could not make the meeting and I'll pass this on. We're all in favor.

Since everybody is willing to work to make this better, I would like to see it approved.

Thank you.

Those speaking against the application:

Jim Duquette from Cardinal Crest. We adjoin the 30 Prosperity Park property. I'm at 245 Berlin Avenue.

My question is: is this hearing tonight just about the proposed right of way easement or does it also entail the property the building that's going to be putting up the units about access to the sewer system and water system. Is this another issue?

The Chair explained this is an SPU to reduce the required buffer and modify private drive and add curb cut. Later on there is a site plan application.

Mr. Grappone explained about the sewer system. With the modification the two proposed homes would discharge into an existing sewer system built by the condo association and there is a portion to be deeded to the town.

Mr. Duquette explained his issue with that. When Cardinal Crest gave the easement to Prosperity Park, in our contract, there is no right to assign the additional sewage or the right to flow into our storm drains without the approval of Cardinal Crest. If he is planning on using the existing sewer system that Propserity Park has,

we have to take issue with that. They have to get permission from our association to let two more units go into the system that flows through our property.

Mr. Grappone said the documents would have to be reviewed, but he believed Cardinal Crest assigned it to the condo association and the condo association transferred it to the town.

Discussion.

And, also the town has assumed maintenance of this sewer system. But the ownership is still Cardinal crest and Prosperity Park pointed out Mr. Duquette.

Discussion.

Mr. Duquette read excerpts from the contract document. The Town Attorney advised he would review the contract document.

Discussion.

Hearing no other speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing item.

B. Proposed expansion of YMCA by two building additions and expanded parking areas: 108, 110, 116, 118 & 130 North Main Street & 29 High Street.

Stephen Giudice with Harry Cole & Son representing the applicant made a presentation.

The Y has acquired three additional properties totaling 5.9 acres. (Explained)

He showed an existing conditions map and explained.

All parcels are zoned CB.

It is the Y's intention to purchase the additional properties for the purpose of expanding their facilities and their operations in two abutting buildings.

The existing parcel is 5.09 acres. Explained abutting properties.

With the exception of the law office, the Y is expanding pretty much into the remaining property that abuts them. We do have frontage on Mill Street, Main Street and High Street. One of the existing two family houses has been removed currently. The existing garage is located here to be removed. (Indicating) Portions of this house have been removed but the remaining brick structure is still in place.

All properties are served by public water and sewer. The topography on the site slopes from east to west. Most of drainage is away from the Rt 10 corridor.

The proposal for the site is to consolidate the Y properties into one campus. Our original proposal is to remove the brick house at this location (indicating), close the curb cuts along Main Street and some curb cuts on High Street and provide pedestrian walkways throughout the site and more convenient parking area and increase parking.

The Y building will be expanded about 10,000 sf to the rear and a 3200 sf addition to the north side of the building.

The existing TD Bank building would remain. The Y would utilize the building for offices and recreational purposes on the lower level.

The parking lot would be consolidated and expanded to 277 spaces. Currently there are 243 spaces on site.

A main entrance on North Main Street is proposed. Curb cuts are proposed to be eliminated. (Explained) We propose to improve the curb cut on High and Mill Streets.

We've aligned the aisles and provided pedestrian sidewalks. Sidewalks connect throughout the entire site out to North Main Street and to the TD Bank building, lower and upper level, and along the parking areas.

The Y is proposing to incorporate Renaissance style fixtures along the North Main Street corridor to be consistent with the town's theme in downtown.

The Y is currently under a court order to restrain them from taking down the brick house at 118 North Main Street. In order to keep our process moving, we propose an alternate "A" which maintains the existing house and reduces some of the parking. If that is the option the courts decide the Y has to move forward with, then that's the reason it's on the plan. That would give us 265 parking spaces.

We've submitted a traffic study. We're in the process of submitting applications to the State of Connecticut because we have over 200 parking spaces. It is for review by the former STC now known as OSTA.

Our purpose tonight is we do have a site plan application but we have a special permit request due to the size of the site in a CB zone, 5 acre size, we are required to request a special permit to move forward with this application.

As part of your consideration for the SPU, you have to look at:

- We believe this application is in harmony with the abutting properties. For the most part this is the CB zone. And, the Y fits

in with this area very well. This is orderly development of the property and we are in a situation with multiple parking lots at different grades and heights and we are making it much more efficient.

- We think the structure itself is suitable in its use and size and location. It doesn't have adverse impacts to abutting properties.

- We think the streets surrounding the property provide accurate access/egress for vehicles traveling. We know there is a problem at High Street. The biggest thing is trying to provide areas of egress at Mill Street and out to North Main without having a bottleneck at the intersection of High and Merrill Street.

The traffic report, Mr. Hesketh couldn't be here tonight, we did submit his responses to comments received. If traffic is a concern, we'll have him here at the next meeting.

We did incorporate landscaping into our site plan. Landscaped berms are proposed along the parking areas.

We think the proposal is compatible with the abutting neighborhood and that the proposed use fits very well.

All public utilities, sewer, water, gas, drainage are sufficient for the proposed expansion.

I believe it would be a very good addition to the town.

I'll answer questions.

The Chair asked about the house coming down: Does the Connecticut Superior Court have the jurisdiction as to whether this house stays or goes? Attorney Sciota they supercede your decision.
Discussion.

In response to a question by Mr. Chaplinsky, Mr. Giudice stated with the original proposal it is 277 spaces and with Option A it is 265. We are above and beyond the requirements of the regulations.

Mr. Giudice explained this was designed both ways in response to the court's intervention and then you can see it with or without the house. To keep the process moving.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy discussed the traffic analysis provided for the area. He noted there are inefficiencies in the system that don't show up in the modeling. Are you willing to consider removing the access off North Main Street? Mr. Giudice said they would rather not.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy added we want to protect the main line street from gridlock. He explained the way to do that is to force the traffic on to the site itself and the minor side streets.

Discussion.

He felt the access on North Main Street would have adverse effects on Route 10. I'm not really in favor of that from a traffic perspective.

Discussion.

Extensive discussion about traffic problems in the area.

Discussion on segregating the two parking lots.

Grades in the area of the parking lot were discussed.

Those speaking in favor of the application:

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. Spoke about the parking and traffic flow in the area.

Connecting the two parking lots and having the traffic flow north to the Mill Street intersection is much more preferred.

Discussion.

The third outlet is crucial to developing a sane traffic flow on North Main Street. We're talking 275 cars and that's a lot of traffic to move. From a pure point of view of saying we need to close as many curb cuts as possible, that logic doesn't always work in my opinion.

The other option is to get the local traffic authority to make Merrill Avenue one way in and not one way out and that would allow the traffic coming out of High Street to go left and right.

Discussion.

This is a great plan and great expansion. There is nothing around the Y that will have a detrimental effect.

I am in favor of this plan.

Mr. Librandi read a letter dated 12/3/2012 into the record from William J. Chamura, YMCA President from 1982 to 1984. (Letter on file in the Town Planner's office.)

Mr. Librandi read a history of the Olney House into the record. (On file in the Town Planner's office.)

Those speaking against the application:

Peter Anderson, 1177 Marion Avenue, Marion, CT. He noted he was here to support the preservation and continued active use of the Andrews-Olney House. He explained the historical background of the house.

I hope your decision will be one of balance and not one that the community will regret in the future.

The Y is an important part of our community and we all support its efforts to serve the well being of members in the greater community. This is a request for a small compromise that continues an important piece of our community and quality of life.

He left a copy of remarks. There is a link for the material that contributed to the establishment of the historic district and background and facts on the Olney House.

Fern Wildman Schrier, 199 Rolling Hill Lane. I am President of the Southington Historical Society. I work at the Southington Care Center and I have my own business here in Southington.

I've really had the opportunity to see what a special place Southington is. Explained.

Special things unique to Southington:

- Farmington Canal.
- 19th Century Old Schoolhouse.
- Milldale Depot.
- Andrews-Olney House.

She discussed each item.

I think we can compromise and have the best of both worlds. The Y can have expanded parking and we can keep the things that make Southington special. Southington is a special place.

Helen Higgins, Connecticut Trust for Historic Preservation Executive Director. We are the agency that brought the injunction to stop the demolition of the Olney House. 652 Nut Plains Road, Guilford, CT.

We wrote a letter that's in the record. I won't read it. I want to say we are in favor of Alternate A. We are working hard with the Y and developers to find a use and redevelopment for the Olney House. We believe we'll be successful. This is an effort to revitalize it and help sustain the downtown.

Discussion.

Stephanie Urillo, 360 North Main Street. I speak in favor of Alternate A to preserve the Olney Building. I know in other endeavors the town has sought to save these historical places.

The open space committee was integral in purchasing the Milldale Depot and it is adjacent to the rails to trails.

The West Street subcommittee in its presentation to the planning & zoning commission on June 19th, one of the things we stated was to preserve the historic sites that are along West Street, including the West Street Schoolhouse.

Even with preserving the Olney building, there are enough parking places for the Y. That should be strongly taken into consideration.

Route 10 is a main north/south corridor in Southington. To put additional parking spaces right on Route 10, I think, diminishes the quality of Route 10. It is part of the historic district. It's important to preserve this and take into consideration that people transiting through our town do see the Route 10 corridor.

Liz Kopec, 469 Andrews Street. Southington, CT.

Thank you for reading the history into the record of the Andrew-Olney House. I would be strongly opposed to any parking plan that would eliminate that house for the reason I stated in the history.

Thank you very much.

Nadine Britton, 72 Hillside Avenue, Plantsville. As a life time member of the Southington Historical Society and a member of the YMCA, we have serious differences as to what the best plan of attack is. I am here to emphasize the importance of the Olney House and support its presence as an integral part of the larger Southington Center Historic District. We really have a gem in this building.

Discussion.

Spoke about the importance of historic preservation.

It would be a disgrace to lose this significant property for just a few parking spaces. We have enough asphalt and blacktop.

Thanks for your consideration.

Margaret Anderson, 1177 Marion Avenue, Marion, CT. Read a brief statement in support of Alternative A.

This gem has earned its place in Southington's past and with this commission's help, its place in the future can be secured.

She passed in letters stating the same thing, basically.

Marcille Crooks, 30 Hillside Avenue in Plantsville. As a concerned resident of Southington and interested in the preservation of the town's historic structure, I voice my concern for the Andrews-Olney House. I recognize the Y's need for additional parking, I feel the best need of the community as a whole would be served by Alternate A, allowing the building to stand and play a role in the historic district while the Y gains the majority of parking spaces they feel they need.

Lisa Janson, 500 Darling Street. I just want to say ten spaces are not worth tearing down something this historic. I'm for Alternate A.

Jim Duquette, 245 Berlin Avenue. I'm not speaking for or against this building. I'm a perplexed citizen and retired businessman. I'm trying to understand if this building is so historic, why didn't the historical society get it registered on a national registration of buildings (it is). And, if that is the case why would the YMCA buy a building if they new it was historic. It would be a bad business decision. An expensive investment you can't do anything with.

Discussion.

Just my comments.

Dick Frazier, 1305 Marion Avenue. I ask you to please reject the concept of destroying this building and accept Amendment A.

(Rebuttal)

Steve Giudice, representing the applicant, requested the public hearing remain open as we'd like to explore some alternatives with the curb cut on North Main Street and we'll have the traffic engineer next time.

The Chair advised the public hearing will remain open and be on at the next meeting, January 2nd, 2013, Wednesday.

Business Meeting

A. Proposed modifications of approved Multifamily development to reduce required buffer and modify private drive and add curb cut - 30 Prosperity Drive (SPU #435.4).

Mr. Librandi advised this application to allow for a reduction of landscaped buffer to modify existing access easement to the rear lots at 33 Prosperity Court, property zoned R-12.

Staff comments have been returned to us. The concern is it is stated there is a driveway and we'd like to ask the commission to review and decide on what you think about having the driveway paved to a certain degree. It does have the characteristics of a rear lot.

Mr. Grappone said the characteristics do give the intention of a rear lot and we feel a portion, if not the entire access drive, should be paved. As far as location and grade, we're comfortable with that.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with stipulations the staff recommended. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Prosperity Park, site plan modification for the relocation of access to former Sabatella property, Prosperity Court, (SPR #1497.2).

Mr. Librandi stated this is just a continuance to the SPU that was granted prior. It's ready for action.

Mr. Bovino said the site plan deals with the grades on the proposed driveway. It is a reasonable grade, very flat. I thought we would discuss the issue of paving at the site plan stage because the applicant would like to keep it gravel for two reasons:

- it allows more infiltration into the ground,
- to keep more of a natural look to it.

We are proposing additional landscaping on the northwest portion of the driveway to prevent any lights from shining into this unit (indicating) and also some landscape boulders to prevent any possible fall of grade in this area (indicating). The boulders would compliment what is proposed.

In regard to the sewer, if the town attorney is going to look at it, we will wait for that. We are not adding any additional drainage to the pond that they own. They have a detention area with an agreement to discharge runoff into it and we are not adding any runoff into that pond.

As far as I know for the sewers, the easement was given to the town.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

The Town Attorney asked for a stipulation: pending approval of the documents by the town attorney's office.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to amend his approval per the town attorney's recommendation. Mr. Kalkowski seconded the amended motion. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Proposed expansion of YMCA by two building additions and expanding parking areas: 108, 110, 116, 118 & 130 North Main Street & 29 High Street (SPU #522).

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

D. Southington Cheshire Community YMCA, site plan modification for parking improvements and building expansion, 108, 110, 116, 118 & 130 North Main Street and High Street SPR #1629.

Mr. Giudice said most of the site plan aspects were covered during the SPU. The one thing I didn't get into was the storm water management. We are proposing a subsurface storm water management storage on site as it currently has now. All this discharges to the northwest towards the Mill Street drainage system.

I would ask that my public hearing information be added to this portion of the site plan.

Mr. Grappone added that the drainage is still under review.

The town attorney advised the entire presentation under the SPU will be incorporated into the site plan.

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

E. Proposed revision to Business Overlay Zone text, Section 4-04.12, 4-04-22 and 4-04.3 (ZA #567).

F. Proposed revisions to Business Overlay Zone area ZC #541 - West Street

Mr. Chaplinsky stated as the subcommittee chair for this project, I would like to ask that items E & F be withdrawn from the agenda.

We are continuing to actively rewrite this and the hope is we will have more information to report out in January.

The Chair indicated they would be withdrawn.

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

Mr. Kalkowski recapped at the last meeting during the public hearing we heard from Mr. Secondo regarding some feedback he gave to us on our proposal. We did agree to meet with the Chamber of Commerce and we did yesterday. We took their feedback to heart. They are truly here and lobbying for the benefits of small businesses which is important to us as commissioners.

We came up with a compromise and the subcommittee last evening after the meeting with the Chamber. For the benefit of the

commissioners I want to run through the five items we are proposing to change and we'd like to get your feedback, as well.

1. We would like to propose allowing A-frame signs within the business zone, however, not along the roads. They will be along the internal sidewalks of plazas within the business zones.

2. We're proposing to charge an administrative fee of \$25 for the application process and for the additional enforcement required for temporary signs.

3. We're going to re-introduce the temporary nature of temporary signs. We are going to recommend to put back the proposal to allow for six 14-day periods with 14 days in between for the displaying of the temporary signs.

4. We're going to recommend that we add language that their purpose is for either a special sale, a special event or for a business promotion and they're not to advertise the core business. That's what our sign regulations are for.

5. We would like to propose putting a six month pilot program in place to allow the businesses in the business zone to be able to display signs along the roadway for a period of six months. At the end of the six months' period, we would take staff's recommendations and our recommendations of how we think it went, together with input from the public and our business folks in the community. We would make a determination whether we wanted to allow that permanently or if the pilot was not deemed successful the pilot language would fall off and not be part of the permanent sign proposal.

Discussion about the five recommendations among the commissioners.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he would be in favor of having the CB zone have basically open access, 365 days a year as long as within inclement weather they put the signs in each night. And, I would even be in favor of A-frame signs in the B zone on interior sidewalks along the building fronts. Just take it in at night. You can have it 365 days a year. And, the six 14-day period would be reserved just for the road sign.

Discussion.

Mr. Kalkowski explained this is for a temporary sign. Explained it is for a special sale, business event or promotion.

Mr. Chaplinsky also stated the stuff going by the roadside, it would seem to me we would want to limit that type of activity. If we have a fee of \$25 to register their sign, I would propose you make them register each one of the six times.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said the five recommendations sound fine. But these signs are everywhere. How does the town enforce this? We've addressed the things the Chamber of Commerce was looking for, but it doesn't address the fact that the town doesn't have the resources to actually enforce any of the regulations. Creating another level of process, how does that address that? I think it makes that worse.

Discussion.

Attorney Sciota explained it has to be a partnership between the town and the Chamber of Commerce. In this case it would not be complaint driven, it would be registration driven.

Discussion.

The pilot program is a very good compromise to see if our concerns come to fruition. The pilot program was explained again.

Attorney Sciota suggested staff draw this up and send it to you as soon as possible so you can think about it between now and the 2nd of January meeting. Keep the moratorium in place until the next meeting. The Chair agreed.

There will be a public input session on January 2nd as a public hearing was already held.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion for a 65 day extension. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

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

H. Kennedy Middle School renovations and expansion, SPR #1627, 1071 South Main Street.

The Town Attorney advised the final revisions are being made. They expect to be prepared for approval at your meeting on January 2nd. We request a table for both.

The Chair advised at the last meeting there were issues brought up that were discussed with the Director of Operations for the BOE and they have been addressed. We're working to try to solve those concerns.

The Town Attorney asked for a 65 day extension for both H & I.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the request for the 65 day extension for Items H & I. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

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

I. DePaolo Middle School renovations and expansion, SPR AA#1553.1, 385 Pleasant Street.

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

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

Stephen Giudice with Harry Cole & Son representing the applicant.

It is a 9.41 acre parcel located at 59 Summit Street. It's an 18 lot subdivision. R-12 zone. Serviced by public water and sewers.

At the last meeting you did have public input and you did listen to the concerns of the abutting property owners. We've made revisions to the plans based on our meeting with the town engineer and also on some of the comments we heard.

Revisions made to the plan:

- The biggest change to the plan was to slide the cul de sac adjusting lots 8,9 and 10. We moved the houses to the north and to the south away from a slope that goes down to a wetland off site.

We redesigned the grading in the area so stormwater from the development of these lots would not go down the slopes. It will travel north to the drainage pipe or to the south to the detention basin.

- We did make modifications to the grading along lots 15, 16, 17 & 18. There was concern about storm water on these properties. We propose a swale to take any water from these lot and put them into this wetland.

- We proposed an emergency swale which allows discharge through the existing swale that runs off site.

- We lowered the cul de sac. We changed the grade here by approximately 2.5 feet and lowered the roadway.

- We did modify the building square on Lot 14 to relocate it outside of the conservation easement.

Drainage, runoff and wetlands seemed to be the biggest talking points at the last meeting. Mr. Giudice explained the difference between wetlands and high water table. He extensively explained the proposed drainage systems for this development.

Discussion.

I know the plan meets or exceeds the regulations for the town noted Mr. Giudice.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy discussed a single basin versus a double basin placed perpendicular by Lots 15 & 16 based on the gutter flow analysis. Mr. Giudice said they would relook at that.

The Chair asked if what the applicant is now proposing to contain the water off of Plaza Avenue and having it run down to the catch basin, is the engineering staff comfortable with what they're proposing. Mr. Grappone said he agreed that the roadway will intercept the majority of the drainage that used to come down by swales into the property. It will help the situation to the north properties of Knowles Avenue by intercepting that and piping it down to the wetlands and then up to the 25 year storm event it is going to be hard piped down through the existing drainage system in Knowles Avenue. There is a swale and right to flow across the new properties ad mentioned, Lots 18, 17, 16 & 15.

The wetland was delineated up to the property line. There was mention on some of the northerly properties on Knowles Avenue that wetland could be extending on to their property. They did not delineate on private property, just their own property.

I did review Mr. Lord's soils report and talking to the environmental planner. It is consistent with the SCS web survey on line.

Discusison.

Mr. Grappone stated in reviewing the revised drainage calculations, I did meet with the applicant and the engineer to go over the comments. They have addressed all the comments. They had two concerns in mind when doing the drainage calculations. The first is to demonstrate they met the regulation and ZIRO is achieved with detention basins designed to reduce the peak rate discharge from the 2,10,25 year storms to a level commensurate with the peak discharge of development and shall have the ability to store the 25 year storm event. The emergency spillway is designed to pass and discharge from a 100 year storm frequency.

Discussion.

They have insured that no significant impacts to the downstream property will occur.

Discussion.

Mr. Librandi read a letter into the record from Stephanie Urillo which is on file in the Town Planner's office.

Mr. Librandi advised the application is ready for action.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve and Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky said we have to follow the recommendations from the professionals who did the studies. Everybody is saying this development is okay and not have an adverse affect on adjacent properties. I am supportive of the application.

The Chair felt we have addressed most all of the concerns brought up by the public. The regulations are followed by everyone in Southington including the developers.

Mr. Conroy further explained the purpose of the planning & zoning commission is to protect the residents.
Discussion.

Mr. Grappone said he would look into the catch basin further and it should be stipulated.

Mr. Chaplinsky amended his motion for approval to include a stipulation for the town staff to have final approval of the drainage system. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

K. 464 Queen Street, LLC, site plan modification, 464 Queen Street (SPR #1564.1)

Mr. Bovino, representing the applicant, explained that in 2009 this property had a site plan approval for a 2000 sf building located at the rear of the property.

After analyzing the costs involved in the project, the property owner decided to reduce the size of the addition to 1340 sf and eliminate one of the pumps and put the addition right next to the current small building existing on the property.

The building was proposed in the rear. This not going to be built and right now the addition is going to up against this building and the pump was eliminated (indicated).

Everything else is pretty much the same. We have responded to staff comments and I believe we've addressed all of their concerns.

Mr. Librandi said this is ready for action.

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

L. Lovley Development, request for release of \$30,000 E & S bond, 1115 West Street SPR #1592

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

M. Et Al Properties, LLC, release of \$55,400 subdivision bond, St. John Place, 474 Mill Street (S #1283)

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

N. Central CT Industrial Park, release of \$159,000 subdivision bond, pending receipt of a \$30,000 maintenance bond, Industrial Drive S #1262.

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

Mr. Grappone asked for a motion to add Item O to accept Industrial Drive. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to add Item O to the Agenda. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

O. Road Acceptance of Industrial Drive, S #1262.

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

7. Items to Schedule for Public Hearing

The YMCA was continued and will be on this meeting.

8. Administrative Reports

None this evening.

9. Receipt of New Applications

Mr. Librandi passed around a list.

- YMCA
- Lake Compounce, SPR 1949.5 regarding an electrical building and retaining wall on site.
- SPR 523 Special Public Hearing for January 2nd.

10. PZC Subcommittees

- **West Street Subcommittee**

Mr. Chaplinsky said the two items were withdrawn today and my hope is during the coming weeks we will have some additional language to incorporate. The intent is to go back to staff and ask for a redraft of what was given to us previously. Then we will consider additional public input and comment on the new language.

Attorney Sciota, on behalf of the administration, thanked Rob Librandi and Dave Lavallee for stepping up to the plate. I'm working very closely with them and Jim Grappone.

And, on behalf of the administration: Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!

Mr. Chaplinsky asked for an update on Darling Street. The construction fence is down. The building has been reduced to a pile of rubble in the back of the lot. It's still pretty rugged and is a safety hazard still with the entry way being open. I haven't seen a lot of activity there.

Attorney Sciota said it is an active construction site. Jim or Rob may know more than I do. This is a federally funded project they got a grant for. Mr. Librandi said he would look into that and send an update to the commissioners.

Mr. Chaplinsky pointed out the site has to be secured so it is safe. It's pretty unsightly.
Discussion.

Ms. Locks brought up Carter Lane. It is awfully messy by that construction that we approved for the condo units. In the road, it is terrible. All washed off into the road. It's going all the way down on to Route 10.

Mr. Conroy noted the development on Smith Street is tracking down to Flanders.

Attorney Sciota said Dave Lavallee will check the E & S controls on both of those.

The Chair said when he heard Ms. Savage Dunham was moving on, she had told me her last day was tomorrow. I had assumed this would be here this evening. She's not. She's at her new position now in Massachusetts and we wish her the best of luck. I didn't have an opportunity to thank her for her service for the last six or seven years she was here. I wish her the best of luck in Massachusetts. I congratulate her on her new venture in life and wish her the best of luck. I do thank her for her service.

I want to thank everyone who sits on this board for their service and the hard work they do and the service they provide to the town. I'm pretty tough. You all serve on subcommittees and I expect progress and answers and I get nothing but professionalism. No one

has ever told me no when I asked them to do something. I really appreciate that and I mean that from the bottom of my heart.

I delegate and everything that you guys do I really appreciate. You make me look good and I appreciate that.

Thank you all for your service and I wish you and all of your families the best for the holiday season.

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 o'clock, p.m.)