

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHLINGTON
AUGUST 16, 2016

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, August 16, 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:

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

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

Absent: Ted Cabata, Ross Hart, Joe Coviello & Robert Hammersley, Alternates

A quorum was determined.

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

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of July 19, 2016

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. PETITION of John Senese (Calco Construction & Development, Inc.) to Change a Zoning District Boundary from R-12 (residential) to B (Business), properties located at 2,4 & 6 Upson Drive, Assessor's Map 181, Parcels 34, 35 & 36 - public hearing continued from July 19

AND

D. Calco Construction c/o John Senese, special permit application to construct multiple buildings on a single lot, 775, 785, 801 and 811 Queen Street and 2,4,6 Upson Drive (SPU #564)

Jeffrey Fitzgerald, BL Companies. 355 Research Parkway, Meriden, CT, professional engineer, representing Calco presented.

Last month we presented a proposed zoning boundary change. (Indicated the area on the map.) It is proposed to be changed from the R-12 zone to B to accommodate the construction of the driveway to the application which is subject for the special permit.

The land comes out of a portion of three of the lots: No 2,4 and 6 Upson Drive.

If you have any further questions on this?

The Chair noted that everything that was put on to the record for the last two meetings will be part of this record.

As to the application for Calco Construction c/o John Senese, special permit application to construct multiple buildings on a single lot, 775, 785, 801 and 811 Queen Street and 2,4,6 Upson Drive (SPU #564), this is the proposed site plan.

There are three new building pads (indicated). One is for a proposed Aldi Grocery Store and then counterclockwise to the left is a proposed Chick-Filet (sp) with a drive thru. South of that on Queen Street is a proposed restaurant pad to have two uses in such as coffee and another use south of that is the existing 7-Eleven.

The proposed driveway will have two entrances. One on the south side of 7-Eleven where the existing curb cut is now at the existing light and that will provide access into the site and then a second right in, right out, only with a raised median island in the middle that'll provide access to the site.

We received staff comments from the Town Planner and we addressed them in the revised plans that were submitted.

One change was the removal of some parking spaces which had been on the south side of the entrance drive. They've been relocated throughout the site. The right in, right out entrance doesn't have any parking spaces.

We've also provided a more robust landscape buffer in the 4 feet along the ROW line on Queen Street.

We've also provided the required 20-foot landscaped buffer between the business use (indicated) and we're able to provide that on the property development side and on the back of the residential

properties. They'll remain residential in common ownership of the developer. They're proposed to be divided where #4 Upson will extinguished and the land given to #6 so it maintains its standing as a lot of over 12,000 sf and the balance given to #2 which always was a nonconforming lot and it will have a little bit extra land although it will still be nonconforming below 12,000 sf.

Grading and drainage were explained.

Storm water treatment was explained.

Utilities were discussed.

Attorney Sciota reminded everyone the SPU talks about multiple buildings on one site and how they function with each other and the traffic flow.

Mr. Fitzgerald explained the truck turning plan. The site is designed to accommodate trailer truck deliveries in both entrance drives. Circulation is easily accommodated. We have a proposed connection to the adjacent property that we can accommodate if they are willing to accommodate us.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted after discussion, it would be nice to have cross easements to the north and south. Mr. Fitzgerald stated that would not be a problem if that is a condition of approval.

Our traffic engineer, Scott Hesketh is here to discuss traffic.

Scott Hesketh, with F.A. Hesketh Associates, traffic engineer, reviewed his executive summary which is on file in the Town Planner's Office for review. This review is dated June 29, 2016. (Please refer to the video to hear in its entirety.)

Mr. Chaplinsky asked: How do we insure that no one is going to take a left out of there if the proposal is moved forward? Mr. Fitzgerald said a raised island is proposed. It's mountable by trucks on the inside of it if need be. We deal with DOT a lot with curb cuts like that. Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky then asked if the applicant would be opposed to an access easement to the east if needed in the future. Discussion.

Mr. Fitzgerald said they wouldn't be opposed in that area but I don't know how effective it would be.
Discussion.

The buffer proposed for the residential area was discussed further. We've provided a 20-foot area of landscaping as well as a 6-foot-high vinyl opaque fence that runs from where the B zone and the existing R-12 zone break all the way along this whole edge, 20-foot-wide and again the fence does the same thing to this end (indicating).

You have landscaping a fence to help cut down noise and screen headlights, et cetera, along that area.

The fence could be up to 7 feet. Discussion about putting it on a berm to make it higher.

Mr. Fitzgerald noted for both the SPU and the Special Permit Review that we received comments from Mr. Grappone and have submitted a response. We can address most of them easily as conditions of approval and we don't take issue with any of them.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

No response.

(Those speaking against this application)

1. Mark Adams, 7 Stoughton Road.
2. Arthur Stolyhwo, 14 Chaffee Lane.
3. Victor Baldwin, 5 Upson Drive.
4. James Gura, 142 Maplewood Road.

All cited issues with the south exit coming out behind 7-Eleven, noise, neighborhood disruption, pollution, lights, safety, tractor trailer traffic, width of the northern entrance and the buffer. (Please refer to the video to hear the exact comments by each resident.)

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Fitzgerald addressed the questions brought up by the residents.

As to the width of the southern egress, Sheet TT-1 shows truck turning movements of a truck heading north in the right lane and turning into the site and a truck heading south in the turning lane and neither truck has to cross over into another lane in order to execute that move.

Another concern was the truck would tear up the curbs. Explained the concrete curb would be used to keep cars from making an illegal turn but it is mountable by truck when they're swinging out. We've used that successfully and it stands up very well.

As to the landscape buffer being inadequate, we've provided the required 20 foot between a residential and business use against landscaping, mostly evergreen trees and an opaque fence to block any headlights. The residential is an island with existing commercial to the north. We are exceeding the town's standards for buffering.

We can make the fence 7 feet with a berm to get another foot or two.

The question on why we're not able to use the northern entrance. We want to use the southern entrance with the existing signal.
Discussion.

Mr. Grappone talked about the southern entrance in relationship to truck egress. The template is shown for a service truck coming in on the southerly entrance. As mentioned, the northerly entrance is the primary right turn in. They show wider pavement where the truck has to turn around. It's 35 to 36 feet of pavement. To me, there is enough width there. I believe it is going to work.

Further discussion on the southern entrance and making that a little bit more of a gentle turn. Mr. Fitzgerald noted since the last presentation that has been widened to make it a nice, easy turn for a truck. Explained.

Mr. Grappone brought up striping it. It is a signalized intersection and we'll gain 4 feet, plus. Mr. Fitzgerald said the raised island can be eliminated and striping done.

Hearing no further comments, the Chair closed both public hearings Items A & D.

B. PETITION of Severino Bovino, Kratzert, Jones and Associates to Change a Zoning District Boundary from R-40 and R-80 to R-40, property located at 2278 Mount Vernon Road (Assessor's Map 165, Parcel 14) owned by Briarwood Real Estate Limited Partnership (ZC #555), public hearing continued from July 19

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant. The property is 9.4 acres. Served by public water and private septic systems. It is bisected by a zone line pretty much in the center of the property running north/south.

The request is to change the zone from R-80, the back of the property, to R-40 which is the front of the property.

Appropriate notifications were sent to property owners within 500 feet.

I request the testimony from the previous public hearing is included in the record.

I was requested by you to provide some potential development scenarios and I have three possible ones.

A. This is the standard subdivision which will have four lots with all the driveways coming in from Mt. Vernon Road. Three lots which include the house that exists and a rear lot.

B. This is an open space subdivision if we apply under current zoning which is half of the properties are R-40 and half are R-80. This will have the existing house on Mt. Vernon Road, a small section of roadway with four houses. This scenario is not feasible because of the road cost involved. This would be five lots.

C. This is an open space subdivision as if we received your approval to go to R-40 for the entire property. Calculations show we can get a total of seven lots. That number is based on the final design with exactly how much wetland and floodplain exists on the property. That number could be less than seven lots but you can see the existing house with all of the other homes on a short roadway. The total curb cuts on Mt. Vernon Road would be two versus four.

I want to point out it is not unusual that the open space concept generates a few more lots and the commission at the time of the application coming forward is going to have the opportunity to review the application to see if it is a reasonable number for this property.

We are asking you to correct the zone that in our opinion is not appropriate at his location on a main road surrounded on three sides by non-residential uses. Lake Compounce, Lincoln College and Industrial Zone.

Discussion.

We feel this is a reasonable extension of the R-40 zone because of the change in uses of the surrounding properties and the availability of public water.

R-80 is usually in an area with no utilities and difficult terrain and difficult soils. We have good soils and the grades are gentle.

If approved, this does not impair the public health, safety and welfare of the adjacent properties. It will be in harmony with the R-40 zone in the area.

This is a unique situation when you have a property severed by a zone lined. You need to ask yourself: is this the right zone to have on the property bisected by a zone line (R-80 & R-40) next to uses definitely not residential in nature.

Is it right to have an R-80 zone in this area on a main road with changing conditions which will see even more dense development in the future at Lake Compounce, Lincoln College and the industrial zone.

In my opinion this is an opportunity to make it right and preserve 5.15 acres of open space.

Acting in a legislative capacity you are free to change the zone when responsible planning for contemporary or future conditions reasonably indicates a need for a change. The zoning must be sufficiently flexible to meet the demands of increased population and the evolutionary changes in the development. The responsibility rests with this board.

I believe the request is reasonable and it is not spot zoning and I would recommend you approve this application.

Open space subdivision with R-80 zoning was discussed.

The subdivision with existing conditions was discussed.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

James Gura, 142 Maplewood Road. I believe the original R-80 was meant to be that way. I can see the four lots being put in with septic systems. No sewers in the area for a while.

That open space seems to be all contour lines. Is it a hill or a valley?

Four larger lots are appropriate in case you need septic system repair in the future.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Bovino said the septic system will function well. The soils are sandy. The college survives on a septic system.

The grades go down into a watercourse that comes from the north and goes southerly and then easterly across the road.

No matter what development we do, it will take place in this area here(indicating). Under this scenario (indicating) this area will be given to individual homeowners. The scenario I'm suggesting would be town owned or an organization will own the open space. This is an opportunity to preserve the open space.

Discussion.

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

C. F & F Concrete, special permit application to construct a 20,000 s.f. building, on a 10.45-acre site which will have over 100 parking spaces as proposed, Parcel 74 Atwater Street (Map 63, Parcel 74) (SPU #565)

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, represented the applicant.

This is a 10.5 acre parcel with frontage on Atwater Street. We border the Eight River with additional property to the north and the rails to trails to the east with industrial properties to the south.

The property is currently used for storage of construction equipment. Basically, it is compacted gravel.

The applicant is proposing a 20,000 s.f. building. This is the first step in redevelopment of the property. We have a small accessory use building in the corner and we're proposing to maintain that.

This is before you due to a zoning regulation 5-02.h. This regulation, the town planner had unsuccessfully hoped to eliminate and the commission chose not to, requires any site over four acres in size to come before you for a special permit use. This site falls under that category.

We have approximately a hundred parking spaces. That regulation has a sixty parking space threshold.

Our site is slightly over parked based on the regulations and that is due to the speculative nature of the application. We don't have a specific user at the moment. We want sufficient parking and access around the building for the potential user. We are hoping for an industrial type condominium. Explained.

Explained the parking location.

Site is served by public water and sewer.

Drainage was discussed. ZIRO is achieved.

Storm drainage system was discussed.

This will be a positive impact to Atwater Street and the abutting properties as we start to formalize uses on the site in an orderly fashion.

This site does not propose any traffic issues to neighboring properties. Circulation and parking was explained.

Landscaping along the frontage and perimeter of the site was explained.

Illumination is full cut off as required.

The building will be in character with the abutting properties. Concrete and/or metal buildings are being considered.

Discussion.

We are here to answer any questions.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

James Gura, 142 Maplewood Road. I believe this is a great thing for this area. I'm for it.

Thank you.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

Karen Van Nesse. We own the property next door at 125 Atwater. We are not against the proposal. I just have some questions.

- I had emailed Mr. Phillips my concerns. (In file)

- Major concern was the water problem. Putting a 20,000 sf building in that big area ---where is the water going to go? We still have water.

- About the property line. We don't know what he is doing for a buffer. Right now there are two or three cement blocks for a property boundary. Is that going to change?

He started doing some material screening now and the dust is atrocious there. That's a major concern, also.

Ann Rivera, 220 West Main. Part of the condo complex to the north of the property on the other side of the river. The back of our property comes up to the area.

We have a concern that the building right now doesn't have an intended use. We were wondering about that.

Another concern is right now it is very loud with the trucks. Our concern is with the truck already going through, they're weighing things at our end, it might echo sounds back which get louder. We used to have more trees on their property, behind ours, that were taken down. The sound is loud from early in the morning to after work hours.

(Rebuttal)

Steve Giudice talked about proposed drainage improvements. We are planning to put the water into a control mechanism and we want to have a positive impact on the abutting properties.

I believe the drainage will improve with the development of this property. We've worked on that with staff.

As to buffering to the south, we weren't proposing to remove the concrete blocks along the property line. We have some landscaping proposed along the edge of the parking lot. And, we've discussed adding trees to the northerly property or southerly parking area that would help.

The site would continue to operate as it currently does. It's part of the F & F operation. This is the first step towards the end goal. We don't have a specific user but it will be industrial uses that are permitted by the zoning.

Hearing no further comment, the Chair closed this public hearing.

E. Meridian Development, special permit modification application to modify the approved number of units from 263 to 245 with the intention to build 180 leased units and 65 condominium units, Greenway Commons, 167 and 217 Center Street and 66 High Street (SPU #443.1)

Howard Schlesinger, Meridian Partners Development, 280 Madison Avenue, New York City.

We are here to make this minor modification to the proposal we had many years ago. We are now at a point where all the buildings are down and gone and the site is now prepared for redevelopment. We are proud of that and appreciate all the work and effort that everyone has been involved in these many years to help us stay the course and get something ready to develop and improve what was started many, many years.

Nick Minoa is the person who is going to take this out of the ground. We should be able to start very shortly.

Nick Minoa, one of the founding partners of Diversified Realty Advisors based in Summit, New Jersey gave a brief background on his company's history highlighting Connecticut.

We have tried to come up with a plan that makes sense for the Greenway Project considering market conditions and where we are at this point in time. We think we've got a plan we can live with and endorse and happy to present this evening.

(Slide Presentation.) Please refer to the video on line for the full presentation.

Mr. Minoa presented plans for the Greenway Commons property. The concept is that the for sale market has changed dramatically over the last four or five years. We're a fan of the for sale market because

we think there is a slice that exists but not for the level of design that was approved here initially. The driver today for a project like this to be financially feasible is the bulk of the units have to be rentals. There is a market here in Southington for for sale, but not the number of units designed.

We'd like to move part 8500 sf of the retail that was approved on the southern part of the property into this building where the arrow is. (Indicating)

At the same time, we'll create this parking area (indicating) which will serve the retail as well as the park area and the common building for some kind of community space or office or museum space.
Discussion.

The buildings on the north side of the property would be converted to rentals. Luxury community. On the south side would be for sale cadmiums.

It ends up to be about 180 units of rental and 65 units of for sale condominiums.

We'll start the rentals and get the project up quickly. Explained benefits of doing that.

We typically have top of the market units. We tend to increase the market. We build units that drive and command the top rentals in any one market. Here they'll be between \$1.75 and \$2.000 a square foot.

Discussion.

We'd like to move forward and start the work on construction drawings and bring this out of the ground as early as this fall or at the end of the year.

As to a comment about the parking area. We've shown a little perspective on landscaping the area to try to screen it to give it a better streetscape. Explained landscaping along Center Street.

The previously approved site plan has very minor modifications. It's really administrative in nature. It's a matter of taking the buildings that were designed as for sale and converting them to rentals using the existing footprint and moving some of the retail. There is a demand for some in-town retail and it would be in conjunction with the first phase of the project. Explained.

Mr. Phillips clarified this application is to modify a previously approved stipulation reducing the number of units and also the ratio of rental versus ownership. That's really the premise to this application.

Some site plan changes were already discussed under the administrative review.

The Chair asked for questions.

Mr. Sinclair asked what happens if the units do not sell. Mr. Minoa explained they will always lease out. The only thing that could happen potentially, to your point, is if the market feasibility analysis is off on the rental, then we rent it for sale. The product is not going to be designed or built anything less than what we are proposing upfront, no matter what the rent is.

Ms. Clock asked if they would reconsider retail along the walking trail on high street. Retail first floor, possibly apartments second and third floor. Mr. Minoa answered yes that could be considered. It is going to be a factor of what is the demand for retail there. You look at the market in the downtown and what the rents are. It'll demand a premium for rent. Parking is an issue for retail. We don't want to add more retail; we're just moving some of what is there. All of those things are on the table.

Discussion.

Phasing was discussed.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if he could commit to a retail component at the lower level, up front, since the plan is build them quickly, along the linear trail? Mr. Minoa didn't think it was financeable. There's no demonstrated demand for that amount of retail in Southington at this location. Today, the answer is, no.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

1. Joe LaPorte, 30 Prosperity Court. I am very familiar with this area. We have to approve this. If we don't, we will be looking at a bad site for years to come.

They've done their due diligence and their homework. They've got a good plan that'll work. I'm confident the people will be happy with.

Get retail down there with people living there and we'll revitalize the downtown area. People will come downtown.

Minimal impact on town resources. No roads being built that we have to maintain. With the rent, I think the impact on schools will be minimal. Just a win/win situation.

I'd like to see this go.

2. Bob Triano, Sons of Italy, 139 Center Street. Spoke about the paved parking area at 167 Center Street adjacent to the Sons of

Italy Club. It does not belong to the Sons of Italy. We have been allowed to park there for so many years because of the courtesy Howard has shown our membership over the years. A pleasure to have him as a neighbor. The membership asked that I extend our heartfelt thank you for his generosity and working so closely with us of the years.

As a neighbor, I have every confidence in this board. I believe we would agree the time has come to move forward with this plan.

The Sons of Italy has gone through a facelift recently keeping with the town's efforts to beautify lower Center Street.

It's time to move forward and make this location an area we can proud of.

3. Art Secondo, 1048 South Main Street, Plantsville. He complimented the members of the planning & zoning commission as they design the community and we have one of the best towns around.

After ten years, Howard has brought his major league team to town. He has stuck through it and proven he is for real. He's been a friend. He loves this community for what he sees. If he is a smart businessman, so be it.

I was impressed with tonight's presentation and I think the folks in Southington are. This project is just as important as when in 1942 Pratt & Whitney came to Southington. Explained.

After hearing Nick, I am so impressed and happy to say we're fortunate. Now we won't talk about a small segment of Southington, we'll talk about Southington! People will come here and live here.

I think we are the gem of central Connecticut and that's why Howard came here and now why he brought the big boys. This project has to go. As a former councilman and president of the chamber of commerce, I am happy we reached this pinnacle. I think it's going to work and we'll all be proud.

Thank you.

Discussion was had about people coming to Southington because of development in response to a query by Mr. Chaplinsky of Mr. Secondo.

4. Niles Pearson. My wife Paula and I own Paul Gregory's. I am also the owner and principal of NWP Properties, the holding company that owns 148 Center Street and 150 Center Street.

As to your question about what a local business owner would say, I would like to echo what Art said. A rising tide favors all boats.

I was thrilled with the presentation. My sons are millennials and they're thinking about that. The presentation was right on.

I'm supportive.

(Those speaking against the application)

1. John Campbell, 491 Hobart Street. I'm not here to speak specifically against this or any application.

I am going to appeal to your planning side. Spoke about the sewer bill and the insert about the sewer treatment plant. I don't think it'll process anything that happens in this town.

In Plainville it cost them about one to two million to take care of the phosphate problem they had. Our town wants \$57 million.

The letter says it is not working. No explanation of what they're going to do. Will it be able to handle any kind of development in this town? Can you consider that in your position as planners?

What happens to development like this if we don't get the \$57 million to do the upgrade? Until that is cleaned up, I'd consider it, if you would, please.

2. Johnny Muir. I have properties on Center Street and South Center Street. This directly affects me as to what they do.

I'm not against. I am definitely for what you are going to do but, my question is: Has anyone taken the time to look at the retail space that you'll be putting in down below against the existing businesses that're already struggling to survive here?

What about the little guy in between?

Have you done any kind of study at all to see your businesses that you are putting in are going to play nice with others that are already here and the local people.

Discussion of Home Depot versus Southington Hardware and the list goes on.

Something to think about.

3. Art Matthews, 347 Center Street. On this here - I'm not against this as it is a good thing to do. But the way they changed things around --- I've seen this happen before and it shouldn't happen that way. Stick to your guns with what you got in the beginning and not in the end.

Now there's a big parking lot next to me. For what? All the traffic will come to Water Street and Center Street. My building's on the corner and it's been hit twice. I don't want it hit again.

Make sure the plans are right here.

(Rebuttal)

Nick Minoa talked about the parking area. If we're going to bring retail to the southern part of the property, it's going to have some parking. That's the most likely place to put it as the retail is here. Explained this is also community parking for events, et cetera.

As to the concern as to what types of businesses are going to go in here and not take away from other businesses already there. Mr. Minoa explained his retail construction experience. It's typically small scale retail. It's 16,000 sf of retail, multifamily up on top. It's not category-type retail like Home Depot. This is local, specialty type retail to serve the residents here and the community at-large. Food service, deli, restaurants.

Discussion.

I don't see it hurting but rather complimenting the existing retail.

The sewer being able to handle the folks coming in was another concern. Mr. Grappone explained staff did a fine job with respect to the newsletter that went out. If there is any additional clarification, I'd be more than happy to meet with the gentleman to answer any questions.

As far as the sewer impact, the sewer line has been in this area for quite some time. There's been a large factory that was here. Tremendous amount of flow.

Sewer impact is going to be, in my opinion, less.

We had a 20-year study, facilities plan, done as part of the major upgrade of the \$57 million we're proposing. It looked at the infrastructure for the next 20 years. Our average flow right now is about 4 mgd and it has a rated capacity of 7.5 mgd. We're well under the graded capacity of the plant.

The need for the \$57 million is the mandate. Explained lower levels needed for phosphorous.

We're long overdue as our last major upgrade was in the 80's.

Mr. Grappone said he would like to research the fact it is only going to cost \$1 million for the Plainville plant. I highly doubt that with the DEEP mandates.

The infrastructure will handle it. This project will not sink the town.

Attorney Sciota said from a sewer impact there'd be less of an impact as he's looking to decrease the amount of units previously approved.

Mr. Sinclair wanted to make sure these are high end apartments as opposed to lower end. What we saw in the photos is what we're going to get. High end. Mr. Minoa said that is the only thing we do.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the Renaissance Theme (lantern type lightings, park benches, signage, brick pavers and walkways) going on downtown and he would like to see this continue that theme to fit in. Could we stipulate a colonial look, peak roofs, stone walkways, stonework on the faces of the buildings, natural materials, cupolas. Would you be opposed to such a stipulation/condition? Mr. Minoa said that would be acceptable.

Discussion.

As to public activities on the greenway to the northern side, is that going to be open space or privately owned? It sounds like there is some planned activities that could be shared between the community and the folks who live in this area. What's the proposal?

Mr. Minoa felt it was premature to get into those details. It's an asset in a great location. We work in hand with the community.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if he were amenable to stipulations about public usage of that parcel of land?

Mr. Minoa felt at this juncture it is premature to talk about specific stipulations. We are amenable to having those discussions.

Attorney Sciota said the original SPU had it is a pseudo --- owned by the corporation but the pathways going between the two roads is open to public ---not a public road --- but open to the public and the green area would be also pseudo public but owned by the corporation. That's on the plan.

Mr. Chaplinsky said the road that leads between is not going to be an open roadway. It's a walking passageway. Attorney Sciota confirmed it is a private road, open to both.

Discussion on its use.

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

BUSINESS MEETING

A. PETITION of John Senese (Calco Construction & Development, Inc.) to Change a Zoning District Boundary from R-12 (residential) to B (Business), properties located at 2,4 & 6 Upson Drive, Assessor's Map 181, Parcels 34, 35 & 36 - public hearing continued from July 19

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the zone change. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Macchio opposed.

B. PETITION of Severino Bovino, Kratzert, Jones and Associates to Change a Zoning District Boundary from R-40 and R-80 to R-40, property located at 2278 Mount Vernon Road (Assessor's Map 165, Parcel 14) owned by Briarwood Real Estate Limited Partnership (ZC #555), public hearing continued from July 19

Ready for action. Staff has the opinion that it is probably best to not change the zone and have a conventional layout due to the fact that you'll have less public infrastructure in the future. Although, you don't save the open space or the wetland area in the back, you still can't build in a wetland area.

Ms. Clock made a motion to deny. I agree with staff. I don't think it's viable open space and I think it is going to create more cost for the town. Mr. Morelli seconded.

Mr. Sinclair said what he liked about the plan was it is a traffic mitigation, as well. Instead of having four curb cuts close to a three-way intersection on a busy roadway, we're talking about two curb cuts which is a safer option for the town. I'll be voting against the motion.

Ms. Locks agreed. That road is awfully busy. I think having four ways for other dangerous vehicles to get hit in that area - it is getting very populated.

Mr. Chaplinsky voiced his opinion. The number of houses or the traffic, somebody's going to have to turn out of a driveway or a road. Regardless of which one, I think the hazard is still the same. Keeping this R/80 is consistent with the other homes in the area. I think that the R/40 zone, mentioned by the applicant, is consistent with the R-40 zone and it's designed that way. That was the reason that as put in place. I think there is an advantage to not having a town road for such a small neighborhood like that, so I will be voting in favor of the denial.

The Chair added he has a difficult time increasing density. I'm I favor of the denial because of the density.

Motion to deny passes 5 to 2 with Ms. Locks and Mr. Sinclair opposed.

C. F & F Concrete, special permit application to construct a 20,000 s.f. building, on a 10.45-acre site which will have over 100 parking spaces as proposed, Parcel 74 Atwater Street (Map 63, Parcel 74) (SPU #565)

Ready for action. Suggested stipulations:

1. Response to Engineering comment #2 indicates that there is no drainage easements on the property to the river. Please stipulate that the applicant work with the Town Attorney to execute a formal drainage easement across the property to the discharge point at Eight Mile River.

2. Provide a stone infiltration trench detail on the plan (Comment #8).

Mr. Grappone, after discussion, confirmed that if this is approved, whatever drainage issues there are today this will make it better. Staff will work with the applicant.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the aforementioned stipulations. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

The Chair noted this is an I-2 use currently and will continue to be an I-2 use. However, hopefully this will create jobs and industry.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. F & F Concrete Corporation, site plan application to construct a 20,000 sf mixed use building with associated parking, Parcel 74, Atwater Street, Assessor's Map 63, Parcel 74, property of Forgiore Management Group, LLC in an I-2 zone (SPR #1715) tabled from July 19th

Ready for action. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Calco Construction c/o John Senese, special permit application to construct multiple buildings on a single lot, 775, 785, 801 and 811 Queen Street and 2,4,6 Upson Drive (SPU #564)

Ready for action. Town Planner reviewed some suggested stipulations.

Stipulations:

1. Work with town staff on the potential for widening the southerly ingress/egress.
2. Subject to Engineering Response to Comments received on 8-16-16.
3. Cross Easements on the northerly, easterly and southerly property lines.
4. Fence to be 7' vinyl on top of a 2' earthen berm running the length of the property line abutting existing residential.
5. Bypass lane to be located at the proposed Chick-Fil-A drive-thru.
6. Number 4 Upson to be removed and the lot lines revised to show a reduction from three to two lots as identified on the zone change plan.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulations above. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 6 to 1 with Mr. Macchio opposed.

F. Calco Construction co/o John Sense, site plan application to construct 3 new commercial buildings, with associated parking, landscaping, lighting and utilities, 775, 785, 801 and 811 Queen Street and 2,4 and 6 Upson Drive (SPR #1716)

Ready for approval. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Meridian Development, special permit modification application to modify the approved number of units from 263 to 245 with the intention to build 180 leased units and 65 condominium units, Greenway Commons, 167 and 217 Center Street and 66 High Street (SPU #443.1)

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky thanked the applicant for working with the commission and coming through with a thoughtful plan. I appreciate everybody coming out for the public hearing.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the following stipulations:

1. Work with staff to insure that the Renaissance features are incorporated throughout the access ways, benches, lantern type lighting, signage, brick pavers and working with staff to incorporate those treatments.

2. Work with town staff on colonial/stone treatments to building utilizing such features as cupolas, peaked roofs, stone facades.

Ms. Locks seconded.

Ms. Clock commented for the record, she thanked everyone for coming out. I'm supportive of the application. She wanted to go on record saying she spent the last two years on the POCD as did other commissioners and the town planner and it is very, very important to me to see the town and especially the heart of our town preserved. It's become very close to my heart. It's obvious that you're going to be putting a lot of thought into doing the same thing.

I'm disappointed that retail is not an option on the linear trail. I would like to urge in your planning something more pleasant. I don't know if it's frontage or what have you, maybe a creative idea on our beloved linear trail. That's important to me and to our residents.

Aside from that, thank you very much for your thoughtful planning.

Mr. Morelli echoed that the effort was appreciated and the time you put into educating us. And, the fact you took our comments and addressed them well. We did spend a lot of time in talking about what was important to our town and why we like Southington the way it is. The linear trail is a key part of our downtown, as well. We're really excited to see this thing go.

Mr. Sinclair commented. First off, I live downtown and I lease and I love it. I have no real issue with the leased units downtown. It's good to see something happen down there and it will be good to sometimes walk down Center Street and not be the only one there. Some nights.

We have to vote on the application in front of us and we're putting our faith in the developer. He showed us what he is going to do. I'll be supportive of the application.

Mr. Macchio commented to Howard and the group. Over the years we've met many times. You spent hundreds of hours on this and I appreciate that as well as the other commissioners. I hope the other citizenry of Southington appreciate the effort that's put in. With

that, I'm sure ---you guys are tenacious. I'm sure that it is going to go above and beyond expectations. I'm very, very committed. I'm happy you're here. Let's get the shovels in there and get going.

The Chair addressed Howard. When I first saw this plan it was a game changer for downtown Southington. That was in 2006. We were excited and we approved it and the bottom fell out of the market. We saw nothing for years. We saw buildings very close to my heart --- and you were coming through with a plan to try to preserve the memory of the blood, sweat and tears of the workers in those buildings. Explained it is a true testament of what built this community.

I'm very excited we're back now and to know now what you're going to build. You're on the record and we're going to hold your feet to the fire and we are going to keep Southington going. I think this addition is really going to be a game changer, again.

I appreciate the efforts put forth. I'm looking forward to seeing shovels in the dirt. Thank you for your efforts and your patience. Let's go to work.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

(Applause, applause)

H. Lake Compounce Ltd Partnership, request for 2-year extension of Earth Excavation approval, Mt. Vernon Road (EE #119.3)

Ready for action.

Stipulation:

1. Per Engineering request for a revised plan showing two stable benchmarks and grading modifications.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulation. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

I. Request for release of \$6,500 site plan development bond, 600 West Street, Lot #3 (S#1289)

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

J. Request for 90-day extension to file mylar, Sandy Field E states (S#1311)

Ready for action. It is the second and final available extension.

Mr. Chaplinsky so moved the motion and Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

1. Travel Center of America, site plan modification for a 15 by 40-foot dumpster enclosure with a 7' high fence with privacy slats and a swing gate. It's behind the existing building and not visible from the street.

ITEMS TO BE SCHEDULED FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

For the MUT, most were concerned about a factory going in which isn't going to happen in a MUT. We could move forward. The Chair said to do it.

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

1. Travel Centers of America
2. Amatto Realty for a site plan modification to construct a 28 x 60-foot garage at 445 West Queen Street.
3. Lake Compounce two-year extension we just took care of.

The Chair added it was a good summer. Back to work. I'd like some information at the next meeting about our subcommittees. I know I spoke to Jim Morelli last week about doggie day cares.

Maybe if we can get to work in the next couple of weeks and have a report out by October and I'd like to put the subcommittees to bed.

Rob, can you add it to the Agenda for the two meetings in September? That'd be great.

ADJOURNMENT

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

Before the adjournment, Mr. Schlesinger thanked all for their faith and their support through all the years of this process.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:45 o'clock, p.m.)