

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
MAY 17, 2016

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, May 17, 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
James Morelli*	Jennifer Clock
Susan Locks	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Ted Cabata & Joe Coviello

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

Absent: James Macchio, Commissioner
Robert Hammersley, Alternate

(* Arrived with meeting in progress.)

The Chair seated Mr. Coviello for Mr. Macchio and Mr. Cabata for Mr. Cabata until he arrives. A quorum was determined.

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

4. Appointment of Alternate

Passed to next meeting.

5. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of May 3, 2016

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve which Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Coviello and Ms. Clock.

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

6. Public Hearings

A. Public Hearing for Adoption of the 2016-2026 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) as presented.

Glen Chalder from Planimetrics presented the POCD via a brief Power Point summary of the plan. (Plan on file in the Town Planner's Office or on line at www.southington.org.)

It is an advisory document meant to guide a community into the future and help us to become the community we would like to be in the future.

The process started about 18 months ago with our initial meeting and continued to the preparation of the draft plan in December, 2015. We forward the draft to you for your review and consideration which brings us to where we are today in terms of adoption of the plan overall.

The plan contains five key pieces which were briefly highlighted:

- Introductory information
- Demographic Information
- Other things affecting the community or expected to be relevant over the next 20 to 30 years
- Three major policy elements of the plan
 - Conservation strategies
 - Development strategies
 - Infrastructure strategies
- Implementation

Conditions and trends were discussed.

Change in the age composition of the community was discussed.

Aging of the baby boomers was discussed.

Numbers to the different strategies in the plan were discussed as to their importance.

The plan doesn't recommend any major overall changes in the overall structure or fabric of Southington. The pattern of development in the community has been fixed for some time and the plan recommends improvements within that overall framework in the areas of conservation, development and infrastructure.

Recommendations in the plan are consistent with state and regional plans. Should we apply for grants in the future, the fact we're consistent will help us be successful in doing that.

With your action or when you feel it's appropriate, that journey can begin.

He acknowledged the hard work of a number of groups in town: the update committee, the planning & zoning commission, town staff and officials, residents who participated.

Happy to answer any questions.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

(1) Arthur Cyr, 103 Berlin Avenue. This is the second POCD I've been involved in. I stand here to say I approve of this POCD. It is a hundred percent better than the last one. I had many objections to the previous one. This one seems to hit the nail on the head for Southington. It involved a lot more input from the committee and from town people. It is written so that almost any citizen of this town can go through it and understand it.

It's a nice, concise, advisory document to guide us through the next ten years. If we don't plan and we don't set up guidelines and have some kind of advisory information, we will end up with another Queen Street on West Street and maybe even down the Meriden Waterbury Road. This POCD is an important document in my opinion.

Discussion.

This POCD gives us better insight.

Thank you.

(2) David Jarmakian, 95 Woodberry Hill. I comment those who prepared this plan. I think it is a very, very well put together plan for the future of Southington.

A couple of comments about the contents of the report.

- Page 34 suggests \$2 million be appropriated for open space purchases. I suggest that number be doubled or tripled. We know \$2 million doesn't go very far.

Under Action Steps, it suggests proposing to amend the open space provisions to have a fee in lieu of open space. This is probably one of the only items in the entire plan I didn't care for. Explained allowing someone to place money into a fund and not create open space I didn't care for, but if it is adopted, I would like to suggest it should be clearly stated where the fees would go and if they would go into the general fund or the open space fund.

It suggests also allowing open space dedication elsewhere if the land adds to the open space system. I think this is another area that needs clarification. It's not clear what dedication means. It's not spelled out. And, adds to the open space system, again clarification as to what that means.

Also on Page 34, the proposal of considering an equivalency factor. Great idea. It should be pursued as soon as possible.

- On Page 19, the number one concern by surveyed residents was open space followed closely by natural resources.

- On page 120, under policy highlights, the highest priority is protection of wetlands.

Thank you.

(3) Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street. I want to speak in favor of the POCD. Planimetrics does a good job. I think that as you move forward with the implementation of your strategic items, specifically open space, I would ask that you take a step back and involve some other people via workshops and allow property owners, developers, business owners and residents to be involved in that process. We spent a lot of time on this in the past few months and I'd like to spend a little more time on it in the future.

I think it's important to implement those changes but to do it in a way that benefits all involved.

Thank you.

(4) Sev Bovino, Kratzert, Jones. Representing a few of my clients. My position is that we do have to have a POCD so it's not that we can oppose it and say we shouldn't have it. It is a flexible plan.

I have few suggestions you can look at it as it moves forward towards implementation. He passed around copies of his list for everyone to follow. (List on file in the Town Planner's Office for review.)

- Parking requirements for restaurants in town.
- Residential use above existing buildings in a B zone.
- Allow Additional R-12 zones.
- Continue to have planning & zoning review the building plans during the approval process. Do not add a review board which would be advisory anyway.

- Reduce the ROD required land area from ten acres to five acres.
- Include the old Alesop Engineering site in Milldale which has pollution on it in the Brownfield development list.
- Preserve open space by keeping the same system and maybe start at five lots instead of ten to require open space. Provide incentives to provide more.
- Allow families to subdivide without the (inaudible) clause.
- Reduce the amount required for fee in lieu of open space. In my opinion it is too high and that's why that's not chosen.
- Look at the current open space subdivision concept requirements and find ways to make it easier to choose it as an alternative.
- Allow multifamily housing on the West Street Corridor in the rear of the properties because business use will not be successful so far back from the street.
- Pursue the creation of an Interchange Zone that you had looked at in the past.

The national, state and local economy is not good and it doesn't look good for the future. Please do not pursue additional requirements which add more cost to everything we do.

We have stringent and costly rules and the bad developers will always be there. They don't follow the rules no matter how many rules you have.

The added burden and cost will be not just for private but for the public projects we'll have.

Thank you for your service to the community and thank you for listening.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the open space development and are there a couple of items that stand out that make it difficult for developers to choose an open space subdivision? Any hot button topics?

Mr. Bovino said we recommend to our client to go with the open space concept but there could be some requirements which I can't put my finger on right now but we could talk about as we move forward.

And, one of them is the frontage. Instead of having a set frontage, make it less but the lot can be open so the home can be situated in the square you're looking for but it doesn't have to be exactly 100'. It could be less. There are other situations like that.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

(Closing remarks)

Mr. Chalder noted the issue before you tonight is adoption of the plan. There is a February 17th memo I prepared with staff's help. There are some photographs and minor tweaks or changes that were noted in terms of clarifying text in the regulations.

I would like for the record to suggest that we have comments from both the CRCOG supporting the plan. They observed it would be nice to place some additional language in regarding the National Hazard Mitigation Plan. We'll put a side bar on Page 46 to address that.

There was comments from the NVCOG and they've suggested additional language related to regionalism and how Southington participates with regional agencies. We'll put a side bar on Page 115 with regard to that.

I appreciate the comments tonight. In terms of the plan, I think a number of these are addressed in the plan and the comments were not supportive of particular policy directions from an individual perspective, I think certainly with regard to comments about the ROD land, there are recommendations on Page 72 the commission look at that regulation.

There is a recommendation on Page 34 to look at the conservation development by the commission.

As to Page 34, from the gentleman who started, they were comments in support of open space. It might be helpful to add a side bar referring to what the open space fund is. It does have statutory importance and it would be beneficial to add that language in.

(Questions by a Speaker)

Michael Karabin, 894 Andrews Street. My wife and I operate Karabin Farms, a 50-some odd acre agriculture operation. We manage also another hundred acres of agricultural land in town.

I'm curious as to the regulation. On the town web site, I'm remiss in the ramifications for our property should this ever want to be turned into a subdivision. It is my understanding that at that point a certain portion of this would be set aside as conservation land.

The Chair concurred. The percentage has not yet been decided.

Attorney Sciota advised these are not regulations. This is the POCD. It is a guide for this board over the next several years to put

a lot of these in place. There are no regulations specifically coming out of this public hearing.

Mr. Karabin explained there are not many farms left in town. Explained his farm's diversity.

Discussion.

I would hate to see a commission say you've got 50 acres here and we're take an X percent of that and setting it aside. That would be our concern.

The Chair said this application before us right now would have nothing to do with that. This is just whether or not to accept this plan for the next ten years.

Further discussion of his land from 1956 forward and a photograph. It is important to have a good master plan going forward to avoid what some of that picture depicts happened.

The Chair closed the public hearing at this time.

B. AA Denorfia Building &Development, LLC, 72 Lot Resubdivision Application, Parcel 51, Loper Street (Map 158, Parcel051) property of Ann Griffin Egan, Trustee, in an R-20/25 zone (S #1312), extended from May 3.

The Chair seated Mr. Morelli who entered the meeting. He thanked Mr. Cabata for his service.

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son. Tonight we're going to request a continuance of this public hearing. We are in the process of revising the plans based on staff comments received.

No new information to add.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

Speaker: I want to speak in favor.

Steve (Inaudible): 107 Woodberry Hill Drive. I am opposed to the conventional site plan submitted as it has access through wetlands. I live on wetlands. I have to move geese to mow my lawn.

The wetlands are important to me and they're important to the town.

As we saw in the POCD earlier, it talks about conservation of open space and wetlands. I would be strongly opposed to anything that goes through the wetlands.

It's my understanding that you don't go through wetlands if you have an alternative. I believe we have a prudent alternative to the conventional site plan and that is the open space plan.

I ask you to consider that.

The Chair kept the public hearing open to the next meeting.

7. Business Meeting

A. Adoption of the 2016-2016 Plan of Conservation and Development (POCD) as presented.

This is ready for action. Mr. Phillips commented it has been a really good process. Everybody worked well together. The plan is very solid.

If you want to approve the plan tonight, I would suggest an effective date of June 4th which is a Saturday which allows us to leave the old guard and start new the next week and allows for the appeal period.

What was stated by the consultant I would definitely support the commission consider including:

Three sidebars, Page 46, Page 34 and Page 115.

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve the POCD with the stipulation to include the three side bars mentioned by Glen. Mr. Morelli seconded.

Mr. Sinclair observed the last plan was done and shoved in a drawer. I like what we've done here. It's a good plan that moves us forward for the next ten years and we'll move in a good direction with it. I am fully supportive.

Mr. Chaplinsky thanked everyone who came out and especially Jim, Jen, Glenn. It's been a great process. Good reviews. Special thanks you for leading us on this. It's very comprehensive with a great vision for us for the next ten years. Thanks to the professionals how come out and support us at the meetings. Input is very valuable.

The Chair spoke about Planimetrics. Nothing but rave reviews. I put a lot of trust into Ms. Clock. She took the committee and ran with it. Jim Morelli. You did a great job. Lots of meetings and time away from your families. Thank you for the effort. This plan is night and day compared to the plan brought before us ten years ago.

A healthy and productive process. I'm very happy and excited. Major support for the plan. Excited to start implementing this plan.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. AA Denorfia Building & Development, LLC, Special Permit Application for open space subdivision, Parcel 5, Loper Street (Map 158, Parcel 051), property of Ann Griffin Egan, Trustee, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #562) tabled from May 3.

Mr. Phillips reported at this point in time, we've had a discussion over multiple meetings. It's ready for commission decision.

Attorney Sciota advised there was a great deal of concern and I've been more vocal than I've ever been in the 20 years I've been doing this, but I did have a chance to discuss his with many departments including our public safety as well as the applicant.

What we are going to suggest you use as a stipulation is that some signage be put both on Loper Street and on the new street.

The engineering department is familiar with the time frame we're talking about which is the colder weather issues that we're going to have as to the concern of what Loper Street may look like during the colder weather with icy conditions.

We're all comfortable with the fact that with some signage put in, we continue to have two ingress/egress points.

Mr. Grappone continued staff is recommending two access points. There's no way we can get away with less than that from a public safety standpoint and a public works standpoint for maintenance. As mentioned, we're recommending prohibiting left turns on Loper on to the Willow Creek Lane (new street). And, existing Willow Creek Lane, prohibiting left turns on to Loper between the months of November 15th and April 15th. The sign placement would be at the discretion of the public works director.

This refers to the western entrance otherwise known as Willow Creek clarified Mr. Phillips.

Discussion on the signage stipulation recommendation.

Mr. Chaplinsky said it was his understanding we don't have an access point through the neighborhood. The wetlands commission vote don that already. We don't want access in/out of the wetlands. We can't go with one access point. Staff and our safety officers feel we have to have two. I'm supportive of putting the signs up as a compromise. Regardless of the development, there is going to be two access points into this subdivision. I think the open space subdivision is the preferred one from my perspective and from what we've heard from the community. I'll make a motion to approve the application with the stipulation stated by the Ass't Town Engineer with respect to the signage. Mr. Sinclair seconded.

Mr. Morelli commented that he didn't understand why we can't have a second egress for emergency vehicles only and not allow public transportation through that entrance. Explained. I don't know why people in the subdivision can't drive to the top of the hill and if an emergency vehicle has to go in the bottom, they can. I would recommend we have a narrow entrance, 1.5 lanes, with a sign that says Emergency Vehicles Only, No Thru Way or not a Public Road.

I think the minute you allow any kind of traffic through that entrance, you'll get continuous full traffic flow. It would be better if we said they couldn't go through there and if they did, it would be at their own risk.

Discussion on Mr. Morelli's suggestion.

Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Morelli opposed.

C. 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-2025 zone (S#1312) tabled from May 3.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table. Ms. Locks 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), tabled from May 3.

(Please refer to the video for the discussion on this matter.)

Ms. Clock said she was supportive of establishing the MUT zone and the text. It establishes all the goals we are looking to accomplish. I'll go on record with that.

After a lengthy discussion amongst the commissioners and staff a motion to approve with the most recent revised language dated April 5, 2016 with the following modifications as stipulations was made by Mr. Chaplinsky.

1. Reinstitute the originally proposed 40,000 square foot minimum Lot Area in Section 7A-00.

2. Remove "Above West Street Elevation" from Maximum Height in Section 7A-00.

3. Reinstitute the language "where the total footprint area of all residential-only buildings does not exceed a 1:1 ratio to total footprint area of non-residential, or mixed use buildings within the

entire MUT zone", however change 1:1 to 2:1 in section 4-06.2.F - Allowable Uses.

4. Add the language "Further, there shall be residential-only development to serve a transition from all previously existing residential zones and uses abutting the MUT zone", in Section 4-06.2.F - Allowable Uses.

5. Reinststitute the language "Sidewalks are required along all public street frontages", however, remove the work "public" in Section 4-06.5.I - Site Plan Design.

6. Remove "micro" from 4-06.6.C - Residential Site Design Requirements.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Locks. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call 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 018); West Street (Map 143, Parcel 017); 1413 West Street (Map 155, Parcel 078); 712 Spring Street (Map 155, Parcel 075); Spring Street (Map 155, Parcel 072); (ZC #553), tabled from May 3

Mr. Phillips advised this is essentially ready for action as presented. There was a petition submitted by property owners within 500' of the proposed zone change and by our calculations roughly 26% of the area was signed by property owners which is above the 20% requirement that would force a two-thirds commission vote to approve. You need five votes instead of four.

The Chair said this is the first foray into the MUT zone.

Attorney Sciota talked about access roads and the importance of them to make this work. Without private access roadways, it is difficult to make West Street anything but a Queen Street. Without access management and traffic control, West Street will not be developed correctly.

Mr. Phillips reiterated if you want to achieve a mixed use type of development, you really have to be looking at a comprehensive type of solution. Discussed development would have more lights, individual curb cuts or entering/exiting traffic. You'll get what you see on Queen Street which is exactly what you want to avoid. The only way to do this is to look at comprehensive type development where you can marry different land uses together. Explained access management is really a cornerstone of the entire regulation and vision of the area.

It gives you the most control. There's a special permit process. It requires a master plan to be submitted and reviewed by staff and approved by the commission before they even have a site plan approval for any individual use. You have a lot of controls to achieve the vision you're looking for and set up the corridor in the best way possible moving forward.

The master plan requirement was discussed by Mr. Phillips and what it entails as to discretion, placement, industry and residential.

Mr. Sinclair explained he is in support of this regulation.

Mr. Morelli said he is in support of the regulation with the way the language reads. Much better use for the property rather than I-2, for sure.

Ms. Clock agreed with both commissioners. I think that the add on revising the regulation addresses the concerns. This is responsible planning of West Street and that's the major task we're handed. We've heard the concerns and took them into consideration. We incorporated them into the regulation and I think we should move forward with implementation.

Mr. Phillips clarified the special permit process as part of the master plan requires a public hearing. The public will be invited to discuss anything proposed under the SPU. And, then there is site plan review for individual properties in areas to be developed.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted under SPU, future commissions will have to look at this type of thing. It gives a lot more bite to the commission to have a say in what goes there, where it goes versus just a site plan on an allowable use that doesn't go thru an SPU. We have a little bit more control of that and it is documented as to what the intention of this commission was to guide future commissions, as well.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Sinclair seconded.

The Chair reminded everyone if you have concern about the speed of traffic in the area you should contact the police department.

This is responsible planning. People want to come to town. So let's control it before it controls us.

Mr. Chaplinsky reminded everyone that we are lobbying the state to help us on West Street with the intersections there that need help.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Effective date: 15 days after publication of the legal notice for Items E & E.

F. Subdivision Regulation amendment, Section 6-Open Space (SA #25), tabled from May 3

The Chair withdrew this application. Speaking with staff and commissioners, maybe have a workshop and go back to the drawing board and make this work for everyone.

Attorney Sciota noted without objection it is withdrawn.

G. Tavern 42 Burger Brew and Que, floodplain application for the placement of piers for proposed deck in floodplain, 42 & 44 West Main Street, property of Tahoe Realty, LLC, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1712).

This is ready for approval.

Jim Jones, Jones Engineering, 962 Savage Street, represented the applicant, Barry DePaolo, local restaurateur. He is currently working on renovating the former Hearthstone. He would like to place a deck for outdoor dining at the rear of the building. In order to do so he'll have to support it on piers that will fall within the floodplain and the floodway.

They fall within what's known as the conveyance shadow of the existing building which means the water goes around the building. FEMA has provisions for small items to be placed and we are going to ask to place six piers to support the deck. The bottom of the structure of the deck will be above the floodplain. He'll put about four-tenths of a cubic yard of concrete within the floodplain and in order to compensate for that, as noted on the plan, we will take out some material closer to the river on the edge of the property. Half a dozen wheelbarrow.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

H. Tavern 42 Burger Brew and Que, site plan modification application for a proposed 833 sq.ft. deck, 42 & 44 West Main Street, property of Tahoe Realty, LLC, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1712).

Jim Jones, Jones Engineering, represented the applicant. This is the site of the former Hearthstone which he is renovating. In order to do so, he has to come before the commission for the site plan

modification. The deck is going to be at the back of the building. It is 751 sq deck on piers. The bottom of the structure will be above the floodplain.

He will place it on piers and he will actually lose two parking spaces so he'll have to go before the parking authority to get a new waiver. Explained.

This is not ready for action tonight.

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

I. Lineberry Realty, LLC site plan modification for a proposed 6,000 sf addition, 1157 Meriden Waterbury Road, in a B zone SPR #1713.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert Jones represented the applicant. This property is located at 1157 Meriden Waterbury road. It is west of where Praline's used to be.

It's in a B zone served by public water and sewer. It's 1.16 acres. The proposed lot coverage is 14.4% and 25% is allowed.

Current business is auto repair and sales.

The proposal is for a 6,000 sf addition to the rear of the existing building. Building materials will be steel, stucco exterior to match the existing building.

Use is for storage of cars, boats, cycles, et cetera.

No car washing, no floor drains.

Mechanicals will be inside the buildings.

We are proposing to close one curb cut. Explained one would be closed and the area would be landscaped. The state will be contracted in regard to that.

No outside storage with this proposal.

We have the appropriate parking.

Staff comments have been received and addressed.

Any questions?

As a response to a query by Mr. Sinclair, this is for storage of inventory.

Mr. Phillips recommended a table. Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the outstanding issues.

Mr. Grappone said the applicant did receive the checklist today. We've been back and forth with Mr. Bovino on comments. We did receive responses to comments. Our concern at this point in time is not seeing the revised plan is it shows a drywell so we have concern for - I know Mr. Bovino mentioned it is strictly for storage of inventory -- - but there are concerns about aquifer protection in that area. We discussed that it could be swaled as far as a small area for surface drainage that could go around the proposed addition out to the back of the area where they'll discharge the roof drainage. We need that shown on the map.

Mr. Bovino agreed to the suggestion. We're removing the drywell and we will have a graded area from this point (indicating) around the building and be surface runoff going towards the back. The plans are revised.

Mr. Phillips clarified the activities proposed for the addition are not on the prohibited list for aquifer protection regulations. Discussion.

Mr. Grappone said we could stipulate that the applicant remove the drywell or catch basin as shown on the previous plan and that swaling be provided along the westerly side of the building on the revised plan. No activity that is prohibited by the aquifer protection act take place on the site.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulations by town staff. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

J. 405 Queen Street, LLC, 3 lot subdivision application, 405 Queen Street, in a R-20/25 and B zone (S #1314)

Sev Bovino from Kratzert, Jones represented the applicant. This property is at the corner of Queen Street and Loper Street. It is 4.94 acres located in a B zone and an R-20/25 zone. The zone line bisects the property.

The proposal is to utilize the residential zone property by subdividing it into two lots. One will be a front lot and one will be a rear lot. Served by public sewer and water.

The driveway to the rear lot would be waved and shared. The staff comment is to eliminate the curb cut and join this driveway with the other one having one entrance instead of two.

The business zoned lot is 2.75 acres. The appropriate coverage is being maintained. The existing tree buffer shown on the map will be maintained. The suggestion was to have a conservation easement and we have done that.

Staff comments have been received and addressed. We have appropriate sight distance coming out of the driveway. There is a little bit of brush in the way and we'll put a stipulation the plan that brush is to be removed. Otherwise, we have responded to all comments.

The proposed house size is approximately 2,000 sf. Single family.

Planning comments have been addressed. Minor engineering comments. Mr. Bovino said he would be okay with a table to give engineering time to review the responses to comments.

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

K. Samir Zukic, site plan application to construct 6,000 sf building with associated parking, 20 Industrial Drive, in an I-1 zone (SPR #1714).

Steve Giudice represented the application. This is a proposed industrial building to be constructed at 20 Industrial Drive. It's 6,000 sf. Serviced by public water and sewer. We have received staff comments and are in the process of revising those.

Metal building consistent with what is up there. We are providing ground filtration for the roof leaders and the rest of the site is tied into the town drainage system for discharge to the detention basin on the other side of the road.

We'll be asking for a table.

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

L. 8-24 Referral for the bond ordinance appropriating \$57,100,000 for improvements to the Southington Water Pollution Control Facility and authorizing the issue of bonds, notes and obligations not to exceed \$57,100,000 to finance the appropriation, 999 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike (MR #507)

Mr. Grappone presented. He noted a Wastewater Facilities Plan was prepared in 2015 to study the collection system, pump stations and wpc plant for the next 20 years. The plan was approved in March 2016 by DEEP.

Major project driver is to upgrade our discharge limits to the Quinnipiac River to meet future low level limits for phosphorous. Explained our current permit and the project limit. The current permit expires in March 2018.

For moving forward with the project, Mr. Grappone explained the key drivers which include:

- Replacing aging equipment. Original plant was built in 1958 and some of the original equipment exists today. We have trouble finding spare parts for some of the aged equipment.
- Last major upgrades were in 1980, 1997 and 2009.
- Improved reliability and resiliency.
- Take advantage of energy grants and Clean Water Funding.
- An aerial photo was shown and discussed.
- Odor Control was discussed.

Right now we discharge in a location close to the floodplain. We have UV disinfection. We are proposing to relocate that as part of the resiliency with DEEP requirements outside of the floodplain making our new sampling point for discharge here (indicating). A new building for UV and phosphorous reduction proposed at this location (indicating).

As to costs arriving at the \$57.1 million, we went through a 30% design VE study. That is to hire a third party peer review of the current documents. Some cost saving measures were identified. The construction costs alone at the 30% level is \$47.8 million, approximately. We have over \$7 million of engineering services which includes getting the design from the 30% level to the 100% level. Going out to bid for the work, evaluating the bids and overseeing construction.

Interim financing is \$1.9 million in bonding costs. That arrives at the \$57.1 million. A fifty percent grant for the phosphorous portion and then a twenty percent grant for all other eligible costs. The average cost of the grant will be approximately thirty percent. So the grant funds under the Clean Water Fund would be \$17.17 million and the net cost to the town would be just under \$40 million.

To meet the Clean Water Fund requirements, the goal is to have a construction contract signed by July 1, 2018 which was just changed by the Governor to 2019. The projects are first come/first serve so we want to get this moving to take advantage of the grant.

The following are milestones for the project:

- November, 2016 referendum.

- Design completion by November, 2017.
- DEEP and Town reviews by January, 2018.
- Advertising and bidding phase by March, 2018.
- DEEP approval and award contract by April, 2018.
- A 36-month construction phase.

Mr. Chaplinsky discussed a recent tour he had of the facility. He was thoroughly impressed with the work, staff and management team at that facility. The operation is amazing. Cleanliness, tidiness, the way things were operating. Impressive. A lot needs to be done to bring us up to date with the state mandates. I'm very supportive of this. Thanks you and Keith and the staff that is operating this facility. A great job.

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

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to add Item M. Request for a 90-day extension, Sandy Fields, LLC for a 4-lot subdivision, 233 Dunham Street, S #1311. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

M. Request for a 90-day extension, Sandy Fields, LLC for a 4-lot subdivision, 233 Dunham Street, S #1311.

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

8. Regional Planning Commission Update

Meeting coming up this week. Mr. Cabata will report at next meeting.

9. Items to be scheduled for public hearing

None for the next meeting.

10. Administrative Reports

Nothing to report.

11. Receipt of New Applications

1. Samir Zukic was on this evening.
2. Petition to Amend Section 12-02.04 of the Zoning Regulations. Public hearing scheduled for June 21st.

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Ms. Clock updated the commission that she and Susan met with Rob and we embarked on our discussions on doggy daycare, grooming facilities, outside storage and farming regulations.

The Chair reminded everyone serving on a subcommittee to make sure the first meeting in June there is a report back to see how we're doing with all of those.

Mr. Phillips added he and Jim Sinclair and Jim Morelli met and discussed brewery regulations for pubs.

12. Adjournment

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:51 o'clock, p.m.)