

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION  
Public Hearing & Regular Meeting  
June 16, 2015

The Planning & Zoning Commission held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, June 16, 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	Paul Chaplinsky
Susan Locks	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Anthony D'Angelo, James Morelli, Jr. & Steve Leggett

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

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

Absent: Kevin Conroy, Commissioner  
Joe Coviello, Alternate Commissioner

The Chair seated Mr. Leggett for Mr. Conroy. 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 June 2, 2015

Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion for approval which was seconded by Ms. Locks. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Chaplinsky abstaining.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted for the record he did read the Minutes of the previous meeting.

5. Public Information Session:

Tropical Storm Irene, October snowstorm Alfred, and Superstorm Sandy are examples of recent events that caused severe damage in the region and resulted in Federal disaster declarations. What can be done to minimize our

vulnerabilities to natural hazards? The Town of Southington is updating its hazard mitigation plan with the assistance of CRCOG to identify activities that can be undertaken before natural hazards occur in order to minimize property damage, risk of life, and the costs that are shared by all. Residents and business owners are invited to attend and offer ideas for minimizing the damage that occurs and the costs that are borne by our town.

David Murphy from Milone & MacBroom gave a very detailed 20-minute presentation on the Town of Southington's Hazard Mitigation Plan. (Please refer to audio tape for presentation.)

The Chair called for questions.

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue talked about the presentation which did not have the things he had written down over the weekend. At the end he did mention expanding the tree maintenance program which I am in favor of. He gave examples of where tree maintenance can be undertaken: Pleasant Street from high school to the JAD Middle school. Intersection of Woodruff Street down to Berlin Street, there is a canopy of old, old big fat branches that tractor trailers barely go under. Discussion.

Meriden Avenue turn on to South End Road, there is a cluster of trees as you come to the end of South End Road from Recreation Park. Discussion.

Whether an expanded tree maintenance program gets done thru a FEMA Grant or public works, that's something we should look at.

It's a problem going up Flanders from Oak Hill Cemetery to the high schools. Trees are hanging over. Discussion.

That should be part of our preventive maintenance program.

The second thing is Hart Street, where it goes down to Stop & Shop; it's reconstructed, nice and wide as it comes down. I do believe we still have a bunch of streets like that. We did Mulberry Street maybe 20-25 years ago. We have streets like Churchill which is barely two lanes wide with lots of trees. Discussion.

Part of our mitigation program should be to take a serious look at some of our streets and roads that have now developed. (School Street)

We need to eliminate those bottlenecks to prevent major problems for our people.

Lastly, I'm appalled at the condition of the Quinnipiac River from the Center of Southington, north. Specifically near Curtis Street. Discussion about the garbage and trees that have grown into the river.

We don't need riverbank stabilization; we just need to clear our riverbeds back. Discussion.

If we do those three, we'll be far head of any other town when another major storm comes through.

Thank you.

Ms. Clock mentioned the POCD will be submitted in 2016 and should we have our coordinator coordinate? Mr. Murphy explained the POCD should reference the hazard mitigation plan. Discussion.

In response to a query by Mr. Chaplinsky, Mr. Phillips explained a lot of this would be from an infrastructure standpoint which we'll be going through on Thursday with the POCD.

From land use development patterns we have protections with wetlands and watercourses through the Conservation Commission to protect flood storage. We have regulations that deal with flood management. We do follow those.

I haven't looked at the current regulations and the current HazMat Plan to see if there are consistencies. Like any other plan you review it to make sure it compliments each other.

6. Public Hearings

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Beecher Street Associates, LLC, Special Permit Application to construct a 22 unit multi-family development, 49 Beecher Street (SPU #553)

Michael Lambert, civil engineer, with Harry Cole & Son. 876 South Main Street, Plantsville. I'm here representing the applicant.

This has frontages on both Beecher Street and Water Street. It was the old Beecher Street school that was converted into the BOE building for the town and has since been abandoned.

Thru this development we plan on still using the main building and turning it into a 10 unit residential building and adding two more buildings, one on Beecher Street to house seven units and then on Water Street there is an existing retaining wall about 8' high and a portion of that would get removed and then a 5-unit building would be placed on Water Street.

This site being mainly all parking lot, a lot of this will be ripped up and turned back into green space. Yards, grassed area in town. Clean the area up a little bit.

Removing all the pavement will help the river to the west of this that leads into the Quinnipiac.

There is a proposed potential parking we'll be putting in the back of the existing BOE building but right now our client just plans on doing a grassed area, landscaped, maybe a play area. He wants the future use if need be. They do have adequate parking spaces to accommodate the zoning

regulations but if they need it in the future, we have potentially designed for it and included it in the drainage calculations.

Mr. D'Angelo noted 22 units total with 10 in the main building. Is that what the council came up with in the original plan? Is that the agreed amount --- 22? Or less than that?

Attorney Sciota said he has spoken to the attorney and has asked him to keep the public hearing open tonight so we can have a discussion and discuss it further with the council. The contract calls for a residential number of 20. It also gives the option of a residential/commercial combination which will lead to more units.

Attorney Matthew O'Keefe, 97 North Main Street in Southington added he and the town attorney have been discussing what he talked about and my client is amenable to keeping the public hearing to have further discussions with the town. The goal is to get the best use out of the property which we believe to be residential rather than office. We want to do it the right way and discussions are ongoing.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue spoke in favor of the application. He spoke favorably about the developer and referenced other projects this developer did at 98 Main Street and 1 Center Street. I believe he'll do the same with Beecher Street.

Once the attorneys work out a couple of numbers, everybody should know that I don't believe Florian Properties has ever done a bad deal.

(Those speaking against the application)

(1) Susan Wojenski, 19 Williams Street, Southington. My husband John and I have lived there for 40-some-odd years. I wouldn't say opposition but we have lots of questions.

(Read the letter which she submitted to the commission previously and is on file in the Town Planner's Office.)

Thank you for your attention and hopefully we will get some answers.

(2) Irene Rock 29 Williams Street. The roads are very narrow. Also, the original plan as supposed to be for a community center and not apartments. These were supposed to be free-standing duplex type homes.

What is this going to do to our property value? Is my property going to be worth anything with this project going on? I am very concerned as a homeowner.

Thank you.

(Applicant responses)

Mat Florian, 506 Mount Vernon Road, Plantsville. The Chair advised we're going to stay away from the number of units. That's a town council thing and you can talk about that offline.

The free standing units are going to be condos and sold. The units in the existing building we're working to have the building listed on the historical site and they'd have to be rentals for at least five years. Ten units would be initially condo rentals. They'll be condos that we hope to sell some day.

No age restriction. No affordable.

As to traffic, we've had discussions and the existing parking is around 120 cars plus for the old BOE building. We'll take that to 44. We think the actual trips from when the BOE was there to the condos will be less than what it used to be.

Discussion.

The sewers and water pressure won't be diminished because of this. Mr. Hayden could not speak to the water main, but we are having a sewers facility plan conducted right now and they're looking at all vacant properties being developed and identifying bottlenecks and this has not been identified as one of those. I'll double check that.

This is public water and sewer.

ZIRO is in place. Much less impervious areas than currently exist.

Speed is a police department issue. Contact them.

Attorney Sciota doesn't remember an RFP ever for a community center. I don't know if a community room was discussed as part of this.

Parking on the street was discussed. If not between November and April, you are allowed to park on the street overnight. This particular complex is over parked which means they have more parking spaces than required by our regulations. Internal parking.

Property values, the units are planned to sell at between \$220,000 and \$300,000. A nice addition to the neighborhood. Hoping it will increase values.

Mike Lambert reiterated about the parking being more than adequate. We are required to have 44 spaces and we are going to have 49. If there is the additional parking put in the back, we'll have 59 spaces. That'll take care of the parking for our residents.

We are in contact with the water department and we have comments from them. We are doing individual laterals for the two new buildings and then there is a new water service and fire service for the existing building.

Storm drainage meets ZIRO. The report is submitted.

Mr. D'Angelo noted the five units facing Water Street, access is off Water Street. Mr. Lambert noted it is a drive under garage. The retaining wall will be knocked down in front of the 5 units on Water Street. The south portion will remain.

Mr. D'Angelo noted a potential of ten cars would be taken off Beecher Street and put on Water Street.

The Chair kept the public hearing until the next meeting on July 21, 2015.

Chairman DelSanto recused himself because of a potential conflict of interest and Mr. Chaplinsky assumed the Chair.

Acting Chair Chaplinsky seated Jim Morelli for Chairman DelSanto.

B. AA Denorfia building & Development, modification of previous Special Permit approval from 25 age restricted multifamily units and 6 non age restricted multifamily units to 31 age restricted and 3 non age restricted multifamily units, 54 & 82 Liberty Street (SPU #523.2)

Anthony Denorfia, 133 Main Street, Southington. We are the applicants. This project has been before you twice before. Originally when started it was a .9 acre parcel in January of 2013 when you approved 22 age restricted units and 2,000 sf of commercial space.

Subsequently, we purchased an additional .4 acres making the site a total of 1.3 acres. We amended the special permit to allow for 25 active adult age restricted units, 55 and older and six non-age restricted units in three separate buildings.

We started construction and we found some unstable soils underneath so we had to have the project re-engineered. The result was we could not build slab construction as we have to drop piles into the ground to hold up the building.

Basically, that necessitated changing the main building. We had to do away with the under the building parking and put the building on a crawl space. That meant we ended up going from 3 to 2 buildings.

We have a 4 unit building in place of a 5 unit building on the corner and the other main building is the identical footprint as it was before is 30 units. The only change is the underground parking.

We did replace that with above ground parking. We have planned for 72 parking spaces and we are required to have 68. Based on historical usage we provide way over the amount of parking required.

In all of our application we meet or exceed all of the special permit requirements and site plan requirements. We did get site plan comments from staff and we will be addressing and hopefully we'll be ready for action at the next meeting.

Architecture on the buildings has not changed since the original application. Explained.

If you have any questions.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

No response.

We will close the public hearing and reseal Mike DelSanto.

MICHAEL DEL SANTO, resuming the Chair:

C. Proposed Zoning Text Amendment, GID Zone District, new Section 4-06 and revised Section 7A(ZA #585)

AND

D. Proposed Zone boundary change, "B" to "GID" Zone District, properties located at (600 Executive Blvd, Map 120, Parcel 001); (500 Executive Blvd, Map 119, Parcel 152); (9596 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 001); (957 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 015); (99 Executive Blvd. Map 131, Parcel 003); 987 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 014); West Street, Map 131, Parcel 043); (1063 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 012); (1115 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 011); (West Street, Map 131, Parcel 013) (ZC #550)

(The following are summary comments on a 60-minute long hearing. Please refer to the video tape of the meeting on line for exact discussion.)

Mr. Phillips said feedback has been received since this was legally noticed and there is enough feedback to justify my recommendation to the commission that we keep this hearing open and gather testimony present tonight, close the hearing and then withdraw the application so we can go back and re-evaluate what we want to do here.

As background, Mr. Phillips noted the West Street Corridor Zoning Analysis Study, 2011, by Milone & MacBroom had various recommendations on

zoning West Street with regulations and actual rezoning. The area we are talking about tonight was recommended to have a zone change from B to Interchange Commercial.

- New zone should permit uses similar to those allowed in the CB zone.
- Larger minimum lot sizes and greater front yard setbacks than currently there.
- Access management techniques.
- Shared driveways and parking rights on the land records.
- Requiring parking be located to the rear of buildings.
- Building façade improvements.
- Other site design standards.

From that Study the subcommittee came forward with some recommendations.

- Encouraging higher density business uses similar to what is currently in the Business zone.
- Encouraging retail.
- Review height restrictions. Build up instead of sprawling.
- Access management.
- Encouraging vegetative or structural shielding of the parking visible from West Street.

The regulations established a greater lot size but also placing an incentive to combine lots to allow an increase in density which would be vertical and within the site itself. The overall idea was to create a wide variety of development opportunities, promote compact flexible development and have control over the type and quality of development, variety of mixed commercial uses.

The intention in a nutshell was to allow flexible development and give the flexibility to the developer to come in, combine properties where feasible and does a planned development type of district with design standards to encourage higher quality / aesthetic appeal. Explained.

There was no minimum required number of parking spaces. It was more along the lines of you know what you need, use it smartly. Put it in areas which are not highly visible and work with the buildings.

One way to do this is with a design review board or have architectural design elements. Explained.

Paul Chaplinsky stated this is not a race to the end zone. I agree with your comments 100%.

The Chair said this will not be another Queen Street and we are going to do this intelligently.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking against the application)

The following people spoke regarding the application:

- Anthony Denorfia, 133 Main Street, Southington.
- Mark Lovley, 710 Main Street, Plantsville, CT.
- Sev Bovino, Planner, Kratzert, Jones & Associates
- Tom Duksa, 987 West Street, Southington, CT.
- Richard Duksa, 561 Redstone Hill Road.
- (Inaudible) Brock, 66 Beverly Drive, Southington.
- Fredrick Leopold, 150 East 58<sup>th</sup> Street, New York
- Kenneth Knowles, Eaglebrook Engineering and Survey, Danvers, MA

The following items were discussed by all speakers:

- Special Permit Use
- Lot sizes
- Setbacks
- Drive-thrus
- Architecture
- Density

Mr. Phillips, for point of clarification, under proposed Section F, read the regulation. Three items are encouraged. Explained they are guiding principles and not a requirement.

Mr. Knowles showed a graphic of the approved site plan which he further discussed.

Mr. Perillo, Economic Development Coordinator, agreed with the comments so far. He spoke in favor of economic development and these proposed regulation changes might not meet the intention.

- Materials
- SPU
- Lot size
- Frontage

The importance or relevance of each was questioned during the public hearing. Mr. Perillo pointed out they are all integral parts that flow together.

Mr. Perillo pointed out West Street is different than Queen Street. We are fortunate we've had Queen Street for as long as we have. We've worked really hard on improving it. We have access management now and redevelopment there. He explained that the street provides a tremendous number of jobs and tax revenue. Provides services.

From a topography standpoint Queen Street is different from West Street which he discussed.

We're not taking from Queen Street to put on West Street. We are looking to add West Street which is making a strong come back. He noted the over \$6 million of infrastructure added.

I offer my services to this commission to work with you.

Mike Shurak, (inaudible). I moved here from Meriden and I don't want to get what I left. There are good points. I'd like you to hold their feet to the fire on the small things such as curbing, landscaping.

Mr. Chaplinsky thanked everyone for their input. Planning is difficult. I certainly would be interested to hear more from those who have offered their support. It is important this is front of the community so we can hear the types of feedback we hear.

Discussion.

This will be withdrawn and taken into subcommittee. There are really good points we heard tonight to take into consideration. We will work with staff going forward. We'll come back with something for you which will be the vision for West Street.

Mr. Phillips suggested these be withdrawn and reworked.

The Chair closed the public hearings on each item.

7. Business Meeting

A. Beecher Street Associates, LLC, Special Permit Application to construct a 22 unit multi-family development, 49 Beecher Street (SPU #553)

Attorney Matt O'Keefe requested a 30-day extension. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the extension. Mr. Kalkowski seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

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

B. Beecher Street Associates, LLC, Site Plan application for a 22 unit multi-family development, 49 Beecher Street (SPR #1698)

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

The Chair recused himself because of a potential conflict of interest.

C. AA Denorfia Building & Development, modification of previous Special Permit approval from 25 age restricted multifamily units and 6 non age restricted multifamily units to 31 age restricted and 3 non age restricted multifamily units, 54 & 82 Liberty Street (SPU #523.2)

This application is ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve which Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. AA Denorfia Building & Development, site plan modification application for proposed 34 unit multi-family housing development, 42-82 Liberty Street (SPR #1674.1)

The applicant asked for a table to address staff comments. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to table which Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

MICHAEL DEL SANTO, resuming the Chair:

E. Proposed Zoning Text Amendment, GID Zone District, new Section 4-06 and revised Section 7A(ZA #585)

And

F. Proposed Zone boundary change, "B" to "GID" Zone District, properties located at (600 Executive Blvd, Map 120, Parcel 001); (500 Executive Blvd, Map 119, Parcel 152); (9596 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 001); (957 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 015): (99 Executive Blvd. Map 131, Parcel 003); 987 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 014); West Street, Map 131, Parcel 043): (1063 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 012); (1115 West Street, Map 131, Parcel 011); (West Street, Map 131, Parcel 013) (ZC #550)

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to withdraw Items E & F. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice 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 with Greenskies and Dom Celtruda of BL Companies presented.

You've seen the site plan and we really just wanted to focus on the modifications we've made to the plan which were per the directive of the board at our last meeting.

We changed the construction entrance moving it to the Hatton School property. That's done to limit the disturbance of construction vehicles coming in off Berlin Street the neighbors.

We've increased the height of the fence from 4' to 6'. And, we've called out to have a slatted chain link fence. This will serve as a privacy fence. You will not be able to see through the fence.

We've been in communication and met with the neighbors at their property along the east. We've added additional vegetative buffer. And, we've added as of last night additional trees to improve that buffer to a point where we feel it eliminates the line of sight from all residents on the east to the array.

I'd like to note one thing we will incorporate into the plan set is we'll have notes on there that say the exact location of the trees can be determined in coordination with the residents. We want to use the existing tree line and add trees to increase that buffer. We'll work with them to move those trees to make sure their line of sight eliminated towards the arrays.

Dom Celtruda showed the site plan and pointed out the new modifications. The access entrance was pointed out and discussed. The fencing around the area was discussed. Landscaping was pointed out and discussed.

The plantings vary from 6' to 8'. We'll incorporate that along the pocketed areas. It will be staggered to provide ample blockage on the east side.

The fencing with slats will be all the way around.

Mr. Phillips suggested you might want to consider only having the slats on the eastern, western and southern side but not the northern side facing the school or security reasons. No slats facing the school you can see into the area.

The applicant will work with the residents on the planning but if there is a problem the final review is always with the staff confirmed the town attorney. Field changes to accommodate requests can easily be done from a staff perspective added Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Leggett referred to letter received wherein it was noted the ROI relative to monies saved by the BOE for the project. They questioned the conservation aspects. They questioned open space. They questioned longer term deterioration of property values. Are we to discuss that? Is that past history now? A very meaningful letter --- to me.

The Town Attorney advised it has been received. Most of those are not site plan issues, but as a board you can discuss anything submitted to you.

The Chair said the entire commission received it and letters we receive influence the way we vote on applications. Once the motion is made, we can second it and then discuss it.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulation of what we talked about the for landscaping and the final authority is with the planning division as to landscaping on site and secondly, make a stipulation that we do not have slats to the north because it's important that the school people need to see inside. Mr. Kalkowski seconded.

Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Leggett opposed.

H. FRAL, LLC, site plan modification for proposed addition to existing facility, 865 West Queen Street (SPR #1699)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates, represented the applicant.

The proposed addition runs along the east side of the building from the front to halfway down the back. It's a continuation of the current operation. No additional employees. Or additional need for sewage disposal. We sent a letter to the health department regarding that.

We received staff comments and they are not anything that we can't take care of.

The landscaping will be transferred along the easterly boundary and additional landscaping is proposed in front of the future addition.

ZIRO is achieved with the current underground storage facility.

Drainage calculations were submitted to the town.

The Chair seated Mr. Morelli for Mr. Chaplinsky who left the meeting room.

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

I. 8-24 referral for ordinance appropriating \$9,400,000 for costs related to the design, construction, furnishing and equipping of a new senior center to be located on the Calendar House Senior Citizen Center site, including the demolition of the existing facility; and authorizing the issue of \$9,400,000 bonds and notes to finance said appropriation (MR#500)

Attorney Sciota introduced the item. This is an 8-24 is asking for your approval as they wish to go to the voters this November for \$9.4 million.

Dennis Rioux, BL Companies, architect for this project. The project consists of the construction of a new senior center on the same site as the existing center. It will be located on the west side of the property. Once the new facility is constructed, the existing facility will be demolished.

We will be back once the plans are developed further and we intend to meet all the requirements of the planning & zoning commission including setbacks and parking.

The program for the facility has been passed around and we have the support of the senior commission as well as the members of the Calendar House for this endeavor.

This passed the BOF last week.

Attorney Sciota explained the 8-24 will be coming back to you as there is going to be a public hearing as it is a municipal use. That is after referendum assuming it passes.

We are hoping to have final action by the council the 22<sup>nd</sup> to authorize this to go to the voters.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve and return a favorable 8-24. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. 9-24 referral for the ordinance appropriating \$2,000,000 for for acquisition of land, or easements, interests or rights therein, for open space purposes; and authorizing the issue of bonds and notes in the same amount to finance said appropriation (MR#501).

Attorney Sciota explained this has been sent to you by the council. The council wishes this to go to the voters for \$2 million.

The BOF is having a special meeting Thursday night to revote on the issue. There were not enough votes to pass it last time. It was a non-vote. Therefore they're going to vote again on Thursday night. Everything should be all set to go for the council to take up the matter on Monday.

Voting on this will have everything in order for the council on June 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to return a favorable 8-24 to the council. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. Cocomo Brothers, LLC, reduction of \$93,300 subdivision bond to the maintenance bond amount of \$15,000 (Cocomo Brothers LLC will pay the Town of Southington \$10,185.50 from reduced amount for the repaving of South End Road), Curtiss Farms subdivision (S#1290)

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

L. Road Acceptance, Curtiss Farm Court from South End Road to its terminus, a total distance of 397 feet (.08 mi) Curtiss Farms subdivision (S#1290)

Ready for action contingent upon the items listed in Letter K above. Mr. Kalkowski so moved the motion. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

M. SDB Properties, release of \$1,200 Public Improvement bond and release of \$1,500 Erosion and Sedimentation Bond (SDB will reimburse Town of southington for road patch restoration costs of \$1,483.39 s a result of project. Remaining balance will be released to SDB Properties ) 56 Center Street (SPR #1503)

Ready for action. Mr. Kalkowski made a motion to approve. Mr. Macchio seconded.

Attorney Sciota advised, pursuant to a query by the Chair, that an agreement put in several years ago made this gentleman responsible to pour the pad which he did. The two other parties are responsible to put up the fencing. It is our opinion that this gentleman has completed what he was required to do.

Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

N. LePage Homes, release of \$30,000 bond in lieu of site plan compliance, 500 Mill Street Condos (SPR #1595)

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

The Chair commented the condos looked fantastic. Very, very nice.

O. Information discussion: Woodard & Curran - West Queen Street Athletic Complex - Conceptual Site Plan Approval Request

Lou Perillo, Southington's Economic Director and Scott Mederios of Woodard & Currant presented this application.

Mr. Perillo stated the town council has given him the task of finding a location to develop a sports complex. With that, the BOF along with the Council has appropriated money to be spent for a conceptual plan.

We found an available location that we think is most suitable given traffic and the size. What you will see this evening maximizes the use of the site within the constraints allowed.

Thanks to the Town Council for their support, the BOF and the administration for their steadfastness in the decision to do this. It's a lot of work and time coming forward.

Also, I thank Jesse Buchanan of the Record Journal as we've received a tremendous amount of publicity which yielded two interested parties.

The plan this evening does not favor one over the other. We are trying to maximize the site with the use that is allowed. The site is approximately 35 acres, has some wetlands and topography issues. It could be a steel building. It could have some outside component and more than likely it will change. A full site plan will probably cost in the neighborhood of \$125,000 to \$150,000 for something of this magnitude.

We have traffic studies and some ground work, borings, et cetera. We are very excited to be here before you this evening.

(Mr. Chaplinsky re-entered the meeting and was seated by the Chair.)

Scott Medeiros from Woodard and Curran, Enfield, Connecticut presented a PowerPoint presentation. (Please refer to the video tape for the full presentation on line.)

The following items were noted:

- Grading, topography, pockets of wetlands on the high and low ends of the site.
- Power line on the upper limit edge of the property. Wetland crossing.

The goal was to establish real site development for the targeted use and the targeted use being some sports and recreation type application. And, to clarify the physical and regulatory limitations on the site to identify how the site can really be developed.

Ultimately the goal of the investment by the town was to maximize the return on the investment for the town while meeting the planning & zoning requirements that are inherent.

(40 minute PowerPoint presentation.)

Various questions by the commissioners regarding building height, building size and proposed sports to be handled there.

Mr. Perillo talked about marketability options. Traffic and access was discussed. Location of the building on the site was discussed.

Mr. Perillo advised in full transparency, we are looking for alcohol and restaurant use as an ancillary use. It is common in sports complexes. We are trying to become a recreation/destination keying off of Mt. Southington Ski area, ESPN and Lake Compounce. A draw gives incentive for people to come to the area and stay and use our businesses.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he was supportive of this. I am supportive the height. We want this part of West Street for a destination location. This would be perfect to help bring more people to this part of town and help our businesses thrive. I think this is great. And, we can work with the height.

The only regulation change that will probably be necessary is the height. Everything else fits into our regulations.

All of the commissioners, upon polling, unanimously were very, very supportive of this plan. (Refer to video on-line for each commissioner's comments.)

8. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Clock advised the next meeting is Thursday night. We are discussing infrastructure. Please do attend if you can.

9. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Phillips said there is another zoning text amendment scheduled for July. This is clean up matters.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

- 1645, SPR, for Perjoni, 848 South Main Street. They want to install patio seating. No alcohol. Administrative approval on that.

Under Miscellaneous, we have a new cell communications facility proposal in a faux chimney at Lake Compounce in the main building. I don't believe that will raise a concern. I don't see any need for a public hearing.

11. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Reviewed.

12. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 o'clock, p.m.)