

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
March 15, 2016

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, March 15, 2016 at the Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Chairman Michael DelSanto called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

Paul Chaplinsky	James Sinclair
Jennifer Clock	James Morelli
Susan Locks	James Macchio
Michael DelSanto, Chair	

Alternates: Ted Cabata

Ex-Officio: James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer
Robert A. Phillips, Director of Planning &
Community Development
Mark J. Sciota, Deputy Town Mgr./Town Attorney

Absent: Joe Coviello & Kevin Clements, Alternates

A quorum was determined.

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

4. Appointment of Alternate

Mr. Chaplinsky nominated Bob Hammersley as an alternate for the Planning & Zoning Commission. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Hammersley approached the bench and was sworn in by Attorney Sciota.

Robert Hammersley, 358 Hobart Street, Southington, CT.

(Sworn, sworn)

Congratulations!

(Applause)

5. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular Meeting of March 1, 2016

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

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

6. Public Hearings

A. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC, Special Permit Application for open space subdivision, Parcel 51, Loper Street (Map 158, Parcel 051) property of Ann Griffin Egan, Trustee, in an R-2025 zone (SPU 3562), continued from March 1

AND

B. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC, 72 lot Resubdivision Application, Parcel 51, Loper Street (Map 158, Parcel 051) property of Ann Griffin Egan, Trustee, in an R-20/25 zone (S1312), continued from March 1

Anthony Denorfia, 133 Main Street, Southington, principal of the applicant presented. Since the last meeting, we have hired a traffic engineer who is presently doing the study which will be ready by the next meeting. We would ask that you keep these public hearings open and continue them to the next meeting.

If there are any questions, we'd be more than happy to answer them.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

The Chair reminded everyone this is an application for an open space subdivision and the question before you is whether or not you are in favor of an open space subdivision.

Please refer to the video recording for the presentations.

The following spoke in favor of the public hearing referencing:

- the Town did not really get a good opportunity to buy this open space.
- No metric makes the conventional better.
- Buffering provided to the houses on Laning (sic) Street and Woodberry Hill Drive.
- Insulate the existing neighborhoods and protect them.
- Smaller impact on the neighboring homes.
- Open space, talking about 14 acres versus 2 acres, 75 % or 10 acres usable versus 2 at most that are usable.
- Traffic will increase on Loper Street.

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

- Home values. Clear cutting Loper Street would have a bigger impact on homes than not clear cutting it.
- The wetlands. Turtles, et cetera.
- We can't stop development but we can minimize impact to the homeowners around it.
- Wildlife preservation with the buffer of woods.
- Enhanced drainage in the area.

(Speakers)

- (1) Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue.
- (2) Steve Jasulavic, 107 Woodberry Hills Drive. Referenced a letter he sent to the commission. (On file in the Town Planner's Office.)
- (3) Laura Rogalski and John Rogalski, 108 Woodberry Hill Drive.
- (4) Residents from 25 Woodberry Hill Drive.
- (5) Mr. Jermakian, 95 Woodberry Hill Drive. (Letter on file in the Town Planner's Office.)
- (6) John Smayda, 136 Woodbery Hill Drive Drive.
- (7) Rhonda Lane, 78 Loper Street
- (8) Steven Maci, 187 Loper Street
- (9) Brian Barrett, 92 Loper Street

(Those speaking against the application)

The following spoke against the application and in favor of a conventional subdivision referencing the following items:

- Large developments with big houses and small lots is not desirable for the town.
- Privacy
- Infrastructure to handle the development.
- Drainage
- Adhere to the half-acre zone and adhere to the open space. Why can't we have both.
- Fewer houses with better layouts.
- Small lot sizes.

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

- Half acre lots with open space considerations to preserve the buffering and quality of life for the neighbors.
- How much and how long the construction is going to go on.
- Taxes going up and home values going down.
- Road come out to Woodberry Hill Drive.
- Safer to avoid Loper Street.
- Larger lot sizes are better.
- Hard to access Loper Street from driveways on Loper Street.
- Weather concerns with Loper Street in the winter.
- Heavy traffic on Loper Street.

(Speakers)

- (1) Kathy LaForest, 160 Wonx Spring Road
- (2) K. Patrick, 351 Loper Street
- (3) Batiste Zgombick, Richmond Court
- (4) Tom Galvan, 40 Richmond Court
- (5) Maureen & David Brennan, 118 Loper Street
- (6) Anna Smigelski, 224 Woodberry Hill Drive
- (7) Mr. Smigelski, 224 Woodberry Hill Drive
- (8) Alberta Boucher, 184 Loper Street

(Rebuttal)

Anthony Denorfia answered the following questions and issues:

Phasing, egress off of Loper Street, cul de sac, drainage, why they are not half acre lots, construction trucks, sidewalks and whether or not property values will decline.

The Chair continued the public hearing to the next meeting.

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record for the three new public hearings:

C. Lovley Development, 2 lot resubdivision application, 15 Twin Pond Terrace, in an R-20-25 and R-80 zone (S1313)

The applicant has requested a table but leaving the public hearing open.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair left the public hearing open.

D. Proposed Zoning Text Amendment, MUT Zone District, new Section 4-06 and revised Section 7A (ZA #587)

And

E. Proposed Zone Boundary Change, "I-2 and R-40" to "MUT" Zone District, properties located at: 1177 West Street (Map 143, Parcel 019); 1193 West Street (Map 143, Parcel 017); West Street (Map 155, Parcel 078); 712 Spring Street (Map 155, Parcel 075); Spring Street (Map 155, Parcel 072); ZC #553.

Mr. Chaplinsky explained the application for the Mixed Use Transitional (MUT) Zone. It is an outcome of the West Street Subcommittee. The zone changes that were identified primarily between the West Queen Street area and just north of that and all the way down to I-94 heading south. There was the West Street Business Zone, Interchange Commercial Zone. There was a Business Overlay Zone which did not go forward.

This transition zone is supposed to transition from what is now the West Street Business Zone that exists today. That is primarily between Spring Street and West Queen Street, both sides of the road. We're primarily looking for transitions to and from that zone.

If you think about the commercial type activity around the highway where Target & Lowes is, the thought is that we are looking for subtle transition as you drive away from the highway and as we get to the West Street Business Zone and what might that transition look like.

Today, the first property being targeted here is an I-2 zone which is on the east side of West Street between Curtiss and Spring. The intensity of the I-2 zone coupled up against the existing R-40 residential zone is not something that we thought would be appropriate. So the subcommittee suggested making this transition

zone for a softer transition to the West Street Business Zone and also adjacent to the residential homes today.

There are two parts to the proposal. The first is we don't have what is called a mixed use transition zone in our town. Do we want to put this MUT zone language in our regulations? If so, the second part would be do we want to take action on rezoning this I-2 portion between Spring and Curtiss Street to the MUT zone.

Light to heavier industrial uses are permitted in an I-2 zone currently. Manufacturing, warehousing, contractor, materials, et cetera.

The uses here with this zone are designed to be the more campus style colonial look considering the topography and abutting residential zones, we try to create language to create more of a softer transition to those zones than what the I-2 zone offered.

Do you agree with that and should we move forward is what we're looking for.

Mr. Phillips walked the commission through the proposed language. (Document on file in the Town Planner's office.)

- Bulk requirements were discussed.
- Purposes and General Concepts were discussed.
- Allowable uses were detailed. Special Permit is required.
- Pre application meeting requirement. Requirement that the master plan be approved by the commission as a requirement of the SPU.
- Consolidated parcels is to encourage lot consolidation and cohesiveness.
- Site plan design was discussed. SPU requirement and access management strategies.
- Abutting zones and adjacent zones are important considerations and critically reviewed by the commission for buffering.
- Outside display of merchandise as part of a pedestrian environmental in a shopping center were noted.
- Outdoor dining features incorporated into the pedestrian friendly plan were discussed.
- Sidewalks.
- All roads and utilities owned and maintained by the owners of the development and not the town.
- Residential site design requirements were discussed.

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

- Internal accessibility.
- Single family residential uses permitted were noted.
- Commercial units were discussed.
- Architectural features and requirements were noted.
- Planting and landscaping plan requirements were noted.
- Buffers were noted.
- Lighting was noted.
- Parking and loading areas.
- Pavers and stamped concrete, interior access drives were discussed.
- Pedestrian friendly.
- Signage was discussed.
- Storm water management was discussed.

This is for Curtis to Spring on the east side of West Street area and over to the old Canal area up into the existing subdivision of Spring Hill Road and Summit Farms Road.

As the result of a staff meeting this afternoon, Mr. Phillips advised, Section 4-06.2, allowable uses, you should consider whether assisted living/age restrict/age targeted are appropriate uses.

And, also consider whether banks and pharmacy uses should be allowed to have drive thrus.

Section 4-06.5, site plan design, Section D, consider whether the term enhances the appearance is an appropriate term with regard outside display of merchandise. It may be too subjective.

Section 4-06.5, site plan design, Section E, you should consider simply allowing seasonal outdoor dining as an accessory use.

Section 4-06.5, site plan design, Section I, consider adding the term "may not be" in place of "are not" with regard to sidewalks along West Street. It may not be conducive because of topography and limited space area. West Street is a state road and the traffic and speeds are high.

Section 4-06.7 - Architectural - consider limiting "vinyl or other man-made product" to a maximum percentage per face of structure.

Things to think about and consider.

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

The following spoke in favor of the application mentioning:

- Protecting the existing neighborhoods.
- Buffers to an existing neighborhood should be double what they are now.
- Building heights.
- Topography.

(Speakers)

- (1) Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue.
- (2) Roger Tolles, 712 Spring Street.

(Those speaking against the application)

The following people spoke mentioning the following:

- Power lines in the area.
- Wetlands.
- Easements.
- Taking single family residences and infusing them into a higher density mixed use zone.
- Increased traffic on roads lined with residential houses.
- Certain areas that are residential should not be in the MUT zone.
- Buffers.
- Keep community feel to what we have.
- Keep industrial more towards Curtis Street.
- Safety for children.
- High story hotels not okay.
- Traffic backups on Spring Street.
- Keep R-40 the way it is behind our houses.
- More research and more planning before implementation.

(Speakers)

- (1) Gretta Patral, 120 Spring Hill Road.

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

(2) Erick Lindquist, 10 Spring Hill Road.

(3) Darcy O'Shea, 676 Spring Street.

(4) Todd House, 88 Spring Hill Road.

(5) Tom O'Shea, 676 Spring Hill Road.

(6) Pastor Mark Castro Giovanni, Tabernacle Church, Spring & West Street. (Submitted a letter which is on file in the Town Planner's Office.)

Mr. Chaplinsky reviewed the meeting he attended with staff at the DOT regarding West Street planning.

Hearing no other speakers, the Chair left the public hearing open.

7. Business Meeting

A. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC, Special Permit Application for open space subdivision, Parcel 51, Loper Street (Map 158, Parcel 051) property of Ann Griffin Egan, Trustee, in an R-2025 zone (SPU 3562), continued from March 1

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

B. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC, 72 lot Resubdivision Application, Parcel 51, Loper Street (Map 158, Parcel 051) property of Ann Griffin Egan, Trustee, in an R-20/25 zone (S1312), continued from March 1

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

C. Lovley Development, 2 lot resubdivision application, 15 Twin Pond Terrace, in an R-20-25 and R-80 zone (S1313)

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

D. Proposed Zoning Text Amendment, MUT Zone District, new Section 4-06 and revised Section 7A (ZA #587)

Mr. Phillips reviewed to his agenda report. The question for you to consider is assisted living, age restricted or age targeted as

appropriate uses and also whether banks and pharmacies should be allowed to have drive-thru uses.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated his opinion is we should keep the drive-thrus off. There's plenty of zones and opportunities in towns for banks and drive-thrus and things that require drive-thrus. We don't want to have the same activity on West Street as Queen Street. I would say we should steer clear of those activities for West Street.

Ms. Clock agreed. It would create more traffic.

Ms. Locks agreed no drive thru.

The Chair advised Mr. Phillips the drive thru should stay out.

As to the assisted living or age restriction, Mr. Phillips assisted living facilities could be more of an intensive use. It depends on what you are looking for.

Age restricted, you're looking at 55 and over or 62 and over. Things of that nature. You can target it to any age group, really. I don't know if that is in keeping with what you would envision as far as the residential component of this mixed use.

Mr. Sciota said staff's thought was we didn't want to pigeon hole this part of it. This is more of an active type situation where you combining active communities with active commercial. Assisted living is a very specific issue with a high density, high service aspect of it with a lot of trips (ambulances, visitations). It depends on the type of commercial you are going to have there. This is designed for more of an active area. That may go against what the POCD talked about for the West Street area which was more of a destination, active area.

Mr. Phillips said the original thought process behind that was to establish a demographic spread of age groups. But it may not be appropriate for this area.

Discussion amongst the commissioners on the age restricted use. Mr. Sciota explained what you are saying is you have no problem with them marketing to toward 55 or under.

The Chair was advised to strike the assisted living aspect.

Mr. Chaplinsky wondered if it were possible to look at the regulation --- it says residential on top of commercial and residential as a stand-alone. Not single family homes, but the question is could you revise the language that it push the residential into what is today the residential part of this area? Just food for thought.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips stated commercial needs to have visibility. Curtiss Street has a lot of frontage for this zone. Commercial is very likely to locate to the southern portion of the zone with access to Curtiss Street where there isn't so much of a topography issue and visibility is the highest. On the northern end you run into issues with the slopes and the fact that anything built there will have to be located farther from West Street and obviously behind existing residences on Spring Street. The commercial isn't likely to locate there.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked staff to consider something to keep residential in that part of the area.

The Chair commented we are okay with the age-restricted.

Section 4-06.5 - Consider whether "enhances the appearance" is an appropriate term with regard to outside display of merchandise. Is it too subjective?

Mr. Phillips stated it could be too subjective. The idea was there would be outside type of display of things as people are walking and will want to see things there on the interior walkways. Staff can review it to tighten it up.

Mr. Sciota said it is tough language and let staff look at it a little more.

The third thing is consider allowing seasonal outdoor dining as an accessory use as regulations on alcohol are likely to be back within PZC purview this year.

Mr. Phillips was advised to keep it simple. Mr. Sciota pointed out it is on private property.

Section 4-06.5 - Site Plan Design - Consider adding the term "may not be" in place of "are not" with regard to sidewalks along West Street.

Mr. Phillips stated he did not know how feasible it would be to place sidewalks on West Street. I don't know if it is really appropriate. If you want to have the ability to put them.

Mr. Sciota said if it is a site plan, under the law you are able to take a look at it. Why not give yourself the ability to do it? There are sections that could be done. Give yourself the opportunity.

And, consider limiting vinyl or other man-made product to a maximum percentage per face of structure. Mr. Sciota offered the fact there is nice vinyl, the shakes and all that, but a huge building with just the horizontal is not something you are going to want. So some language is necessary. Rob will put those regulations together.

Mr. Chaplinsky liked the percentage idea. Less is more.

Mr. Phillips marked off three areas of the regs:

Section 4-06, we'll leave in active adults at the end of the paragraph. Leave in the restricted.

In 4-06.3, pre application meeting, I would suggest some language that requires a master plan approved by the commission to make it clear that is exactly what we're looking for.

And, Section 4-06.6, residential site design requirements. Under C, it says single and multifamily. Maybe remove the word single. When I wrote this I was thinking of single units and not single family detached housing. Everyone agreed with that.

The moving of 3 to 5 on the yield was discussed.

Control of residential versus commercial component, the ratio, was discussed. Mr. Chaplinsky wanted a minimum ratio of residential to commercial. We don't want a complete residential component.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up lot sizes and width.
Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up maximum lot coverage and the information for stories and height changes.
Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky also brought up the buffering requirement. Is 30 feet enough?
Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked Mr. Sciota about increasing the buffer amount. Mr. Sciota said that would be okay as it is more protective of the neighbors if you expand the buffer.
Discussion.

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

E. Proposed Zone Boundary Change, "I-2 and R-40" to "MUT" Zone District, properties located at: 1177 West Street (Map 143, Parcel 019); 1193 West Street (Map 143, Parcel 017); West Street (Map 155, Parcel 078); 712 Spring Street (Map 155, Parcel 075); Spring Street (Map 155, Parcel 072); ZC #553.

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

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

F. Lovley Development, Inc. site plan application for 64 units of multifamily development, Eden Avenue (Map100, Parcel 17), in a CB zone (SPR #1711), tabled from March 1

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

G. Subdivision Regulation amendment, Section 6 - Open Space (SA #25), tabled from March 1

A lot of information was received at our last meeting. We were asked to send Rob any questions or issues.

Mr. Phillips advised, in general terms, what we have done here is a reduction of the number of lots before open space applies to a conventional subdivision. Now, it applies to all residential subdivisions with a conventional layout with 3 or more lots.

Removal of the open space per lot calculation and replacement with a 10 percent requirement of predevelopment land area or a combination or a fee in lieu of. Ten percent is essentially the norm throughout the state.

Establishing a standard requirement at least 50 percent buildable to unbuildable land ratio unless the commission determines otherwise. Buildable and unbuildable is defined in the regulation.

Removal of the language that would now be redundant or no longer applicable which is that whole natural diversity database language. It wouldn't matter as we are applying it to all residential subdivisions.

Miscellaneous wordsmithing to establish flexibility and intention. Adding the word stewardship. The commission basically has the authority to determine what the disposition of the preserved open space land is going to end up being. Fee simple to the town or land trust. Staff would work with the applicant to figure out what is most appropriate and the commission has the authority and should maintain the authority of the final decision. Also, changing some of the terminology.

I did suggest removing an equal amount under the "tot lot". Explained.

Changing the terminology from "may" have a full rail fence . . . The word shall is not always suitable and appropriate. I think it should be if you determine the fee simple dedication should have a fence to identify it.

Otherwise, keeping the language the way it is so we don't have any issues with people thinking there is language that doesn't make sense.

Discussion.

The Chair stated that folks have said that this is taking or stealing of land. This is in concert with what other towns are doing. Mr. Sciota stated there is a statutory provision which talks about this board having the right from the state to do subdivision of land and part of that is to preserve open space. This isn't taking of land. I'm very comfortable with this. Ten percent is the norm and probably on the low end of the norm. And, rather than taking some areas of open space in a standard subdivision we may seriously want to talk about taking a fee in lieu of which is put into an account and we have money to target what land we want to buy for the public.

Discussion.

The Chair talked about the preservation and conservation of land and this is going to help us.

Ms. Clock suggested tabling this as we still have our POCD open. I think we did hear a lot of opinions and we should wait to act on this until that part is closed.

The public hearing for the council is March 28th and the PZC's is May.

Mr. Morelli asked about consideration or the grandfathering the existing number of units on land. If we make this change, there are large tracts of land that are minimized. I think it is our opinion that open space developments make more sense but that doesn't guarantee those with land for large subdivisions today. Mr. Sciota said it is impossible to grandfather. When we pass a regulation, you have 15-days from publication if you wish to submit an application. After that, the regulation kicks in.

Mr. Sinclair agreed with Ms. Clock that we should wait for the POCD to be finished. We have a lot of feedback and in concert with the POCD we should have another subcommittee for open space to preserve space in subdivisions.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said we've gone through the POCD and the feedback we had with respect to open space was what --- directed question to Ms. Clock. Ms. Clock responded the public was split into two pieces: landowners and the community. There is a back and forth. The language says: make action to preserve open space, review our regulations and it makes several suggestions. Ms. Clock continued she felt it was a disservice to the community to act on something like this until we pass the master plan. This is a subpart of the master plan that hasn't been approved, yet. I am not sure what the rush is

for action.

Discussion.

Ms. Clock made a motion to table. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

H. Rt 322 Motorsports, LLC, request for C.G.S. 14-54 Location Approval for Motor Vehicles sales and service, 1223 Meriden Waterbury Road, in a B zone (LA #1) and acceptance of Municipal Registration Form for Regulated Activities in Aquifer Protection Area.

Attorney Larry Shipman for the applicant, Route 322 Motorsports. What the applicant wants to do is this is an application with regards to CGS 14-54. There is currently a used car dealership there by the name of Route 322 Motorsports.

There is a new owner coming in that has established a new limited liability company. As a result, they need to go to the DMV to obtain a permit to operate that business.

Therefore, they need to get approval from the municipality where the dealership is located that indicates that the site is usable as a used car dealership. It's been through that process with the ZBA. I believe that the way you folks handle it is changed and I think I am the first one.

We are looking to continue the exact same use in the exact same building. No changes. And, I have submitted an application registering this property for the Aquifer Protection District. We ask that application also be accepted by the town. No changes to the structure or services.

Mr. Phillips noted that both applications are ready for action.

Parking was discussed and the amount of cars allowed on the lot.

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve the location. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

As to the municipal registration for the activities in an aquifer protection area, Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

I. Lovley Development, request for release of \$2,900 E & S bond, Pavano Drive subdivision (S #1288)

Planning & Zoning Commission – March 15, 2016

This is ready for action. Ms. Clock made a motion to approve and Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. Cumberland Farms, release of \$29,000 Public Improvement Bond, 1978 West Street (SPR #1677)

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

K. Lovley Development, Release of \$40,000 Maintenance bond, Empress Drive (Recko Farm Estates) S #1277

Ready for action. So moved by Mr. Sinclair. Second by Ms. Clock. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

8. PLAN OF CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

We have the public hearing at the town council meeting on March 28th at 7:00 pm. Attend if you can.

9. ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None. Just a couple of continuations.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Phillips had no report but he did bring up the continuous improvement committee document. (Passed around to the commission)

The Chair reviewed the issues outstanding and who was assigned which issue.

I think Mr. Sinclair volunteered tonight to head up our new open space subcommittee. We'll talk off line about that.

Mr. Sciota asked to be advised when the solar subcommittee meets.

The Chair was hoping by June 1st to bring a lot of these issue back. Speak with Rob as to more versus less important. Administrative stuff is the most pressing.

Discussion.

Keep the Chair abreast of what is happening.

11. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

- CarSue Realty for a site plan modification for lot line revision and site improvements for a 15,000 sf addition at 44 Robert Porter Road. I-1 zone. Next meeting.

Mr. Phillips will be at a conference at the time of the next meeting.

Commissioner Items:

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the Spring Street and Queen Street, DOT and Spring Street with West Street. Is there an update?

Mr. Grappone stated Chief Daly did make a request of the executive director of OSTA concerning the intersection and what could be done at West Street and West Pines Drive intersection. With the report he compiled three-year accident data. Explained.

Mr. Grappone said once Mr. Lovley makes that connection with Welch that will improve the traffic situation.

Just sit and wait until we hear back from the state.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the Queen Street/Spring Street intersection. The land adjacent to the highway and if that is something the DOT could help us with. Mr. Grappone said there was no word on that and it would be related to the development of the additional pad site at BJs.

Discussion.

The Chair brought up the wall in front of the hospital which came down, part of it. It's been about a week and a half. Can we get the rocks off the sidewalk and open the sidewalk up? Mr. Sciota will contact the director and get an update on the status.

12. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:17 o'clock, p.m.)