

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting
May 5, 2015

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a regular meeting on Tuesday, May 5, 2015. Chairman Michael DelSanto, called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Commissioners were present, viz:

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

Alternates: Anthony D'Angelo
Steve Leggett

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

David Lavallee, Assistant Town Planner
Keith Hayden, Town Engineer
Mark Sciota, Deputy Town Manager/ Town Attorney

Absent: James E. Morelli, Jr. Alternate Commissioner
Joe Coviello, Alternate Commissioner

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community
Development

A quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of April 21, 2015

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

Before starting the public hearing, the Chair noted a student in the audience. He asked him to come up.

My name is Cameron Clynes. I'm here for my high school civics class, to observe. I have to do an editorial and some questions to answer.

The Chair advised him it is important to do good in school and study hard. Welcome! Hope you learn something tonight and let us know how you're doing.

5. Public Hearings

Mr. Lavallee read the legal notice into the record.

A. West Corp., LLC, Special Permit Use application to construct a multi-family age restricted community of 86 units, property of The Forgione Corp. and MMCSA, LLC located at Eden Avenue and Main Street, Assessor Map 100, Parcels 15,17,18,19,20 and 21 (SPU #548) hearing continued from April 21

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented on behalf of the applicant.

The subject property is located off of Eden Avenue on Forgione Drive and Forgione Drive will serve as an access to the property. The land area is 3 acres located in a CB zone, served by public water and sewer.

The proposal is for an elderly housing complex of 86 units. The ratio of 1500 sf per unit allows this property to have 87 units.

Section 4-01.2C of the zoning regulations allow this kind of use and this kind of building, rental apartments, by special permit. The proposal is for 80 units of 2-bedroom about 850 sf. Most of the time the second bedroom is used for a den in our experience. And, 6 units will be one bedroom, 650 sf, approximately.

The setback requires are in the front 10', rear 20' and the side is 0 required. Our proposal has a minimum of 20'. The building height allowed in this zone is 55'. Our proposed building may reach 48'.

Expected age of the occupants is early 60's and early 70's.

The submission package before you has a property map, an aerial map with the 500' radius indicating all property owners surrounding the property. The existing condition map. There's a preliminary layout and the building elevation.

The building exterior will be cultured stone along the bottom. The entry way will be enlarged and with a more colonial look to it. The siding will be a mix of shakes and clapboard to give some interest and look to it.

The roof peaks and dormers above the roofed area will be added to this rendering.

The interior will have sprinklers, elevator, community room, game room, workout area and there is no dining area for the residents as they have their own kitchenette.

The outside area will have appropriate parking near the units. Full cut off lighting fixtures. There will be trees and shrubs and a private area in the back.

(Pause)

He showed the entrance, Eden Avenue, to the facility. This is Forgione Drive which runs north/south. The proposed building and parking associated with the building. In the rear there will be a patio area, benches, trees and walkways for the residents to use. Appropriate lighting.

There will be an ability to walk from this area to possibly Columbus Avenue. Negotiations are going on for a possible connection. Explained.

There is also a possibility of a full access in that area. The applicant is working with the town attorney's office for a municipal parking facility.

The traffic will enter from Eden Avenue with a two way access. There will be stop signs and stop bars at various locations to slow down the traffic going through this area.

Explained.

The sight distances are good at Eden Avenue, east and west.

Peak hour traffic does not coincide with rush hour for these kinds of uses. Bubaris Associates, Traffic Engineers, prepared a Memo which I will enter into the record. (Read the memo.)

There is a letter in favor of the application and the application itself which I will enter.

Site drainage system was discussed. ZIRO will be accomplished and it will reduce runoff to the neighboring properties.

Proper notification was sent to the owners within 500' of the property.

We have received staff comments and responded to them in writing. The applicant sees a need in the community for this kind of use and feels the proposal is consistent with the regulations. We respectfully request you consider approving this request knowing there will be additional scrutiny at site plan time.

Mark Lovely, member of West Corp., LLC, office at 710 Main Street, Suite 11, Plantsville, CT. We are here tonight before you for an elderly housing project. I felt the town really needed it.

I want to talk about the architecture and my plans. In this rendering, this is a break in the building so this portion of the building is a little bit higher. Our plan is to put some dormers on the top end, do cultured stone around the bottom and maybe the portico and more dormers in this area (indicating). I want to make this look like the colonial buildings I've done in town already so it fits in with the town's architecture. Pretty much as I did at Clocktower Square.

Explained this is going to be a model for five more of these buildings I'd like to do throughout the state in the next ten years.

I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Conroy asked for the parking requirements to be reviewed again, which Mr. Bovino did.

Mr. D'Angelo asked about the connection to Columbus Avenue. Is it a walkway and not for vehicles? Mr. Lovely said he did talk to the landowner to the north and we have an agreement that we are going to open that up for foot traffic right now. We are working with the town attorney's office right now on a municipal parking plan for this area and if that does go through, that could open it up for vehicular traffic down the road.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. I speak in favor of this application as it is exactly what we need downtown. Coming in conjunction with other apartments proposed before Greenway Commons, this will bring our downtown density back up. Great for businesses. All these people can walk to the library, town hall, Music on the Green. Perfect place for 86 units of elderly housing. Not low income housing.

I am in favor of this and thrilled to see Mr. Lovely doing this. Explained if this looks like Clocktower Square, it will be a home run for Southington.

Thank you.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair noted folks who sent emails and letters; those are all part of the record.

The Chair noted renderings are coming back and the public hearing will be kept open for two weeks.

6. Business Meeting

A. West corp., LLC, Special Permit Use application to construct a multi-family age restricted community of 86 units, property of The Forgione Corp. and MMCSA, LLC, located at Eden Avenue and Main Street, Assessor Map 100, Parcels 16,17,18,19,20 and 21.

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

B. Southington Water Department, site plan application for the construction of a storage tank, pump station, water mains and appurtenances that will serve a new pressure zone, 720 Pleasant Street, 271 Chesterwood Terrace and Smith Street (SPR #1691)

We are waiting for revised plans, so a table is requested noted Mr. Lavallee. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to table which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. Cusano Realty, LLC, site plan modification for proposed 3,200 s.f. building addition, 214 Canal Street (SPR #1694)

Sev Bovino, Planner, Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant. The property is to the west of Canal Street. It is an existing facility in place. We are proposing an addition to the west side of it.

It's in an I-2 zone. The land area is 1.31 acres. It's served by public water and sewer. The existing facility is now 10,067 sq. feet (+/-). The proposed addition is 3,200 sq. ft. It is an expansion of the current business. The addition is located to the west of the building.

A pre-engineered steel building. The plan shows additional trees and landscaping along the front of the property to dress up the property. (Indicated)

The existing surface area is blacktop and processed stone toward the rear of the property and they proposed to replenish the processed stone area as needed. There is some heavy machines being moved around and the pavement will be destroyed if we had some additional blacktop in that area. We'd like to keep the processed stone.

The plans show an underground storage facility to achieve ZIRO. Explained.

Section 9-02.39A indicates that the street sidewalks are optional in this zone. The applicant received a waiver in 1998 when they did the first addition to this facility. If it needs to be reconsidered, we are requesting a waiver of the sidewalk because the area is all built up north and south of this facility and there are no walks anywhere near. Actually, the sidewalk will end into the canal and will not serve any function. We'd like to have you consider waiving the sidewalk. Explained.

The building is a typical pre-engineered steel building. This will be added to the end of the building that is there now. Explained the addition will run north/south with an overhead door and service doors at the appropriate locations.

I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Lavalley said the item is ready for action with the following conditions:

- Sidewalk waiver if you think it's appropriate. The plans should be revised to show the sidewalk and then you can waive it.

- The Assistant Town Engineer requested a survey be done just to close out the street line.

Mr. Bovino said as far as the survey, this is an A-2 survey which was accepted years ago and still is a valid survey. There is a dimension that caught his attention and the actual occupation is another dimension but we have monumentation and pins in place. We actually surveyed the property to the north years ago so it has been locked in. He's referring to the street line which is more a ROW than a road. I'll discuss with the applicant if she is interested in doing the additional survey work. However, I think at this point we've met the requirements. Our boundary is an A-2 survey.

Attorney Sciota said if the Assistant Engineer has a question on it then I would stipulate they work out that issue with the Ass't Town Engineer and maybe they may have to file a document certifying that line if that is the case.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked Mr. Lavallee for his opinion on the sidewalk waiver. We try really hard to insure we're putting sidewalks in every time when we can. Given the property constraints, what are your thoughts?

Mr. Lavallee said he would say follow the regs in the sense that if it is developed all around that general area, you have the discretion not to allow them which I think Mr. Bovino indicated it is developed all around.

Mr. Bovino explained the developed surrounding area parcel by parcel.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the sidewalk waiver. I think we have to be reasonable. This is an area where I think we have a termination point and a lot of development already. I don't think there is a whole lot of point in requiring it here. I think it is counterproductive. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Motion to waive the sidewalks passed 7 to 0.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the application with the stipulation that the applicant work with the town engineering department to clear up any issues he has with the property lines and the survey. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The Chair noted this is another business expanding which we like to see in Southington. It's important.

D. Nichols Enterprises, LLC, site plan modification for proposed 6,193 s.f. building addition, 175 Spring Street (SPR #1695)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones and Associates represented the application.

This is our property and next door is the storage facility here and further north is the new BJs constructed a couple of years ago. To the southwest we have the old Step Saver building.

The property is located at 175 Spring Street. It is served by sewer and water. Located in an I-1 zone. The land area is 1 acre which complies with the regulation. Lot coverage allows us 35%. Our lot coverage including the addition is 23%. The current facility is 3,819 sf and the proposed addition is 6,193 sf and it will be manufacturing/storage.

The current surface area is blacktop and processed stone toward the southwest of the property. The proposal is to pave and curb the entire property with appropriate landscape along the front and sides and trees are proposed along the street as required by the regulations.

The ZIRO is achieved with underground storage in three separate locations. Explained.

There is a grass swale along the front which will carry any excess water flow that comes off of those facilities or the current surface area of the property.

The applicant has a few panel trucks that will be stored in the garage area. Not large trucks.

No queuing of trucks on Spring Street. They come and go at different times between 6:30 and 4:30 pm. The deliveries are done after hours to this facility.

The building will be improved. Your cover sheet shows the addition will match the building. The windows will be changed and it

will be embellished with new architecture. The entire frontage will be landscaped in addition to what is there, already.

Internal walks are provided. The walk along Spring Street is shown as requested. But again we are requesting a waiver. The same situation here as it is optional in this zone. Again there are no walks within a short distance of this property. There is not enough room from the edge of pavement to the street line. If we give an easement and put the sidewalk inside of our property there is a grass swale that carries the surface runoff into the pipe will be impacted.

For all these reasons, we request you grant us a waiver.

We received staff comments and responded to all. The Ass't Town Engineer requested three stipulations and we have objection to those.

Discussion regarding the sidewalk issue. Mr. Lavallee said it is the same issue. It is an industrial property. The regs state if it is more than 75% developed around it, you can waive it. This is ready for action with stipulations.

Stipulations:

- Detail be provided for underground storage cleanouts
- Existing monitoring well is no longer needed and can be abandoned according to the State of Connecticut Health Code and local director of health.
- New proposed catch basin existing in Spring Street shall have a full sump, four feet.

Discharge of runoff into the public storm sewer was brought up and discussed by Mr. Conroy. Mr. Bovino said the water is from the roof area and the parking lot. Should there be an oil/water separator in there or other treatment? Mr. Lavallee noted a deep, 4 foot, sump. Mr. Bovino said they would put a hood on this catch basin to prevent oils from migrating down into the town system.

Further discussion.

Mr. Hayden said we would be fine with the hood and snorkels on them.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy wondered about a chemical spill which would go into the system. Explained the private system is separated from the site system and the state system so everybody is responsible for the

treatment of their own water.

Discussion.

Mr. Hayden said we would be fine with the hood and snorkels. The parking is for employees and not a lot of trucks dragging processed grease into the parking lot.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about sidewalks on Queen Street heading west. How about with the new recreation center across the street. Mr. Bovino said that sidewalk was waived, also. Discussion.

Discussion of restrictions now with traffic on Spring Street and the future plans for Spring Street.

For the record, it looks like there are sidewalks from Queen Street up to and including BJs but it stops short of the storage facility. This is one parcel removed from that.

Mr. Macchio made a motion to waive the sidewalks. Ms. Locks seconded.

Motion for sidewalk waiver passed 4 in favor with Mr. Conroy, Mr. Chaplinsky and Ms. Clock opposed.

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

E. Referral under Section 8-24 for the modified site plan for South End School (MR #498)

Attorney Sciota explained this is a request to the town council. This is for a site plan to have the ground based solar panels for South End School. You tell the town council it is not in violation of the POCD. This doesn't approve your site plan. It gives the council the authority to keep moving forward.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to return a favorable 8-24 to the council. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. Referral under Section 8-24 for the modified site plan for Hatton School (MR#499)

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to return a favorable 8-24 to the council. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Greenskies Renewable Energy, LLC, site plan application for the installation of a ground-mount photovoltaic array, property of Town of Southington, Hatton School, 50 Spring Lake Road (SPR #1696)

Chris Palmer, Greenskies Renewable Energy. Joining me tonight is Dominick Seltrudo with BL Companies. BL has been contracted by Greenskies for design services.

I'm here to discuss the proposed installation of two ground mounted solar arrays. One at Hatton School and one at South End School.

The town has entered into an agreement with Greenskies. It is a power purchase agreement for 20 years. And, we'll be providing between 80 and 90 percent of all of the power requirements for Hatton and South End Schools. These arrays are going to be installed on property adjacent to the two schools, both town owned parcels.

Additionally, the projects will be at zero cost to the town. Greenskies is responsible for the design, construction and maintenance of these systems over the course of the power purchase agreement.

I'll hand this off to Dominic Seltruda who can discuss the two sites.

Dominic Seltruda, BL Companies 150 Trumbull Street, Hartford, CT. I'm lead landscape architect with BL Companies. I'll start off by talking about the Hatton School site. He pointed out the actual photovoltaic ground mounted array. This is on the back side or southern part of the site, just adjacent to some existing playing fields and a buffer.

Front yard setback for the site for an R-20/25 zone is 40' on the front, side setbacks at 20 and rear setback of 25'. We are on two parcels and this overlaps. The building height is 35'. We will not changing that nor will we change the configuration of the site in any way.

The array will be positioned running east to west. It is going to be following the existing grade out there. The arrays are constructed in ground. They are post driven into the ground with

varying height. The maximum height will be approximately 8' above grade and lower height about 24" from grade. They sit at a pitched angle.

They are positioned on the site to take on optimal sunlight. We tried to limit the amount of removal of trees on both sites. On this site there is removal of some vegetation to be done to the left of the image.

Total disturbance on site is going to be just under 3 acres for this. A lot of that is moving in and out of the site and it will be put back into the condition the site was in prior. The one issue is the area directly underneath the array. We like to use conservation mix in there.

Drainage for the site does not change. These drain like small roofs to the ground. We implement an energy dissipater on the ground where they fall or cascade down to some crushed stone aggregate on the ground level so the water will dissipate naturally within the site.

We are providing a small buffer to the neighboring properties to the south along the property line. Vegetation will be added. This is on the Hatton Project.

AND

H. Greenskies Renewable Energy, LLC, site plan application for the installation of a ground-mount photovoltaic array, property of Town of Southington, South End School, 10 & 25 Maxwell Noble Drive (SPR #1697)

Mr. Seltruda explained this is the South End School site. The lot configuration may be confusing. The school entrance drive is on the left hand side. This is an area where there is an existing old hockey rink and kind of a make shift parking lot. And, there is a pond to the right hand side. Small volley ball court to the bottom right of the image and a small structure that is owned by the municipality.

This configuration is to take advantage of the optimal sunlight throughout the year. It is designed in such a way that we can reduce the amount of vegetation we cut down. There is an area where we will take some vegetation off that big darker green swath (indicating). We will remove the trees down to the stumps as it is in a sensitive area. We are going to leave the stumps and the existing underbrush alone. And, then infill with conservation mix as we did on the other project.

We knew there was an existing parking lot so we brought back a design that allows for a future parking lot the town can do in the future on the front portion of the site. It is not part of this project.

We are in an R-20/25 zone. School use. Lot width 100' which we are not changing. Front yard setback is 40' which we are not changing. Side setback is 20' and rear setback is 25'. The property line is off to the right. There will be a combination of properties as part of this project.

That will open it up to questions.

Discussion of the South End parking lot.

The total height is 8' on Hatton and 8' to 10' on South End.

All will be fenced in for protection.

Discussion about foul ball damage and the fact that it will be responsibility of Greenskies to correct any damage that occurs. They are designed and rated for hail impact. A baseball won't do damage.

Discussion of leaving the stumps in. It is in a sensitive area and there would be more damage by removing them. If it is a deal breaker we can remove them but we thought it better for that small ecosystem in that area we take them down to stumps and leave the understory unchanged.

Mr. Lavallee, wetlands agent, said it does help keep the soil intact. There is an area four or five times larger than the stump itself for the root system. We prefer to see them flush cut.

As part of the original notification the site itself that the school is on, the directly abutting neighbors were notified. But since there was a lot line merger, that brings into play more properties. We'll notify them.

Mr. Palmer explained the only concern people mention is if there is going to be glare, but they have anti-reflective coating. When we're reflecting sunlight, we lose production. Reflection is held to below 2 percent. Compare it to flat standing water.

There will be no transfer of heat.

There is a site up and running in East Lyme. It is about ten times the size of this array. We could arrange for a visit if necessary. We'll bring pictures in of that one.

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

I. Lovley Development, release of \$25,000 Maintenance Bond, Trotters Crossing Subdivision (S #1279)

This item is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. Plan of Conservation and Development

Ms. Clock reported there is no new report. The next meeting is Thursday, May 21st in the room adjacent to this one. We will be discussing development strategies.

8. Items to Schedule for public hearing

A. Frank DiBenedetto, Special Permit Application to allow more than 3 garage spaces to construct a 20 x 40 butler barn/metal garage, 32 Rosemont Avenue (SPU #440) May 19th

That can be scheduled along with the continuance of tonight's public hearing.

9. Administrative Reports

Nothing this evening.

10. Receipt of New Applications

There is a new special permit application for a parent/grandparent apartment on 124 Andrews Street for May 19th.

11. Adjournment

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:07 o'clock, p.m.)