

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
 Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
 January 2, 2013

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Wednesday, January 2, 2013. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:02 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

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

Alternates: Jennifer Clock
 Randall Gage
 Susan Locks

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Robert Librandi, Acting Town Planner
 James A. Grappone, Acting Town Engineer
 Greg Klimaszewski, Assistant Town Attorney

Absent: Ryan Rogers, Alternate
 Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney

A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance with Arthur Cyr leading.

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chairman, presiding:

Approval of Minutes

Regular Meeting of December 4, 2012

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Sinclair abstaining.

Mr. Gage added for the record he had reviewed the November 20th and December 4th, 2012 Minutes.

The Chair advised tonight we would go out of order and asks at this time for Mr. Secondo to come forward and speaking regarding the A-frame sign regulations as he has another meeting to attend.

F. Proposed new text for A-frame and temporary wire signs, Section 13-02M and 13-14 ZA #569.

Arthur Secondo, 1048 South Main Street Plantsville, on behalf of the Chamber thanked everyone for their hard work on this regulation revision.

A-frame signs weren't a problem until we brought it up. The initial problem was it was illegal for so many years no one noticed it. But now the subcommittee has made some recommendations and the Chamber is proud to say we are going along with it.

My only objection is we would like you to consider the fee listed in the proposal be reduced to \$25. In these economic times, \$50 is going to be tough.

This won't be easy with the A-frame signs because for years we've ignored it. But our businesses now realize someone is going to be watching them.

I promise you and give you my word on behalf of the Chamber that we will work with the ZEO. We will send out this proposed regulation to see what happens after you vote. We'll make sure all of our members are aware of it. Don't hold us responsible for our nonmembers who may violate the regulations. We'll do everything we can. We'll comply as much as possible.

Discussion.

We felt we had an obligation to bring to your attention the A-frame signs. I did a survey of every retail establishment in Southington and I found only 36 signs displayed.

Discussion.

I'm sure there'll be violations of the 84 days they're allowed to put the signs up. But the Chamber will be your partner on this. We'll make sure to do everything we can to make sure these rules are followed.

I thank you for your work. Please later on just consider the \$50 fee reduced. In years, people haven't paid anything as they thought it was their right to put the signs on. They didn't know it was illegal until someone complained. Now things are different.

I do thank you on behalf of the Chamber for the regulation on these A-frames.

Public Hearings

Mr. Librandi read the legal notice into the record for the public hearing items.

A. Proposed expansion of YMCA by two building additions and expanded parking areas; 108, 110, 116, 118 & 130 North Main Street & 29 High Street (SPU #522), public hearing continued from December 4.

Commissioner Sinclair announced that due to family circumstances he had to miss the majority of the last four months of meetings.

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, South Main Street, Plantsville represented the application. This is the continued hearing from the last meeting. I'll go over the statistics on the project and get into some of our responses to concerns raised.

This property is a 5.09 acre parcel. It's a combination of multiple parcels: the former TD Bank property, two existing house parcels, and the existing Y building located on the corner of High and North Main Street. The house at 108-110 was razed. And, the existing house at 116-118 is still standing.

The site at the moment consists of 8 curb cuts. We have 243 parking spaces. The site is currently used for YMCA activities and former residential property and a business use for the TD bank property.

Our proposal is to consolidate all the parcels into one YMCA campus. It includes a 10,000 sf addition to the rear for a multi use gym. And, a 3200 sf addition to the north of the building for the warming pool. We have a small garage we are proposing for maintenance purposes.

Our site as proposed consists of 277 parking spaces. We are eliminating five curb cuts. Explained.

The proposal includes a realignment of the parking areas on site to improve efficiency. The aisles are aligned to get the most parking we can get out of the property. We have added pedestrian walkways throughout the site. We have crosswalks. We

have landscaped islands with trees and full cut off lighting fixtures throughout the parking lot.

We've incorporated some Renaissance type lighting along North Main Street, as well.

There was a lot of discussion at the last public hearing on two main issues: traffic and the existing house and what the Y is proposed to do with the house.

I wanted to clarify tonight that we are here for a special permit use under Section 401.2.E which states that in a CB zone any development of a site 4 acres in size or larger or with 60 or more parking spaces is required to go for a special permit. This site is 5.09 acres and we are proposing 277 parking spaces. That is the reason we are here for a public hearing tonight.

The YMCA use itself is an acceptable use in this zone, a permitted use, for this zone. Not special permit is required for the actual YMCA or the type of activities they perform on the site.

There is no special permit use required for making parking lot modifications. But there is this one regulation that puts us into this scenario.

We are not here to discuss the fate of the existing house. That was kind of the focus of the conversation at the last hearing which was frustrating from our point of view.

This public hearing continuation should be focused on the use of the property and what the outcome of this site plan will be.

Discussion.

As to the house, one thing brought up last time was that we lose 12 spaces if the house were to remain. It wasn't pointed out that if the house were to remain, it would be converted to professional office space or medical office space. If so, we would be required to provide an additional 10 spaces for that house and we'd have to provide handicapped accessibility for parking. We estimate we would actually lose a minimum of 23 spaces due to the spaces lost and the spaces we'd have to allocate with that use. The Y is not interested in occupying that building and they would have to designate spaces for that user.

And, another thing was asking this commission to act on Option 1 or 2. This, as presented, includes an Alternate A. We're asking you to consider this plan with the Alternate A. We are not asking you to consider Option 1 with the house or Option 2 without the house. We're proposing the plan before and that's what we presented and that's what we'd like you to consider.

The existing house at this point is in the hands of the court system. We don't believe we should get into a huge debate over what happens to the house at this level. Let the courts decide and we'll make whatever changes we need to at that point.

This commission doesn't have the authority to regulate the demolition of a house, garage or building or pool. It's not part of your oversight. The Y was able to eliminate the other house and we feel if the courts allow us, we should be able to demolish this house, as well.

I'll ask Scott Hesketh to get up and talk to you a little bit about traffic and we can have discussion about that.

Any questions for me?

Mr. Chaplinsky commented for the record he disagreed with the opinion that we do or do not have the authority to determine whether the building is appropriate or not. Under special permit I believe it is our purview to make sure that this is consistent with the economic plan of development. Conservation is part of that. Section 4 talks about the proposed use and buildings.

Discussion.

Scott Hesketh, licensed professional engineer in the State of Connecticut with the firm of F.A. Hesketh & Associates. We're the authors of the November 12, 2012 traffic impact report. And, some additional information that was submitted to the commission by Cole dated December 4, 2012 in response to comments received from staff dated November 20, 2012.

He went through the traffic report which is on file in the Town Planner's office.

I believe we've addressed all commission and staff comments in our responses. Explained.

Questions were entertained from the commissioners.

Discussion in response to a question by Mr. Kalkowski about the mid week dates used for the study and discussion about activity on a Saturday at the YMCA.

Mr. Conroy brought up for discussion the driveway along Route 10. He didn't agree with it. Explained he was concerned

about the access he was providing for what used to be a couple of individual homes and a multi family. That is a great deal different than providing access to what is a 300 space parking lot. He compared that to a big box parking lot and he couldn't think of one that had three full access points. And, he didn't think it was necessary.

Discussion.

If the parking lot were to be confined only to the office building with the 10 or 15 spots, that would be acceptable. But having free run of the parking lot from that location I think is a safety hazard and it adds to congestion. I hope the applicant would address that concern.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice was asked by Mr. Chaplinsky if we were expecting a large increase in activity as a result of this expansion. What the numbers of people to increase as opposed to if this wasn't done. Mr. Giudice didn't see a huge increase. It was more about providing additional services and facilities.

Further discussion on the parking lot layout.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application.)

Pete Anderson, 1177 Marion Avenue, Marion, CT.

My comment is regarding Mr. Giudice's comment on the Olney House. I'll leave it to the determination of the jurisdiction of the commission to the town attorney, but as a resident, I state on the record that I believe it is the purview of the PZC to consider quality of life in its deliberations and in my opinion preservation of a significant contributing property in a historical district is a prime contributor to my quality of life.

Pamela J. DePaolo, 54 Delahunty Drive. Owner of DePaolo's Furniture on Center Street. I don't necessarily wish to speak against this application but I wish to make a few comments.

Being intimate with the downtown going to and from my business, I would like to say Mr. Conroy's comments are very accurate and I agree with him about the egress on to Route 10 and I do have a question on the access from High Street. I'm most

concerned with that because I see a traffic jam there all the time.

Explained.

If you're entering the YMCA through the High Street entrance, are you going to be able to go all the way through the parking lot and exit at the Mill Street exit? Answer: Yes.

Discussion.

Having a third entrance or exit would be problematic, I think.

The area around High Street, no matter what you do is going to be a logjam there.

Margaret Anderson, 1177 Marion Avenue, Marion, CT. My comment is about this not being planning & zoning's purview to rule on the Olney House. There is a big part of your title that gets forgotten and that's the "plan" in planning & zoning. You have a lot of tools available to you to make a zoning decision.

You have the master plan, the constant updating of our zoning regulations and then other studies the town paid for that are tools for you to make a good, informed decision. Especially when it comes to the "plan" part.

This would include the historic district study that established the historic district. That's a tool for everyone to use. It needs to be used.

If you look at North Main Street you can see how a compromise can be reached here. Plenty of space for parking, the house could easily stand and we might all live happily ever after.

One more thing: About the handicapped accessibility and things, for historic structures, those are often times gotten by a special waiver.

Keep the "plan" in planning & zoning.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Giudice added that the point about the commission's purview over demolishing the house had to do with the regulations you follow. Explained they don't come before this commission to ask permission to do that. It is my belief that the commission can control the parking spaces but if someone wants to tear down a building, special permit use or not, they have the right to do that without permission from this commission. I don't want that to be the sole decision-making process with this plan. Our plan

addresses both scenarios. We would like you to allow us and the court to meet both in that regard and accept it.

Discussion.

John Myers thanked the commission for looking at the plan. He explained his enthusiasm and excitement for improving the Y for members and future members.

We'll agree to disagree respectfully on some of the historic background on this.

Discussion.

Discussion of the Olney House. We are working towards finding a way that is feasible and prudent to keep the house. We're working hard on it. Very positive direction we'd like to go in.

Alternate A is in the plan so we can move forward.
Discussion.

As to usage, Saturday, interesting enough is not our busiest day. Weekdays are. Explained.

The two main additions are the 10,200 sf addition in the back that is going to be a family all purpose gymnasiums. We want to bring our gymnastics center back on to campus here. Explained classes.

The warm water pool will add some members. Our Y pool now is maxed out. The warm water therapeutic pool will be good for seniors and younger members.

Our women's center will move to the TD Bank building. Maybe a Livestrong Program or a Diabetes Program, as well.
Discussion.

As to parking we will end up losing more with the house staying there. If we lease it out they'll use the parking as well and it would impact our parking.

We are respectful of the fact the parking lot is taking up a good amount of footage on North Main Street and we are looking at the berm look with some trees in front. A continuation of Renaissance Theme look.

Explained.

Mr. Giudice emphasized we believe we have presented a good plan. There are concerns about certain aspects of it, but we want the Y to work and don't want to cause problems for drivers

on Route 10. The High Street intersection is a tough one, regardless. We think having three points of access is a positive thing for this site. We're comfortable with the presentation we made.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

B. AA Denorfia Building and Development, special permit use application for a proposed mixed use 22 unit apartment building with 2,000 sq.ft. commercial space on first floor, with associated parking area, 76 and 82 Liberty Street (SPU #523.

Anthony Denorfia, 133 Main Street, Southington represented the application as one of the principles of the applicant.

I'd like to start a few exhibits:

- A little analysis done by Cole's office concerning traffic counts.
- An opinion as to property values by Diana McDougall, broker/owner of Realty III.
- You also already have a copy of the elevations.

The proposal is for an SPU to construct 22 units of age restricted housing at 76 & 82 Liberty Street with approximately 2000 sf of commercial space on the first floor.

The property has approximately .9 acres at the corner of West Center and Liberty Street.

It's in a CB zone. Bounded on north on property now used as a residence and formerly used as a neighborhood store. On the east by Liberty Street, on the south by West Center Street and also by parcels used as residential and on the west by residential properties and Factory Square which is the former Southington Hardware Building.

Property served by water, sewer and natural gas.

The historic uses of the properties were explained.

The use we're proposing is allowed by SPU by the PZC under Section 4-01.2C of the regulations. It allows high rise

structures and also mixed use of residential and commercial structures by SPU in CB zones subject to requirements of Section 8. There really are only three requirements that pertain to this application:

- The lot has to have 30,000 sf. We have 38,237.
- The minimum land area of 1500 sf per unit which allow for a maximum density of 25 and we are proposing 22 units.
- The lot has to be served by water and sewer.

The building we're proposing is a three story building and the square footage is probably a little bit more than 25,000 sf.

The exterior architecture is a combination of the commercial building we put across the street (31 Liberty Street) and also the building we put in at 34 Pratt Street.

On the first floor we are proposing six units plus 2000 sf of commercial space. The second floor would have eight units and the third floor would have also eight units.

The proposal calls for 20 2-bedroom units and 2 1-bedroom units. All have one bath, a deck and laundry facilities on each floor. A small exercise room and meeting room. Those are similar to what is provided at 24 Pratt Street.

Explained the building would be similar to 24 Pratt Street. Described the building.

There is a need in town for elderly housing and that is based on the demand we have for 24 Pratt Street which is constantly 100 percent occupied.

Discussion.

Explained the tenant make up in the building.

It doesn't matter what kind of regulations you put into effect, the downtown area needs population. Only by population are the businesses going to thrive.

Discussion.

We also need to address Section 8 - general characteristics.

As to traffic, Cole's office did a very short analysis of what traffic this use would generate versus a reasonable development of the property - a 10,000 sf office building. Two

stories. Basically, on the AM and PM peak hours, under both scenarios, we are talking about a 50% reduction in the AM peak hour and 55% reduction in the PM peak hour. These are not big traffic generators. I also did a count on parking at Pratt Street for comparison as to whether we have enough parking. Basically, the highest level we would need at any one time is approximately 23 spots. We're proposing 55 spaces as required under the regulations. We won't drain the parking in the downtown area; we'll be adding surplus parking based on these counts.

Explained.

The site plan we're presenting is a conceptual site plan. It will be reviewed more when we get to the site plan application process.

As far as sight distances that doesn't seem to be an issue.

As to the character of the neighborhood, right now it is a very mixed use area. We think this would fit in well and we would bring in the population to the downtown area.

To maintain the property values, there is a letter in your file from Diana McDougall at Realty III that indicates it would have a positive impact on the area from the commercial and residential aspect.

The only issue as far as development and we are working hard with town staff is there are drainage issues down there. That issue is because the property is lower than the drainage pipe that feeds the Quinnipiac River. The water backs up through the pipes and there is some storm storage on site. He hasn't happened in a number of years but it is considered a floodplain.

I have to comment staff and the town on their farsightedness. When the town bought the Primus Property and in the future they wanted to develop that as a storm storage area for ZIRO. I approached the town attorney with this issue of compensating for the floodplain filling and he was very enthusiastic about using the Primus Property.

Discussion.

We designed the floodplain compensation project they'll have up there and what we are going to be is excavating our portion and then in the future everybody can piggyback on it.

Discussion.

On site we will have to do the ZIRO.

In conclusion, we think this is a good fit in the area and that it will help the downtown area and increase the tax base.
Discussion.

We think that it satisfies an obvious need in town. We hope that you will vote in favor of the special permit application so we can proceed to site plan.

Discussion on the onsite ZIRO which needs to be done to insure this doesn't affect the adjacent property owners.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

Pamela DePaolo, 54 Delahunty Drive. I am not necessarily in favor or against this application but I would like to make some comments.

I am very concerned about the drainage in this area. Explained there are inadequate measures in that area. And I hope it will be seriously looked at by this commission.

The other thing is this area needs a lot of serious upgrades in terms of on street parking.
Discussion.

I am concerned about pedestrian safety. Explained maybe more cross walks.

I would like to see the site plans have a green area, buffers and will there be an open space area?

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue spoke in favor of the application. He stated that this would be an asset to the town. He spoke about the parking and he would like to see more than the 55 provided. It will be a great boon to our tax rolls.

Jim Jones, 962 Savage Street. This is an excellent proposal for this area and I think it will fit in really well with the downtown and it seems that they have already considered the issues of parking and drainage and are already working toward resolving any they have. I am definitely in favor of this.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

Business Meeting

The Chair reminded everyone for Item A & B we will seat Ms. Locks for Mr. Sinclair.

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

Mr. Librandi advised this is ready for action. Mr. Macchio made a motion to approve as laid out with Alternative A so that if the Y wants to keep the house there as instructed by the state then we already have the plan in place. And, if not, then let them go ahead with the other. I would make a motion to approve the plan as presented. Ms. Locks seconded.

Mr. Conroy stated based on the testimony given he cannot support it as presented due to concerns about safety with regard to the access along Route 10. I'm disappointed the applicant hasn't made a really simple fix to the unneeded hazard, in my view, and I don't think it's the right thing. He cited traffic safety downtown as an issue.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he would support the motion and asked the applicant to work with the historical society and those involved in the preservation of the building. Explained he would agree to allow the courts to make the decision on which way to go. The Y does an overwhelming amount of good stuff for the town and it is an anchor for the community. I do have a little concern about more pavement along North Main Street, but I believe the Y is a worthy cause to make an exception for. I trust the activities to come out of this are going to be positive.

I do agree to some respect to the accessways to Mr. Conroy and maybe we should talk about that more at site plan. But I will support the SPU.

Mr. Champagne said he was in favor but he would like to have them look at making this a south direction right in/right out only to avoid lane crossing going northbound as we continue with the site plan.

The Chair noted that the Y indicated they had positive discussions going forward on the Olney Building. The Y will take the town's interest at hand. I am in support of this, as well.

Motion passed 6 to 1 on a roll call vote with Mr. Conroy opposed.

B. 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. Librandi advised this is ready for action. If this is approved, we would like to have it approved with Alternate A dependent on the court's decision.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve with the stipulation set forth by the acting town planner. Mr. Champagne seconded.

Discussion about the concern expressed by Mr. Conroy regarding the ingress/egress.

Mr. Giudice asked for the item to be tabled. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to table which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. AA Denorfia Building and Development, special permit use application for a proposed mixed use 22 unit apartment building with 2,000 sf commercial space on first floor, with associated parking area, 76 and 82 Liberty Street SPU #523.

Mr. Librandi noted responses to comments have been received and this is ready for action.

The Chair reseated Mr. Sinclair.

This is a great application with the mixed use of residential and commercial. It will get more people downtown and foot traffic is a shot in the arm for business owners down there, commented Mr. Chaplinsky.

Parking, open space and on street parking can be looked at as we go forward to site plan, but the SPU, I will make a motion to approve concluded Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Conroy liked this as well. He did talk about the drainage and the site plan will have to look at that to see the numbers work.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy stated personally, the decks and the siding really don't fit. Just throw it out.

Mr. Sinclair said for the first time I think ever I will support these condos in downtown. I like the site plan. It has some issues, but I wholeheartedly support it.

The Chair voiced reasons for his support as this will bring people to downtown to help businesses thrive.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. AA Denorfia Building and Development, floodplain filling application, 76 Liberty Street FF #235.

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

E. B & R Corp. site plan application for proposed 2,400 sf office and attach 8,000 sf maintenance garage and proposed mulch processing and storage, 49 DePaolo Drive SPR #1621.1.

Jim Jones, Jones Engineering, North Summitt Street presented. This would be a site plan modification to a previously approved plan. The property is at 49 DePaolo Drive and is approximately 18.7 acres. We're proposing a 2400 sf office with a 10,000 sf attached maintenance garage. All associated parking, utilities and equipment parking area on the lower level.

Discussion of the locations on the map.

We've revised the internal layout of the lower level of the production area. We've aligned the new access road and we've actually cut one of the piles. Explained two other mulch piles added to increase the volume of mulch stored on the property.

The storage capability of the water quality basin has been increased to satisfy ZIRO.

Traffic flow and signage was discussed.

The access road added for internal use only for deliveries was pointed out and discussed.

The access out of the parking lot by the office was discussed. This is for internal use for office people traveling back/forth into this area (indicated) with no truck traffic on this.

We worked with staff and answered all comments. The one issue outstanding is an existing easement the town has over this site. (Indicated on map)

Extended discussion of the wording of the easement. Mr. Jones said the proposal would be to change this easement to move the road to this position (indicating).

Staffing on site would be a small office staff of two or three office people and one or two mechanics clarified Mark Vigneault of B & R.

Refer to the traffic study for numbers on truck traffic which was asked by Mr. Chaplinsky.

More discussion on the easement and the wording.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the application with the stipulation that the town attorney's office approve the language of the revised easement language. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call.

F. Proposed new text for A-frame and temporary wire signs, Section 13-02M and 13-14 ZA #569.

Mr. Sinclair stated that for reasons stated earlier, he would be stepping down on this application. The Chair seated Ms. Locks for Mr. Sinclair.

Mr. Kalkowski quickly went over the proposed changes to the temporary sign regulations.

After a lengthy discussion regarding the changes, the following stipulations were summarized by Mr. Kalkowski:

- As far as the fee, the town Council will set that.
- Add on an annual basis to Item M.
- As far as Items F & I, we agreed that we want to simply introduce the similar language we have in our outdoor dining regulation as far as distances.
- The changing of can and cannot to shall and may throughout the entire regulation.
- On Item 2 of the wire frame, removing the types of service organizations.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with Steve's recommended changes outlined. Mr. Champagne seconded.

Mr. Conroy commented he appreciated the work done on this but I believe we are approving text amendment changes without actually having the text in front of us. We make the applicants come in and make sure their I's are dotted and T's are crossed and I'm looking at a page here that has more red on it than a child's homework. I have to make a motion to table this at this time.

(No second.)

The Chair stated that the motion is for approval and we have a second as noted.

The Chair pointed out these are minor and in some cases grammatical changes. Nothing heavy duty here in my opinion.

Motion passed 6 to 1 on a roll call vote with Mr. Conroy opposed.

G. Kennedy Middle School renovations and expansion (SPR #1627) 1071 South Main.

Mr. Librandi advised comments have been reviewed and we have met with the applicant numerous times to go over the proposal. The checklist has been responded to in part. We are still working with them to move forward. We do believe this is ready for action.

Mr. Grappone pointed out the time sensitivity with this action. Both middle schools have to go up to the state with approval at this meeting or a special meeting.

Mr. Conroy asked for a copy of the latest site plan. We have DePaolo's but not Kennedy's.

Mr. Librandi asked for a moment to go and get the Kennedy plans.

The Chair advised this would be on hold and we'll do the next application.

H. DePaolo Middle School renovations and expansion (SPR #1553.1) 385 Pleasant Street.

Angela Cahill, Fletcher Thompson Architecture and Engineering. This evening our team will be presenting the site layout and traffic engineering designs. We have individually, Barry Blades, landscape architect, Stephen Giudice, civil engineer and Mike Galante from Frederick Clark Engineering. Each will present their completed designs and where they are in the individual approval process with the various local and state agencies and authorities. They are working with the utility companies, also. They will summarize how they have addressed the staff comments for each school.

The final estimate is being developed at this time. Mr. Grappone mentioned the time sensitive nature of this and we appreciate your willingness to consider that.

As Mr. Grappone mentioned, the state will be reviewing both projects in the next few weeks for plan review.

We'd like to mention the design team has worked very closely with the town staff and have had various meetings to address their questions. We've reviewed the site plans with the building official, fire marshall, the building committee, school administrators and construction manager, who is also here this evening, and then quite closely with the BOE facilities department. Mr. Cox is present. Mr. Pocock, Chairman, of the building committee is also present.

It is our intention to present the projects by the design team and if you have any questions for any of the individuals we are all present at the time.

Starting with DePaolo, I do have facts and figures in terms of the buildings. The school renovations themselves are identical. This stands for both schools: existing square footage is 5,000 sf on the lower level and 61,500 sf on the ground level and 33,000 sf on the upper level equaling 99,500 sf.

When previously presented for special permit use on one of the projects we were looking at an additional ground level of 23,000 sf and a two story addition of 7,000 sf. Since then, the project has been slightly reduced by 6,000 sf total.

Previously presented we had four separate additions and the two small additions here (indicating) for faculty dining and cafeteria expansion has been eliminated. The two story addition has been made smaller; both corners have been notched out. And,

the main ground floor addition has also been made smaller effectively eliminating the equivalent of 1.5 classrooms in that area.

Subsequently we have made some slight changes with the previous submission in terms of the ball field and site layout work.

As to schedule and enrollment, I'll be happy to answer after the presentations.

Barry Blades, landscape architect. I'll take you through the basic design of the sign plan. Others will talk about the traffic analysis and storm drainage.

Detailed presentation of the site plan layout noting the building additions, parking and circulation modifications and then the athletic fields where we are proposing minimal work. The fields will remain as is and we are proposing to do some required by code handicapped accessibility to the areas of the two ball fields.

Traffic circulation for the 14 buses required and visitor parking was explained and pointed out on the site plan layout. Parent drop off and parking and staff parking was discussed.

Mr. Conroy gave his comments regarding the traffic circulation patterns, parent drop off and parking. Bus queue was commented on, as well. This seems to be a problem that hasn't been addressed.

Discussion.

Elimination of the tennis courts allowed for a paved play and parking area. There is a service drive to accommodate police and fire apparatus. We are planning to gate off that area so it is not used in an unauthorized fashion.

Discussion.

A small patio outside the cafeteria was noted. The screened dumpster and recycling bins were pointed out.

The reductions and eliminations from the original plan are summarized as follows from the building perspective by Ms. Cahill:

- cafeteria addition
- faculty dining addition
- two other additions got smaller in the corners

From a site plan perspective added Mr. Blades:

- The initial plan had a much more extensive renovation to the athletic fields. We flip-flopped the baseball and softball fields and by doing that we had a shorter outfield dimension and we were able to bring the bus queue down further to lengthen the bus queue and get additional parking in and extending this out further. Some regrading was happening in the fields. We had always planned to eliminate the tennis courts.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy noted this schools has more parking spaces than Kennedy. Is there a reason for that? Mr. Blades responded the parking counts for the two schools are:

- DePaolo had 192 plus 6 handicapped spaces.
- Kennedy has 171 plus 6 handicapped spaces.

We tried to max out the parking to the extend we could.

Mr. Conroy said DePaolo has significantly less area in front of the school. You're kind of boxed in for the circulation patterns for parking. The 42 spaces in the center lot are causing problems. Are they all necessary? Can you reduce it to 21 or 20 which would allow you more room as you intend to have access through the parking lot for parent pick up --- which I think is going to be a problem. When someone backs up, it is going to block the queue. Any thoughts?

Discussion.

Queues for parent parking were discussed in response to a question by Mr. Conroy.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said he was in favor of the one way south through the parking lot. Explained.

With regard to the site plan, another concern by Mr. Conroy was a pedestrian safety issue. Explained the need for a crosswalk.

Mike Galante, traffic consultant. Before I get into the traffic study portion of it which relates to the campus circulation, with any traffic study and we've done many for schools around the state, the first concern is safety. The second one is to separate the buses and drop off and pick up. It is key to any plan. We're dealing with this school and this location.

As far as the center entrance being an entrance only, we thought about that. I would suggest as the traffic consultant, if we force the parents to come in at the entrance only, drop off

and pick up, come around and come around again to pick up and drop off, we're going to have serious traffic congestion and back up. Mr. Conroy elaborated on that comment.

Discussion.

The sports buses in the loop were discussed. If we leave them up front, it will change the whole operation of the 14 buses picking up and dropping off. The back drive has been designed to accommodate the sports buses coming out after the traffic has left.

Discussion.

We are trying to move traffic safely. Not fast, but safe.
Discussion.

We did a traffic study with counts in October which I will run through. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.) Also, there is an updated report dated December 20, 2012 and we have extra copies tonight.

Mr. Conroy had no issue with the traffic report and no need to go over it. All commissioners agreed. No grand scale changes.

Mr. Galante said it is all about safety in terms of traffic circulation.

Mr. Grappone added today staff met with Officer Petro who is in charge of traffic in this area and there was a concern about traffic spilling out on to Pleasant. He looked at the parent drop off area and it is at least double if not more as far as queueing and they were pleased to see that.

Mr. Conroy discussed the sports bus issue again.

No other questions for the traffic consultant.

Stephen Giudice explained he was charged with handling subsurface storm drainage and sanitary sewer connections, water and gas and erosion and sedimentation controls.

We have approximately 1 acre of impervious surface on site. It is not located in a floodplain so there is no issue. Our flows run toward Pleasant Street and south towards Woodruff Street.

He pointed out the two analysis points where they tied in.

The total drainage area for the site is 16.01 acres.

Proposed infiltration systems were indicated on the plan and explained.

The sanitary sewer service was explained noting it ties into the existing system in Pleasant Street.

Fire hydrants were pointed out.

We have submitted responses to comments from staff. There are a few outstanding items as the water department has to give their blessing to the plan.

That completes the presentation on DePaolo.

Mr. Librandi added if this is acted on tonight, we would like to add the stipulation that responses to comments are met for approval. Most of them are engineering comments.

Mr. Grappone noted a lot of the comments had to do with suggested changes in trying to utilize the existing system which they have incorporated as best they could. The fire marshal, final review on the life safety code along with the building inspector on the plans. These are going to go out as a construction management package so they will be developed over time and let out for bidding. The individual trades would come in for permits. The more items we can address up front the less change orders there are on the project.

We would like to stipulate:

- Fire Marshal final review along with any building plans which have not been fully developed.
- The Southington Water Department final plan review.
- Drainage calculations final review.

All other issues have been addressed added Mr. Grappone, although we did not receive updated plan sets.

Mr. Sinclair asked for a clarification of the stipulation. Mr. Grappone said we should stipulate the December 27, 2012 checklist. Item 3,4, and 6. Also Item 14.

Discussion.

Mr. Gage asked if variances were necessary for the dugouts. Discussion.

Mr. Blades explained we are not proposing dugouts. The improvements proposed consists of providing a way to get to the location and in some cases we will replace the backstop and providing a new area for a team bench on both sides and spectator viewing areas. No structures there.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulation that Items 3,4,6 and 14 on the staff checklist dated December 27, 2012 are met to staff's satisfaction.

Mr. Conroy recommended it be the entire staff checklist.

Mr. Chaplinsky amended his motion to include the entire December 27, 2012 checklist. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Sinclair advised he would be voting "no". We had a rule on this commission since I've been here that if you don't have final plans and we're not sure what we're looking at, we don't approve it. So for that reason I'll vote against this.

Mr. Chaplinsky said it was disappointing with the consultants that we got to the point we are at with a compromise in the services we originally sought out to get. The consultants should understand it is disappointing. I believe education is a foundation for a town. This is an improvement but certainly one I think we could have done better on.

Motion passed 6 to 1 on a roll call vote with Mr. Sinclair opposed.

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

Angela Cahill, Fletcher Thompson, introduced the item. All comments I made previously about the building are the same for Kennedy Middle School but the site is different so I will let the team proceed. Thank you.

Barry Blades, landscape architect. Same scope of work as we have for DePaolo. The building additions and total renovation of the site, as you can see, and same improvements for the existing athletic fields with the code updates (indicating).

A difficult site to try to achieve all the objectives of the separation of vehicles, adequate queuing length for buses and for parents. Explained the traffic circulation pattern and parking areas proposed.

A new curb cut (indicating) will be introduced as inbound only. It will be where the parents will come in and staff will come in for queuing. This location was chosen to provide as much queuing as we could. It will be two lanes wide.

Discussion.

An additional parking lot and drop off area is provided (indicating) for two reasons: it can expand and lengthen the parent drop off queue. One way circular pattern and they can queue up again along the curb line. The other reason is so that we can have a certain number of visitor parking spaces that will have closer proximity to the front door. Signage was explained.

Staff parking was indicated on the map and explained.

The buffer was discussed. We've done a couple of things to increase the strength of that buffer. We've widened and moved the parking area and curb line about 4 or 5 feet further away from the property line. We have added plantings. Explained the staggered row added. We will work with the construction manager to phase the planting.

Discussion.

As to the fencing, we are proposing a new 6' high chain link fence (indicated).

Further discussion about the circulation pattern of traffic entering/exiting the site.

The service drive around the back of the building was described.

Special ed bus accommodation was discussed.

Dumpster and recycling bin location was pointed out.

Sports bus location was discussed.

We have paved play, basketball court here (indicating).

In response to a query by Mr. Chaplinsky the fencing was further discussed.

Mr. Conroy had a couple of minor pedestrian questions that were discussed.

Official revised plans have not been received by staff to-date. Mr. Chaplinsky said if we are going to act on this tonight, what are we going to reference? Mr. Grappone clarified we want to approve the staff checklist which is more up to date than the plan before you. We had several staff meetings with the consultants to go over those comments. Again, they are minor in nature with three to four stipulations of the original checklist. Again, we have not received final complete plans based on the checklist you have in your packet.

Discussion.

Mike Galante, traffic consultant, indicated as no further traffic presentation was required, he was all set. Just a note that the traffic is being reduced as the enrollment goes down for this school.

Stephen Giudice stated it is the same situation as with the previous school. Pointed out the one analysis point. We are reducing our flows on site per the regulations. We have subsurface pipe systems (indicated). We have a few infiltration systems similar to the previous site.

We have been working closely with Jim and Rob. It may seem like you don't have the latest plans but we've been going back and forth a lot trying to get everything addressed for tonight's meeting.

Mr. Librandi stated if this is acted upon, we would like to add the checklist of December 19th to the entire motion to verify that everything we require is being done to update the site plan.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulations that the December 19th checklist needs to be completed to staff satisfaction as well as update the site plans on file to include the things that we talked about today - the fence and some of the other changes that were here. Staff has assured us these things are taken care of. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Sinclair stated that for the reasons discussed earlier, I am voting against this. Quite frankly I am not sure how to put this. I am speechless. Our middle schools we are approving here and I can't remember what the numbers are on this project as I don't have any revisions on that end, but we don't even have finished plans in front of us. I don't know who to blame on this one, the consultants, people in town government who are overseeing it, but I would be ashamed. So I am going to vote "no".

Motion passed 6 to 1 on a roll call vote with Mr. Sinclair opposed.

Mr. Conroy commented that he didn't want to give the impression that I am real happy about not having the information in front of us. I realize the town is up against it from a financial standpoint, so the consultant has made a good faith effort to address the staff comments. But having sat on the process review committee, this is what we spent all summer doing. We spent all summer talking about how we are not going to approve stuff that isn't complete in front of us. I don't want my vote

tonight or give the impression that this is an acceptable thing. By all rights both of these applications should have been denied for incompleteness. Recognizing the spot that the town is in, we try to do our best here. Really, it is really kind of beyond the margin of error that I think everyone is comfortable with.

I. SRS, request for release of \$15,500 E & S Bond, 199 Lazy Lane (SPR #1586).

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

J. Burger King, request for release of \$2,700 PI Bond, 800 Queen Street (SPR #1602).

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

K. Lake Compounce, request for release of \$7,230 E & S bond, parking lot expansion, Phase I (SPR #1527.1).

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

L. Central Connecticut Contractors, LLC, release of \$4,700 Public Improvement bond, Industrial Drive S #1262.

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

M. Central Connecticut Contractors, LLC, release of \$40,000 E & S bond (Phase I), Industrial Drive S #1262.

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

N. NBA, LLC, release of \$24,000 maintenance bond, Timberwood Drive S #1264.

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

O. NBA, LLC release of \$2,500 E & S bond, Timbercrest Estates, S #1264.

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

P. East Hollow Estates, release of \$5,250 E & S bond, East Street S #1282.

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

Q East Hollow Estates, release of \$3,400 Subdivision bond, East Street S #1282.

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

7. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

A. Lovley Development, Inc., request for Zoning Regulation Amendment of Text, Section 5-01.N of the Zoning Regulations ZA #570, January 15.

B. S. Carpenter Construction Company, 2 lot resubdivision application, 176 Townline road, Lot #3, Strawberry Fields S #1259.3, January 15.

Both items to be put on for public hearing on January 15th, 2013, Tuesday.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Reminder: Picture on January 15, 2013 at 6:30 pm. Here at this location.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Mr. Librandi advised:

- S. Carpenter Construction Co., 20 lot resubdivision application, S #1259.3.

- Lovely Development Inc., zoning regulations amendment, ZA 570.

- Betty J. Cole request for proposed zoning boundary change from B to R-12, ZC #542.

10. PZC SUBCOMMITTEES

Regarding West Street, Mr. Chaplinsky advised he would update at the next meeting.

Mr. Kalkowski said the next thing they will focus on is our livestock and poultry regulation. We'll report out at next meeting.

11. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:32 o'clock, p.m.)