

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing and Regular Meeting
February 4, 2014

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on February 4, 2014. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

Paul Chaplinsky	Jennifer Clock
Stephen Kalkowski*	James Macchio
Kevin Conroy	Susan Locks
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: James Morelli, Jr.

(*Arrived at 7:08 o'clock, p.m.)

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz?

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development
Keith Hayden, Town Engineer
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney

Absent: Anthony Cervoni, Alternate
Joe Coviello, Alternate
Ryan Rogers, Alternate

The Chair seated Mr. Morelli for Mr. Kalkowski. A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular Meeting of January 7, 2014

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Macchio did note for the record that he did read the Minutes from the last meeting and watched the video replay.

5. Public Hearings

A. Request for change of zoning district boundary, Wonx Spring Road, Map 62, Parcel 142 from I-1 to R-12 (ZC #544)

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville representing the applicant presented.

This is an application of Wonk Road Partnership proposing to change property on Wonx Spring Road from I-1 industrial to R-12 residential. It is approximately 30 acres encompassed in one parcel.

There is a long history behind this property. Originally it was submitted for a 9-lot industrial subdivision. We did go to the conservation commission and this commission and did receive approvals. However, those approvals were appealed to the court system. The applicant and the town are both in the process of defending those decisions currently.

The applicant asked me to take a look at changing this to a residential zone. It is not our normal course of action but we decided this property was unique enough to warrant the request and come forward with this application.

I did bring a copy of the subdivision plan of what was being proposed for 19 lots to the conservation commission and to the planning & zoning commission which was submitted on Monday. (Showed and explained the plan.)

The northern portion of the property has 19 building lots and a proposed road to be known as Hunters Landing. The detention basin location was noted. All development is proposed to be outside of the environmental land use area.

We are trying to work with some of the abutting property owners as there were some encroachment issues and we're trying to deed off property in certain areas that would alleviate the encroachment issues. Try to be a good neighbor as we move forward.

Referring to the zone change map, I stress this isn't our normal course of action. It is a unique piece of property. We did come in with the subdivision for an industrial zone which is what is permitted but that has not gone smoothly due to residents' concerns about how that will affect their quality of life. After a lot of deliberation, the applicants have decided to move forward in this direction.

We did receive the town planner's comments about changing industrial properties to residential and how this is not the typical direction you take. I agree with that, but I think you have to look at this property in a different light. If we look at this as an approved industrial subdivision, we still have the legal system to go

through and get a favorable opinion from the courts on. That's possible. The fear is that we go that route and get that approval and now we have nine building lots which means nine applications to the conservation commission and nine appeals to those approvals and nine applications to the planning & zoning commission and nine appeals to those approvals. This property will not be producing the normal tax base maybe ever due to the fact that the neighbors are uncomfortable with the proposal and are willing to put their money where their mouth is and stand behind their beliefs.

We think in this situation this is the best alternative for the town, for the applicant and for the abutting property owners.

Any questions, we're more than happy to answer them.

(Mr. Kalkowski entered the meeting.)

(The Chair reseated Mr. Kalkowski for Mr. Morelli.)

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Frank Punzo, 170 Wonx Spring Road. I'm speaking on behalf of the neighborhood group. This is a very emotional issue for the residents involved. One thing that has been clear in all of our discussions and meetings is that we would prefer the property to be preserved as open space; however, we are also realistic in knowing something is going to be developed.

We have a very large group of people and I'm not sure it is possible to achieve a unanimous agreement in a group that is that large especially with such an emotionally charged topic. We do have an overwhelming majority that is in favor of this proposal.

The proposal to rezone the property to residential is part of an agreement reached by the residents, the town and the developer. As part of this agreement the northern portion of the property will be developed residential and the southern portion will be preserved as open space. This agreement is a substantial concession and will clear up all outstanding court matters. It also addresses our main issues to this point.

From a health and safety perspective, preserving the southern portion of the property addresses our issues about digging, roadways and disturbance on the ELUR. (Environmental Land Use Restriction)

Also converting it to residential removes the issues with the trucks and reduces the total traffic flow that would occur with an industrial subdivision.

From an environmental perspective, preserving the southern portion of the property addresses out wetlands issues, wildlife issues as well as the impacts to the Quinnipiac River.

We are in support of this proposal and ask this commission to approve the rezone from industrial to residential.

(Those speaking against the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. That may not be a tax producing parcel this year, next year or the year after. But in the long run, that's the kind of industrial land that we should think long and hard before we change it to residential.

We still have plenty of room to build residential. We do not have a lot of I-1 or I-2 land. In the long run, we would be better off waiting for it to be built industrial.

As far as building it residential, people surrounding may think that's a good idea. Referred to Love Canal in New York. We don't put residential in a former polluted site.

Discussion.

It's as simple as that. Think long and hard about what is proposed. Residential into a former Superfund Site or Hazardous Waste Site. Contaminated. It should be industrial. It is as simple as that.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Giudice said this isn't the same as upstate New York. We have to rely on the experts of the State of Connecticut. Our development is outside of the ELUR area. We are comfortable this is a viable piece of property to develop. We think this is a sound application.

Mr. Phillips noted receipt of a letter today. It is against the application. It is from Frank Castellano, 112 Wonx Spring Road. (On file in the planner's office.)

The Chair closed the public hearing.

B. Estate of Barbara Gugliotti, resubdivision application for 4 lots (plus existing house lot) Glenwood Park Road, Assessor's Map 64, Parcel 106 S #1301)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant. It is a four lot subdivision, expansion of the existing cul de sac. We had a few comments which we have addressed and unless you have questions, it is ready for action.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing for this evening.

6. Business Meeting

A. Request for change of zoning district boundary, Wonx Spring Road, May 62, Parcel 142 from I-1 to R-12 (ZC #544) continued from January 7th.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky asked if town staff had record of the contamination and hazardous waste for this site that were discussed during the public hearing? Any concerns brought forth with respect to this parcel. Mr. Sciota responded he didn't believe the planner or the engineer have had any objection to it. I'm sure they know the restrictions on the property and my understanding is based on the presentation that the property in question where they'll be developing is outside of the restricted area. The ELUR area can't be touched.

The Chair referred to a correspondence from the SPD which did some fact finding in regards to safety and turning radiuses and it was not favorable for an industrial application in their opinion. We rely on their opinion as they are the safety experts in town. It would fall to the town to repair those roads with new signage and widening of roads, et cetera. Mr. Sciota concurred. If something is approved and out experts say there is some sort of offsite situation that had to be corrected for the public safety that would be up to the taxpayers of Southington to do.

Mr. Conroy made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Locks seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky agreed with the motion. I feel this is a difficult situation and unfortunately we do have to consider taking industrial land and making it residential. I would like to ask that we take serious consideration to the economic developer's request to look for parcels in town for industrial. We are at a shortage of industrial land. I don't think we can do it at the safety of the residents, so I'll be voting in favor of this.

Discussion.

The Chair addressed I-84 and the access to this property. We have to consider that.

Motion passed 5 to 2 on a voice vote with Mr. Kalkowski and Mr. Macchio opposed.

B. Estate of Barbara Gugliotti, resubdivision application for 4 lots (plus existing house lot) Glenwood Park Road, Assessor's Map 64, Parcel 106, (S #1301) continued from January 7th.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Lovley Development, Inc. 95 lot open space subdivision application, 300 Welch Road (S #1302)

Andrew Quirk, professional engineer and principal with Kratzert, Jones & Associated represented the application.

We have addressed a lot of the issues. But to summarize, we did complete all comments from the planner and the engineer for the project. Also, the applicant will be granting the town the necessary easements for public sewer should the public sewer be extended to this area to serve the project. Also, we did meet and work closely with the town attorney so we can properly and legally arrange the public golf course. That's in place, as well.

We did submit separate phase plans as part of the DEEP requirement. We did have to submit as part of the SPU but there is a Phase III plan that specifically shows the access will be from Welch Road for construction. That's detailed on the plans, as well.

I'll take any questions.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the golf course. Mr. Sciota explained the agreement between the applicant and the town. They retain ownership of the property. The town gets the development rights and the conservation easement over the property so it is maintained as a golf course and improvements to a golf course. The town does not want to take ownership to a golf course for a lot of reasons. The town is very well protected in knowing it will always remain as an open space, active recreational area. They have the right through the town council to make modifications to that but the key is it maintains a golf course and they can come back for structures to maintain the use of a golf course. We are fully protected and the legal division is very happy with the fact we are not taking title but we can control the land through the two methods mentioned.

There is written documentation on the subdivision plan.

Mr. Conroy asked about construction accesses for Phases I and II. Is that shown anywhere? Mr. Quirk it is not shown as it is so far remote from the site, but it is part of the SPU approval --- a stipulation.

Mr. Sciota commented the town is putting a major construction effort in that quadrant, especially sewers. I cannot say enough and I'll speak on behalf of the engineer and the planner, how helpful this applicant was to push that program forward and the assistance in the easements as mentioned here. I'll say publicly, on behalf of the staff, that we're grateful to the applicant to assist us in doing what is very important for that quadrant of town and publicly thank him for that.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with stipulations that the planner has provided us in writing today on correspondence dated February 4, 2014.

1. Applicant adheres to the stipulations outlined in the fire, health and water department letters as dated above.

2. If not already, incorporated into the revised plans, engineering has recommended the following stipulations:

- When parcel 165019 and the parcel proposed for the future maintenance facility are required by the developer, the developer will work with the engineering department to finalize the necessary future sewer easements for the pump station and gravity sewer line.

Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Lovely Development Group, proposed office and retail center, 1085 West Street (Map 131, Parcel 011) SPR #1666)

Sev Bovino, planner with Kratzert, Jones represented the applicant. The landscaping plan was discussed. He pointed out existing facilities.

The property is at 1095 West Street next to the UCONN Medical Center and other medical offices. The land area is 8.49 (+/-) acres. It is zoned Business. It is served by public water and sewer.

The proposal is for a mixed use development of multiple buildings and uses. There is a 10,000 sf medical building in the back of the property. A 3,075 sf restaurant in the front with drive thru. A 6,242 sf restaurant on the southwest corner, sit down restaurant with no drive thru. And, a 32,480 sf retail /office space mixed. A bank is proposed on the southerly end with a drive thru. Total of 51,797 sf.

The lot coverage allowed is 25% and the proposal is 14.7%.

The lot frontage requirement is 100' and this property has 618' (+/-) frontage.

Number of parking spaces are 369 spaces which accommodate all uses proposed on this plan.

All proposed buildings are slab on grade.

Based on Section 12-02.05 open space landscaped area needs to be provided on the property and that is in the ratio of 20 sf for each parking space. Totals 7,380 sf. Our proposal is for 13,000 sf. The landscaped areas are within the parking area. There is additional green in the back and on the sides.

The project proposed one right in, only turn on the south side of the property so that relieves some pressure at the light. Explained.

The existing main drive at a temporary signal which will turn into a permanent signal. That's the main drive for the entire project. An escape route to Curtiss Street and the other development was shown.

Hesketh & Associates did the traffic study which concluded that the traffic volumes associated with this development can be accommodated on the local roadway. That information together with all plans will be submitted to the state for approval after your action.

The traffic report was submitted to staff with the application.

The project shows internal sidewalks along the shopping area, restaurant and medical center as well as sidewalks along the entire frontage of West Street.

This proposal has incorporated many, if not all, of the ideas this commission wanted to see along the West Street Corridor: additional landscaping, colorful berm along West Street. We propose a row of boxwood with the berm so we can see green all year round. And, we have flowering shrub groupings to make it look nice.

We incorporated rain gardens in this project in the front and parking areas. Explained.

We incorporated brick pavers or stamped pavement at main crossing areas. We have benches and planters and flower boxes including a small fountain in the atrium as a focal point.

We incorporated New England architecture into this, as well. Pitched roofs. Lighting will be full cut off fixtures with recessed lens as required in the regulations.

We have incorporated reducing the number of curb cuts. This proposal together with the other buildings have over 1,000 lf of frontage on West Street. We only have one curb cut, the driveway with the signal and one right in, only off of West Street.

We believe we have incorporated a lot of the commission's ideas in this plan.

Staff provided us with comments. All of them were addressed and response provided in writing.

Andrew Quirk can discuss circulation, drainage and grading.

If you have any questions, we'll be glad to answer them.

Mr. Conroy commented it looks very well put together. Thank you very much. It seems to conform to what we are looking for in this area. My compliments to you.

Mr. Phillips added it is ready for action with stipulations.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the town planner's stipulations noted in a memo dated February 4, 2014.. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky said this is exactly what we are looking for on West Street. I thank the applicant and the folks working on this application. We've incorporated interconnectivity, we've incorporated green space. Full cut off lighting. I would like to say though, for town staff, I would like the staff to use this plan as a guide for discussions when applicants do come forward looking for direction in advance of coming to the commission with a plan. In preplanning meetings, these are the types of things we would like to incorporate into projects in this town. Especially West Street.

Discussion.

The Chair said this is one of the first applications before us after the West Street Subcommittee's hard work. The bar has been set. What Lovely did, that's our vision and what we are looking for. Thank you.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Request for approval under Section 8-24, Southington Water Department to install approximately 100' of new 12" water main on Newell Street bridge crossing (Quinnipiac River) MR #481.

Fred Rogers, Superintendent of the Southington Water Department presented. This project is to suspend a 12" water main approximately 100'. He gave a brief history.

This creates a redundant feed to our West Queen Street Pump Stations and our Robert Porter tanks and creates a pressure zone here in town for supply.

It has some other positive effects. We are able to feed Redstone and the West Queen Street and Town Line Road areas. Residential and commercial customers.

It is being designed at this point. We hope to bid it and get underway in early spring.

Mr. Sciota noted that this is paid for by ratepayers and not the general taxpayers.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC, site plan application for proposed 2,400 sf retail/office building, 196 Main Street (SPR #1648.1)

Stephen Giudice represented the applicant. This is the site on Route 10 next to the Derynoski School. The applicant has purchased the property and they're looking now to use it for retail or professional offices or a combination thereof.

We're requesting permission to approve the site as is. The town planner did have some comments about parking and we believe that we will be able to meet the parking requirements depending on the user. We are talking to four different people.

Mr. Sciota said after the approval, they have to get the permit. That's where they'll catch the parking.

Mr. Phillips said with the one additional parking space, if necessary, that's something that typically has staff level approval. Mr. Sciota said that is the normal case.

Mr. Phillips noted some stipulations he put in his comments and it is really the commission's discretion. It is a proposal without a specific tenant basically.

The stipulations:

- Architectural renderings be provided and approved by the planning department staff.
- All site lighting to be the full cut off style down lighting.
- Any and all rooftop mechanicals shall be effectively screened from view on all sides.

- All attached and detached signage and sign lighting shall be in conformance with Section 13 of the zoning regulations.

- Screening to be provided around the proposed dumpster pad either fencing and/or vegetative. Vegetative screening to be provided at the rear of the property to effectively shield the existing residential uses.

- Add additional landscaping to supplement proposed tree plantings at the front of the property along parking as approved by town staff. Just beautification type vegetative protection.

Mr. Conroy asked if with the new use, this is no longer proposed to be used for food service. So, the health department approval for food service use given in August is no longer relevant to this application? Mr. Phillips said it was his understanding it has been changed to office/retail and it is not food service. Therefore, the health department doesn't get involved. Mr. Conroy asked if that could be stipulated on the approval.

Mr. Giudice said, if we have a food service user, why would we want to get rid of that?

Discussion.

Mr. Sciota said if you are worried about the previous application, you can rest assured that this not here. If that's your concern, that's not the process here.

Mr. Giudice said he has been engaged to start the process on another use.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the town planner's stipulations given in today memo dated February 4th, 2014. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Lovley Development, reduction of subdivision bond from \$56,000 to a new amount of \$40,000 Recko Farms Subdivision S #1277.

Mr. Phillips indicated it was ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

H. Homewood Suites, release of \$19,200 E & S bond, 1096 West Street (SPR #1525.1)

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion and Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

I. Lina Perillo, release of \$3,000 E & S bond, 210 & 218 Queen Street (SPR #1458).

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. Walmart, request for release of \$3,000 trailer bond, 235 Queen Street (SPR #1210.11)

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. Mt. Vernon Estates, LLC, request for release of \$4,600 E & S bond, St. John's Place (S#1283)

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

L. AA Denorfia Building & Development, request for reduction of subdivision bond from \$533,000 to a new amount of \$105,000, Walker's Crossing (S#!292)

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion which Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

M. Kurt Holyst, request for release of \$3,300 E & S bond, 897 South Main Street (SPR #1594)

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

7. Discussion: with operator of 1126 Queen Street

Mr. Phillips stated that the subject site has been subject to an enforcement action by the ZEO on the basis that the operation's activity being carried out at the site don't have specific zoning permit approvals. At this point in time, there has been evidence gathered by the town staff as well as evidence received by an abutting property owner. We're at the stage where we have issued a Notice of Violation and the next step in the enforcement process would be a cease & desist order. The commission has requested that the owner/operator come in and discuss his activities.

Jim Voisine at 1126 Queen Street. I spoke to the ZEO on Friday and he said just come to the meeting. I had been in contact with him prior. We discussed some of the issues. It doesn't seem like it was going to be a big problem.

The Chair said the commission was sent some photographs of some possible violations on your property with regards to storing items on the property that are not allowed. Has the ZEO or planning department discussed those with you?

Mr. Voisine answered they did talk about abandoned items and the oil truck that's parked on the property --- which I service. I also own Jim's Autobody at the same location.

Mr. Phillips added it was determined from the planning department file that there was a previous approval for a dealer/repairer's license for that location. In state law, you are able to transfer that under circumstances. We do not have evidence that this party is a benefit to those exemptions with transferring that dealer/repairers license. But there are other activities observed there that aren't consistent with that previous approval. That's kind of where we are at.

The chair asked Mr. Voisine to speak on that.

Mr. Voisine said he still maintains his used car dealer's license. I still do service work. It's all up to date and I have a copy tonight if you'd like to see it.

I also operate Route 10 Trader. It's a consignment shop and antiques. That's also what I do as an extension to my business. I sell used car parts and new parts, also.

So, I am confused.

Discussion of transferring of licenses. We have a repairers and dealer's license noted Mr. Chaplinsky. Was there a problem with the Traders business there? Mr. Phillips said from his description the Route 10 Traders appears as though it is a retail use. We only have approval for a dealer/repairers license, basically. We don't have a retail approval.

The process is there has to be an application for retail and auto repair needs to be approved by the town, a permit, stated Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Phillips said if in fact it is a completely different owner than previously approved, it would be subject to another dealer/repairer's location. It would be by this commission per state law.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated there is a process to come into conformance. The applicant has to do some work as far as identifying exactly what they are doing and wish to do and have it go through the proper approvals.

Discussion.

The Chair advised the owner/operator work closely with town staff to be sure he conforms to the regulations.

Mr. Sciota suggested, if your position is you have a valid dealer/repairer's license, get that clarification from the state and file it with the planner's office. There is one on the site and the question from the town is was that transferred to you or your entity. If it was you will get a clarification letter to file with the planner and that takes care of that.

Secondly, is you are operating a retail use that is not approved currently and you need to go through the planning process for that. The staff will help you with the forms.

There are also some complaints that there are things on the site that may not be appropriate to either one of those uses. You'll work with staff on that.

Mr. Voisine said he understood. However, he commented, the statement that the license was transferred is wrong. My license has been there for 27 years. (Showed a copy) I just renewed it in October of November of 2013. It is in my name.

Mr. Phillips encouraged Mr. Voisine through the ZEO to schedule a meeting and we can sit down and go through it all.

Explained he had a Trade Name for the Trader business at the Town Clerk's Office about 2.5 years ago. Just last month I was told I was in violation because of a complaint filed against me.

Discussion.

When I met with the ZEO I got the impression everything was going to be fine. Now I have a certified letter saying I'm in violation. He did talk about a vehicle parked on my lot --- two vehicles, actually. The oil truck I service. And, other vehicle is my own personal vehicle I use for my business. What am I doing wrong?

Discussion of the oil truck being there for service. A customer.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted you have your license for the repair and that's good. The Trader's thing, just work with the planner.
Discussion.

The bigger issues are regardless of those two businesses, what have been passed along are the nonconformances. It looks like you

have a van parked by the road, documented for a long time that is not in use or registered. We don't allow those types of vehicles to be parked by the road to be used as a signage.

I don't believe it is within our zoning regulations for you to have overnight storage of those trucks long term for the oil use because of the hazardous materials. There is potential for a zoning issue there.

Discussion.

Other things brought up was the storage of items in the rear of the lot. We have regulations around the size of the storage area based on the square footage of your building. It does have to be screened in. Explained the regulations.

As you go through the process, you are going to have to fix things to come into compliance to operate the business there. If you're out of conformance and other businesses come to us, they'll say that business is out of conformance, why can't I. We're trying to maintain consistency throughout the town.

Mr. Voisine said he understood. Since 1955, my building and location hasn't changed. It's always been a service or retail. I asked the town about the extension of my regular business.

Discussion.

Mr. Sciota explained you still have to follow up with zoning as to whether you can have a retail use on that property.

Mr. Voisine explained his retail use as selling used parts and new parts. I just added more to it.

Discussion.

The Chair asked the question: Are those things in conformity with an autobody/auto repair shop permit. We'll clarify it. Call and get a meeting with the ZEO and sit down and discuss it.

Mr. Voisine explained his operation has been clean for the past 27 years but he did have some medical issues recently. I've never had a violation before. The ZEO just told me to show up at the meeting.

Staff will work with Mr. Voisine following the meeting. Staff should photocopy the regulations and some areas that the applicant needs to bring into conformity so when an application comes back to this commission, we have some peace of mind all issues have been addressed before going through the approval process, added Mr. Chaplinsky. We want to help the applicant bring things into consistency and staff will help.

Discussion.

Mr. Voisine commented if he knew that's what he had to do, he would have done it 2.5 years ago.

The reason why the van is there is I was never told that the van had to be parked a certain amount of feet away from the street. It is behind poles that I have and I'm trying to slow down the traffic coming into my parking lot. I have cars that come into my parking lot doing U-turns. They crack the asphalt and spit rocks against the glass door; they broke the window three times now. That's one of the reasons. I'm so crowded, people can't fine me. They're trying to squeeze me.

When I use the van, the van is under my dealership's name. When I'm done with it, it goes back there.

8. Plan of Conservation and Development

The Chair announced Jennifer Clock would be chairing this subcommittee. She has some good ideas. He reminded everyone to review the previous plan of development and get comments to Jennifer.

9. Items to be scheduled for public hearing

None.

10. Administrative Reports

None.

11. Receipt of New Applications

Mr. Phillips passed around a sheet. 19-lot subdivision, Wonx Spring Road which was the subject of a zone change this evening. Denorfia Building & Development for a 1 new lot of a 3 lot resubdivison off of Savage Street. That'll be on for public hearing the first meeting in March.

Commissioner Comments

Mr. Kalkowski advised where his subcommittee is with garages. It is out for review by the regional planning agency and it should be on the first meeting in March. In particular we are addressing the size of garages. We are going to propose an SPU for more than three garages on a property to allow the capability for as many garages as we feel would be appropriate on a particular lot.

Discussion.

The ZBA variance process was discussed.

The garage size of 14 by 26 is what is proposed added Mr. Kalkowski.

12. Executive Session: pending litigation

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to go into executive session including the town planner, town engineer, the commission and town attorney to discuss pending litigation. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Meeting adjourned to executive session at 8:11 o'clock, p.m.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Planning & Zoning Commission entered executive session immediately following their meeting with the following in attendance in order to discuss pending litigation.

The following commissioners were present, viz:

Paul Chaplinsky	Jennifer Clock
Stephen Kalkowski	James Macchio
Kevin Conroy	Susan Locks
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: James Morelli

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/Town Attorney
Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development
Keith Hayden, Town Engineer

No motions were made or votes taken during executive session.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to adjourn from executive session.
Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

(Executive session was adjourned at 8:35 o'clock, p.m.)

REGULAR SESSION

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed unanimously.

(Meeting was adjourned at 8:36 o'clock, p.m.)

Mark J. Sciota
Acting Secretary