

**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting  
October 7, 2014**

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

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

Jennifer Clock	
Susan Locks	Paul Chaplinsky
Kevin Conroy	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: James Morelli  
Anthony D'Angelo

Ex-Officio members present were as follows:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development  
Keith Hayden, Town Engineer

Absent: James Maccio, Commissioner  
Anthony Cervoni, Alternate  
Joe, Alternate

The Chair seated Mr. Morelli for Mr. Macchio this evening. 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 September 16, 2014

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Kalkowski abstaining.

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

5. Public Hearings

A. Anthony M. and Deborah Pizzitola, Jr., Special Permit Application for a 54' x 40' garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to more than three, 72 Village Gate Drive (SPU #541) continued from September 16<sup>th</sup>.

Anthony Pizziotola, Jr., 72 Village Gate Drive, applicant presented. The public hearing was continued to allow the applicant to resubmit revised plans showing renderings for the upper level of the detached garage. He did submit. We do need a little bit more information when it comes to cross sections of that area. I believe you could consider approving this with a stipulation that the upper level must meet the building department calculations as a half story as part of the required zoning and building permits.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

B. Proposed zoning Test Amendment, Sections 2-01 A5 and 2.18 (recreational vehicles) ZA #581.

Mr. Phillips noted this proposal came out of the continuous improvement subcommittee. It has been a topic of discussion for at least years. The intention here is to propose new regulations that would be more inclusive and less restrictive as it comes to storage of RVs. Currently the regulation says they can be stored in the rear yard. The proposal in general is to allow RVs to be stored in the side yard, as well, with other certain stipulations of that regulation.

Mr. Chaplinsky conducted a survey on the town website to gather feedback on this regulation change.

Steve Kalkowski, Chair of the Continuous Improvement Subcommittee, stated this text change proposal has been going on for about a year now. We did attempt to revise these regulations and we did get some feedback before the denial.

We took the feed back to heart. A lot as around screening, side yards and so forth. The proposal before us today is - I want to stress - less restrictive than what we have on the books today.

Today we can only have RV parking in the rear yard 5' from the property line.

What we've proposed, where applicable and have residents have the room in their side yards is to allow that in the side yard as long as it doesn't encroach in any of the offsets per the zoning regulations.

And, also we felt it important to protect the abutting property owners to really allow and enforce appropriate screening for this so the abutters don't have to see the large RV right next to their side yard if it is stored in the side yard or in the rear yard.

We tightened up the regulations by doing some analysis of other regulations in there (Meriden, Cheshire, Plainville, Berlin) and we felt it important to introduce regulations that the RV has to be registered in the State of Connecticut. It has to be a registered vehicle in order to be there.

We feel that limiting to one per property is sufficient and appropriate.

That is the gist of the changes that we have. I'm anxious to have you look at the results of the survey. What we will see in the results is pretty much what I expected from the difference between RV owners and non-RV owners.

I'll turn it over to Paul and he can walk us through the results of the survey.

Mr. Chaplinsky added that the goal of doing the survey was to reach a broad group of people and get some perspectives and try the on-line method of getting feedback.

He presented a power point presentation. (Hard copy on file in the town planner's office for review or refer to the video on-line.)

The Chair reviewed the proposed wording and reminded everyone that what we are proposing is less restrictive than the current regulation.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. Spoke in favor of the proposed changes mostly. It is a vast improvement to allow them in the side yard. He had a problem with buffered or screened or located in a way to minimize visual impact. If RV owners have to go out and put a 6' fence 20' on their side yard, that is a real imposition. If someone is going to park an RV in their side yard, you are going to be able to see it over a 6' fence. It's not going to be hidden. Maybe you need to look hard at that new requirement.

Missing from this is the requirement that the RV is either parked on gravel or asphalt or concrete. If not, it makes no sense.

The other thing I would request is that it go into effect as soon as possible and our ZEO start enforcing the people who have moved their RVs literally in front of the front of the house and have their RVs parked right on the property line.

Stephen Giudice had a point of clarification. The interpretation of the side yards as presented is this specific to RVs or is that your interpretation of side yards/rear yards per your zoning regulations? The Chair said it is the side of the dwelling.

Thank you.

Michelle Allaire, 228 Lazy Lane. How about for a property that is behind another property - a rear lot. The person could park in a side lot plus the rear lot which is actually my driveway in front of my house.

Attorney Sciota stated that was correct.

At this time, I realize people use these for recreational reasons and there are true, valid reasons for this. Would there be no footage requirement from the neighboring property? They could park it right on the line.

Mr. Kalkowski interjected they have to honor the setbacks. Rear and side setbacks have to be honored.

This does not cover trailer hitches at this time.

Michael Riccio, 484 Meriden Avenue. I live on a corner lot. I don't have a back yard as far as town zoning. I have a camper in my side lot. Am I going to worry about this being a problem? I don't store it in the wintertime at my house but in the summer am I going to have a problem because I don't have 5' setback. My driveway butts my neighbor's property. It is hard for people with corner lots. If I move it into my side yard, it would be more of an eyesore for my neighbor. I'd have to take a fence down and pull it through my front yard to put it in the side yard. More of an eyesore for her.

The Chair said they would get the answer later tonight.

Stanley Malinowski, 180 McKenzie Drive. I am speaking in favor, especially the provision that applies for the screening and sheltering the RVs from the side of the neighbors and also from all ROWs.

I'm supportive of anything we can do to make the area look better.

Spoke of the circumstances with his neighbor who has a boat and RV. (Submitted pictures)

I have no objection to any of the ordinances but it would be a nice improvement visually to the neighborhood.

(Those speaking against the application)

Paul Okstra, 65 Maxwell Drive. He noted that some of the questions on the survey were confusing.

Comparing the regulations, you are going from rear yard to rear and side yard and it sounds like you're giving us something. But the old regulation was unenforceable and there was a problem with the word "storage". And, you are still using the word storage - confusing. Where does parking and storage start?

Can we park in the driveway? It is not clear. You should tell us right up front if it's no.

I think is regulation is offered for purely aesthetic reasons and it's ridiculous.

If the new regulations addressed safety concerns (sight lines at a stop sign) you can make a regulation that addresses so that so that police officers and ZEOs can take action.

I don't think this is a good regulation.

Number of complaints? Shouldn't you go by that?

Storage in the side or rear yard, most people don't have a driveway in their side or rear yard. Driving an RV in and out of your yard will damage it, especially if it rains or you have an incline.

Metal objects or vehicles placed on grass, is not good. It'll rust them quicker. To put gravel will cost a lot of money we can't afford.

Clarify parking versus storage.

I don't know what kind of screening you'd want to the neighbors couldn't see it from any angle. I'd have to have a 12' fence which is against the regulations. If I plant shrubs, I'd have to block all three neighbors from seeing it.

Spoke about not more than one RV on a lot.

Mark Colk, 115 Welch Road. My lot is not big enough to get it on the side or around the back. It can't happen. You have to be fair to allow us to do what we have to do.

Do we have somewhere in the town to put it?

Doreen Seneschall, 125 Welch Road. I ditto what everybody else said in front of me. Take into consideration how many people are here for camping and RVs and are taking care of them and worry about those not taking care of them and go after them.

Faith Sullivan, 30 Lawncrest Drive. I do not have an RV nor have I ever owned an RV. She has an RV outside her bedroom window and she has no problem with it. It's parked on their property, on gravel. Four months out of the year it's there and the rest of the time it goes into storage. It's not a big deal. Why can't they keep it there? Everybody is fine with it. No problem.

Taxes were discussed.

Scott Siarkowski, 147 West Street. I agree with it being registered. We need taxes in town. The screening thing bothers me like what everybody else has said. My RV is new, cleaned and washed. It looks good. It's registered.

The screening is an unneeded expense for people. My RV is in the back. But some people don't have a side yard or can get to the back yard.

The other thing is it says here it can't be used for human habitation. What about sleepovers in the driveway with kids?

Rob Phillips said the human habitation clause is because there are situations where clearly there are extension cords and things running to the actual RV and people are living there for a long period of time, day in and day out. It's a problem when they use it for their living quarters for a long period time. It's not for a nightly sleepover or anything like that.

Ann Marie Connaty. 1237 Mount Vernon Road. The regulations now do not say specifically it has to be parked in the back yard. It says: when parked in the back yard. Anybody's RV in their driveway, parked, and would be legal.

We pay taxes, why can't we park an RV in our driveways?

We are doing everything for special interests instead of the majority of the people. That's how we pass our laws now days.

You want them to buffer an RV that they take good care of. You want them to park it on dirt in their yards. That ruins cars.

If people are abusing the regulations, we have a Blight Ordinance.

If you are looking at any changes, you have to include driveways.

Tim Johnson, 67 Ferncliffe Drive. I am going to speak about the passion of owning an RV and I have some data that you need to build

into how you approach the regulation. We live for RVing, it gives us a sense of control and flexibility that we can afford to ignore.

Spoke about the RVs he has purchased over the last ten years and the taxes paid to the town and the state.

I'm probably in line with most of what you are asking but now you are asking me to buffer this RV from my neighbors. To try to erect bushes or fencing for units 42' long and 12.5 high will create a more visual impact than the RV itself.

If people are not able to meet all the regulations, there is the option for offsite storage which is a major cost impact. Insurance fees will rise.

Maintenance of an RV was discussed which is almost impossible to do off site.

I can support one per lot. I can even support Connecticut registration. I can support the 5' requirement.

But the buffering, screening, fencing, that's going to be almost impossible for any of us to do. That provision has to be seriously reconsidered.

Thank you.

Chris Parent, 44 Dunham Street. I ditto everyone's perspective. My concerns are that after the regulations many times, there is nothing in here that is enforceable that say anything about the RVs having to be in the back yard. There might be inferences or assumptions. It is not an explicit expectation.

The questions on the poll seemed ambiguous.

I think the new regulations are extremely restrictive. I agree it should be a registered vehicle, registered in Southington, even, if w could enforce something to that effect. Registered at the very least in the State of Connecticut.

I believe the Blight Ordinances could be enhanced to make sure if it parked there for two years and not moved there is something we can do. If it's not used, that's totally different.

Lastly, I have an RV that me and my family enjoy. I can adhere to all your rules except the last one regarding buffering. I would

have to put something up in front of it which would prevent me from getting to it. Doesn't make sense.

I think this is very restrictive for taxpaying citizens.

Jerry Zimmerman, Walkely Drive, Southington. I have no neighbors that are against my having a camper in the side yard. Many could not put their camper in their back yard. You'd have to put in possibly a gravel driveway and it would be an inconvenience for most of the campers.

In defense of people that have campers that do stick out in front of their house by a couple of feet --- they couldn't put the rig in the back yard, it would require them to store it at an offsite location. This would be a very big inconvenience.

Storage areas were discussed.

Taxes were discussed.

I'm in Southington four months out of the year and in Florida for six months of the year and here and there the other couple of months. With your comment, it has to be a Connecticut registration --- that has nothing to do with your vehicle on your lawn or being an eyesore. That could only mean one thing: you want our money. Fine. This would be an inconvenience for me as I choose to register the vehicle in Florida. That has nothing to do with where I park my trailer or what it looks like.

I do not want my trailer to be a blight on the neighborhood. But it sounds like you are purposely looking at trailers and motor homes and you're not considering people that don't mow their grass or who haven't cut their bushes and they're overgrown. You're not considering five unregistered cars in a yard. Commercial vehicles in the yard.

It has been good for 46 years and I can't understand why we need a change. Consider what people here have said today.

Thank you.

William Spring, 29 Lowrey Drive. He can't park his RV in the rear yard because of septic, et cetera. In 1975 I approached the town

and told them I wanted to put it on the side yard alongside the house. They told me to proceed. I had to excavate, put in a footing and wall.

If I go by your variation on this, my motor home sticks out about 5'. I'll have to tear down that wall again. Considerable expense.

I did place shrubs in the side yard and a tree in the front. The neighbors said it was satisfactory.

Your current proposal is geared to visual impact of an RV on residential property. Around town, on residential property, I notice boats on/off trailers. Trailers, ATVs, skidoos, jet skis, commercial vehicles including trucks, cherry pickers, payloaders, numerous vehicles parked on driveways or on the front lawn, unregistered vehicles up on blocks, waste high grass and weeds.

If visual impact is the issue, include all of the unsightly things in town.

If public or safety risk is the issue, clarify why only RVs are being targeted here.

The proposal as presented will not allow a registered out of state vehicle to be stored on the property. This seems discriminatory. Residents, who reside out of state for half a year plus a day, pay no tax and use no town services during that time. You're taking away their rights and they're not even here half the year.

I don't have a problem particularly with one RV on the property. But there doesn't seem to be a problem with the huge utility vehicles around and parked all over people's yards.

I commend you for trying to maintain and improve the beauty of our town and you've done a good job, but I do think you are going to start causing us a lot of expense and pain and I'm not sure we can do it.

Finding storage is difficult and expensive.

You need to look at the proposal and do a little bit of revision.

Keith McKeary, 41 Highwood Avenue. Some of the stuff is a little confusing. I want to ditto about the safety on the grass.

Spoke about the difficulty with the Blight Ordinance taking care of some issues on his street.

You are creating more aimed at the recreational user and it is unjust or untimely.

Spoke of the value of his RV to his family and quality of vacation time.

Ed Sauer, 104 Debbie Drive. I am saddened a few people have had a problem with RVs, however there are a lot of RVs in town and in my neighborhood. As far as I know, with no problems.

My trailer is in East Hampton --- they're getting my taxes.

I couldn't have moved the trailer to the back of my yard if I wanted to because there's a garage there.

He compared a camper to a cottage on wheels. We were able to take our kids where we wanted to and when we wanted to.

Thank you.

Russ Fuller, 26 Lucian Drive. Put on a short power point presentation in regard to his RV. (See video on line for full presentation.)

Spoke about the number of trailers allowed on one site. Spoke about side lines.

Don't jeopardize a good industry that helps education, economics of the world and helps family units. It's the wrong way to go about doing this. Look at it in the bigger perspective.

Attorney Kevin Hecht, 220 South Main Street, Cheshire, CT. I'm here this evening on behalf of Janet Haverkamp who is a resident at 18 Luty Drive, Southington. She is probably the reason we are all here. A neighbor of heir's complained. There was an enforcement action and as a result she pointed out 85 of the approximate 100 complaints that have been referenced. There are very few complaints. My client brought to the town's attention the number of violations to the existing regulation as it presently exists in an effort to show it

is unenforceable and she was being targeted because a single neighbor complained.

Most of the things she asked me to talk to you about have already been addressed. I will re-emphasize she is opposed to this regulation and the existing regulation particularly the existing one seems to target RV owners. There are many other types of vehicles which if you want to look at aesthetics that are more offensive.

Her RV is new, well kept and registered and insured and the taxes are paid. She can park it in the street, but she can't park it in her driveway. Something is wrong with that picture.

As others have said, buffering is just impossible. The fence ordinance doesn't permit you to buffer it. It is unworkable.

This regulation seems to be entirely about aesthetics. Passing a regulation purely for aesthetics is unconstitutional. There's no public health, safety, morals or welfare that are benefitted by this proposed regulation. It's simply because someone doesn't want to look at something someone else has. There is no reason for it.

Storage areas for RVs in town are limited.

One option in this regulation is that it would be considered storage after three days.

In closing, given the number of RVs, enforcing this regulation requires significant town resources to insure 100% compliance. The current regulation has not been enforced except upon complaint. I think it would be the same with this except there may be more complaints because I think it is more restrictive although now it permits side yard storage, it has many other conditions of storage such as the screening.

I ask you: what is the purpose of this proposed regulation? Is it public safety, welfare and morals that cause it to be on the table before you today or is it just plain aesthetics?

Thank you.

Josh Levin, 68 Maxwell Drive. I live on a corner lot. I live in a two family house. Both sides the families camp. There is a camper on either side of our house. Well pay taxes. We clean and take care

of them. They look nice, but if you limit it to one per property, how to tell the other one, sorry, yours has to go?

Thank you.

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

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Anthony M. and Deborah Pizzitola, Jr., Special Permit Application for a 54' x 40' garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to more than three, 72 Village Gate Drive (SPU #541) continued from September 16th.

Mr. Phillips said there is more information necessary in the renderings. The building department would require cross sections to verify the upper level is in fact and could be considered a half story. Once we have the information and it is verified, the zoning permit will be signed off on as well.

I would recommend a stipulation on the SPU approval that the upper level must meet building department calculations as a half story as part of the required zoning & building permit.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the town planner's recommendation on the stipulation. Ms. Clock seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted this is another example of work through the Continuous Improvement Committee. We are considering additional garage spaces now in residential properties to loosen that regulation and that comes to this board now versus the ZBA.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Proposed zoning Test Amendment, Sections 2-01 A5 and 2.18 (recreational vehicles) ZA #581.

Mr. Kalkowski thanked everyone for coming out. We're here to listen to you and support you. These proposed changes were a result of the Continuous Improvement Committee being asked to look at this.

We took it to heart and validated across other towns and cities. This was our proposal.

But listening to all of the discussion and commentary, I am going to recommend we table this and bring it back to look at a couple of the areas. Certainly, the screening. I understand where that would potentially be a hardship. We'll revisit the screening.

I do understand we have some residences and lots where the rear and side lots are not accessible. We need to go back and revisit that, as well.

Then we'll come back with something that will be comfortable and appropriate for all of you.

Mr. Chaplinsky said as to screening, I am not a big fan of fences. If you guys stick to that, my preference would be more natural vegetation.

There have to be some reasonable times where these could be stored versus parked.

The 5' in the rear yard, I'm all about this not being more restrictive. I'm about it being a little bit easier. I think we might want to differentiate if we consider setbacks still being the language, I think the intent of the existing reg is to allow storage in the rear yard. I don't think it should be any more restrictive than that in the rear yard. Including, buffering in the rear yard.

Connecticut registered, Southington registered versus another state, for me, just registered. It needs to be verifiable.

The corner lot ones, I think for the subcommittee, we have to recognize there are some people who aren't going to be happy and some people are going to be happy. If policies are enacted, there should be a way to go to zoning board of appeals, not necessarily prove a hardship but there is a difference between a hardship and an exception. In our reg, if we specify special exception, that provides an opportunity for people to not to have a hardship.

My biggest thing is I think this is incumbent upon the neighbors, also. We don't as a matter of course; the ZEO doesn't run around citing these types of things. These are all complaint based. We have to do some more work on that.

And, I am not vehemently opposed to this as people think I am. What's important is that people need to realize this is an issue for

some people and for some people it is an aesthetic issue. We have to consider the other side. It is a community issue and we have to talk about this stuff.

Two family houses? I would have never thought about planning for two family houses. Two RVs.

Mr. Conroy brought up we have some regulations that are old that are misinterpreted and hard to enforce. We have to go through these and try to make them more usable for the community. This fell under that.

I thank everyone for coming out. A lot of discuss was had about vehicles and other vehicles and there is some confusion. This is not really about vehicles. It falls under the regulations for accessory buildings. For the purpose of zoning an RV is actually a building, more like a shed. In that vein, there are regs that are associated with accessory buildings and the gist of it is you don't want them planted in front of somebody's window or up against the property line. You don't want them to interfere with the enjoyment of other people's property. All of our zoning regs fall into that category in some sense or another.

Our challenge was how do we on the committee respect that balance without putting undue burden on RV owners and without impeding on the rights of other property owners who also pay taxes.

We're trying to figure out a fair balance between the uses in residential zones. Some things I heard educated me. The point of the registration as we didn't any unregistered large vehicles parked indefinitely in somebody's yard that would constitute a blight. It is more to verify the vehicle is registered and if we can do that for out of state vehicles, we can address that.

The buffer issue is something we can address. It was never intended to be a full screen, build a fence, put in a row of arborvitae. It was more to kind of break up the silhouette of the RV where it was up against an abutting property owner.

One thing we should pursue in the committee is maybe attacking this from the blight angle.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to table which he withdrew to allow discussion.

Mr. Phillips noted we can make a motion to table, but if we are going to revise the regulation, we should probably start the process over again. Withdraw this.

Attorney Sciota advised if they came back with a substantially different wording, you would withdraw. Not approve or deny, just withdraw. Start the process over. Right now, we'll table.

Discussion about an RV being considered an accessory use.

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

(The Chair called for a recess at 9:04 o'clock, p.m.)

(The Chair resumed the meeting at 9:09 o'clock, p.m.)

**CHAIR MICHAEL DEL SANTO, resuming the Chair:**

C. HQ Dumpsters and Recycling, LLC, site plan application for a 17,200 sf building with associated parking, 64 Triano Drive (SPR #1678).

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, CT.

I've presented this application to you at a previous meeting. We have made some revisions based on staff comments and we've addressed all their concerns.

Our proposal is for a 17,200 sf building for HW Dumpsters and recycling. There were questions about repair work and my testimony as that HQ would do minor repairs but they're not in the business of repairing trucks. They don't propose to do that on site or in this building, as well.

As to the plan, we did remove the scale. That'll be proposed in our next phase on Lot 6.

We think this is ready to go and if you have any questions, I'll answer them.

Mr. Phillips said staff has reviewed it and all concerns have been met. It's up to you --- in my report I asked the hours of operation and the use and the impacts on a daily basis - if you want to dive into that, or not. Otherwise, we are ready for action.

Attorney Sciota said this is an industrial zone.

Mr. Phillips stated he had an email from Jim Grappone stating the application is ready for action. He revised the revised plan and responses to comments dated 9/23/14. He had the following comments:

- A building permit and CT PE design is required for the proposed retaining wall.

- The rear parking lot is sheet and a swale is proposed in the pavement to divert flow around the retaining wall. A gravel strip is proposed where the runoff will meet the end of the parking lot. Staff recommends a stone trench rather than gravel in this area for treatment.

- Show and label the proposed sanitary sewer grade and pipe size for the sewer service on the utility plan sheet.

Those could be stipulations. Mr. Guidice said they were all agreeable.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulations mentioned by the town planner. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Discussion of the hours of operation by Mr. Conroy.

Truck traffic routes were discussed.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Car-Sue Realty, LLC, site plan application to construct a 3,000 sf addition to existing building, 44 Robert Porter Road (SPR #1680).

Mr. Giudice presented the application. This is at 44 Robert Porter Road. The proposal is for a 3,000 sf addition to the rear of the CV Tool facility. It is an addition to the back side of the building. There is some relocation of the storm pipe and modifications to the detention basin for ZIRO. Everything is done at the back side of the property.

We have addressed staff comments and revised the plans according to the requests.

We believe the application is ready. The intent is to buy some more equipment for the facility --- large pieces of machinery and he needs additional space.

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.

E. Don A & Nancy B. Florian, 3 lot (including existing house) subdivision application 156 School Street (S #1308).

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the application. This property has frontage on School Street and Old Mountain Road. (Indicated on the map on the screen.)

The property has 570 lf of frontage on School Street (indicated on the map). On Old Mountain Road, there is 361.55' of frontage. This property is split by a zone line: R-20/25 and R-80.

There is an existing residence on 156 School Street. The proposal is to keep the existing residence and create two lots. Lot 1 and Lot 2.

Lot 2 has 2.5 acres of land with 215' frontage on School Street. Lot 1 is 0.74 acres and has 125' of frontage on Old Mountain Road. It also has frontage on School Street, 131.86'.

The access drive was discussed. Examples of other places in town where this exists.

The lots proposed will be served by private wells and septic systems.

A conservation easement is proposed for the entire wetland area on the property. We recently received wetlands approval for this proposal.

We received staff comments which were addressed on the map and responded to in writing.

We are providing a right to flow to the Town of Southington with a drainage easement at this location for the 30" culvert that exists there.

ZIRO was discussed.

I'll be glad to answer questions at this point.

Discussion on the split zone scenario.

Discussion of health department information requested.

The Town Planner suggested the following stipulation:

- No building permits issued until it is signed off by the health department.

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

F. Ed Reinhard, request for Rear Lot Determination, property of Estate of Dorothy Zacek, 1913 Mount Vernon Road.

Ed Reinhard, 390 South End Road, Plantsville, explained the proposal. He indicated he was here for a rear lot determination. The property is the estate of Dorothy Zacek. Tim Sullivan is the executor. It's 1913 Mount Vernon Road, R-40 zone, 5.87 acres. There is an existing house on the property and previously approved in 1990 was the same configuration that's on the plan presented tonight.

It was in place for 22 years and Mrs. Zacek at her age decided she didn't want to pay the property taxes, so she had it returned to one parcel.

What I want to do is return it to what it was approved as in 1990 and stayed in place for 22 years.

Attorney Sciota said it is stale and that's why it's back to you. Normally, we would do this administratively. We feel the best use of this land is as a rear lot.

Mr. Phillips suggested the commission consider removing the stipulation of the 50' buffer from the plot plan and submit updated wetland delineation upon zoning and building permit for development.

The original delineation was done such a long time ago, we have suspicion there might be a vernal pool which is subject to a greater setback. Certainly, I think a new wetlands delineation is appropriate.

Mr. Reinhard agreed.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the Town Planner's stipulation about redefinition of the wetlands. And, this is the highest and best use of the land under our regulations. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The Chair stated that Items G thru X will be all approved with one motion and vote.

G. Southington Country Club, release of \$1,000 E & S bond, 150 Savage Street, SPR #1392.

H. Southington Country Club, release of \$1,100 E & S bond, 150 Savage Street, SPR #1392.2.

I. Tabernacle Christian Church, release of \$1,000 E & S bond, 724 Spring Street SPR #1363.

J. Grace Farm, LLC, release of \$1,000 E & S bond, Flanders Road (SPR #1361).

K. Bradley memorial Hospital - MRI Building - release of \$1,000 E & S bond, 81 Meriden Avenue (SPR #1370).

L. Lepage Homes, Inc., release of \$5,000 bond, Milcrest condos, 500/514 Mill Street (SPR #1595).

M. Fox Hollow, Section H, release of \$10,000 maintenance bond (Rahlene Drive) S#896.4.

N. Sanjay Patel, release of \$4,850 E & S bond, 1700 West Street (SPR #1647).

O. Sanjay Patel, release of \$13,200 Public Improvement bond, 1700 West Street (SPR #1647).

P. GFU Investments, release of \$5,400 E & S bond, Merry Oak Estates, S #1244.

Q. GFU Investments, release of \$49,000 subdivision bond subject to posting of \$8,000 maintenance bond, Merry Oak Estates S #1244.

R. Acceptance of Sultana Terrace, from Meriden Waterbury Turnpike to its terminus, a total distance of 300 feet (.06 miles) subject to the posting of an \$8,000 maintenance bond (S #1244).

S. Laurelwood Estates, release of \$115,000 Phase I subdivision bond (S #1221.1, 1221.2, 1221.3)

T. Laurelwood Estates, release of \$8,000 Phase I public improvement bond (S# 1221.1, 1221.2 1221.3)

U. Laurelwood Estates, release of \$134,000 Phase II subdivision bond (S# 1221.1, 1221.2 1221.3)

V. Laurelwood Estates, release of \$8,000 Phase II public improvement bond (S# 1221.1, 1221.2 1221.3)

W. Laurelwood Estates, release of \$1,035,000 Phase III subdivision bond, subject to acceptance of \$55,000 maintenance bond (S# 1221.1, 1221.2 1221.3)

X. Acceptance of crown Ridge Drive, from Laurelwood Drive to Twin Pond Terrace, a total distance of \$1,085 feet (.21 mi) and Twin Pond Terrace from Mount Vernon Road to its terminus a total distance of 935 feet (.18 mi) subject to the acceptance of a maintenance bond in the amount of \$55,000, Laurelwood Estates (S #1221.1, 1221,2, 1221.3)

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve Items G thru X. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

#### 7. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Clock reported the first public input session was a great meeting. A good attendance. Everyone was able to contribute their views and opinions. The video is on the POCD page on the website.

The Town Clerk would be consulted to have it put on the TV.

The next public input session has not yet been scheduled. The POCD Committee is meeting this month.

Mr. Phillips said the monthly meetings will start the third Thursday of every month. There will be another public informational session and another public input session closer to the end of the process before the plan is finalized. In the meantime some may be contacted for interviews on October 15<sup>th</sup> & 16<sup>th</sup> to try to get an understanding of some of the history and issues and positive and negatives about the town.

The regular meetings are held here in this room and are open to the public.

8. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Phillips reported on two administrative approvals:

- Chris Fields King 33 at 75 Aircraft Road. Basically a site plan modification to literally move previously approved live fire and retail sales which are in two separate buildings. The live fire you approved actually was never actually initiated. The actual footprint of both of those uses are moving to the larger building on the same site.

Under the SPU conditions of approval, that would travel with this. It's moving the operation to a different portion of the lot inside a better building for the type of use. The conditions will still apply.

We can do an administrative approval if you're okay with it.

- COCC at 100 Executive Drive, site plan modification to install a retaining wall about 3'. That is in order to put a detached sign and they also want to put in a sidewalk that extends from the adjacent hotel all the way down the front of COCC and attached to Executive Drive.

We can do an administrative approval.

The Chair indicated there were no issues with either of the two items.

10. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

(1) George Loukopolous, reapproval of 12,600 sf building at 122 Spring Street.

(2) COCC site plan I just explained.

(3) Chris Fields, 75 Aircraft Road, site plan modification.

Mr. Phillips noted we had a moratorium placed on internally illuminated signage for a period of three months. That's going to expire in the beginning of November. With that, Mike and I met with a company that does a lot of signs and we tried to gather some information.

I did receive a 3-ring binder from the USSC (United States Sign Council). A lot of information and the best part of it is easily the model sign code at the back which is pretty extensive.

It is written from a viewpoint of a signage type of favoritism. I did look at the model code and look at other communities in the area. Specifically, Avon. Their sign regs are effective and have been used as a model by other communities, as well.

I went through our sign regs and change the definition of signage a little to be clear, put some existing regs in table format which is clear and also remove some redundancies and bring some confusing portions of the language into one area.

You have two copies. One is proposed deletions and additions. And, then you have a clean version with it as it would be approved.

The Chair asked the commissioners to take it with them, look it over the next couple of weeks and at the next meeting we will comment and discuss.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to adjourn. Ms. Clock seconded.  
Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 o'clock, p.m.)