

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
OCTOBER 18, 2016

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, October 18, 2016 at the John Weichsel 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:

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

Alternates: Ross Hart

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

Absent: Joe Coviello, Robert Hammersley & Ted Cabata Alternates

A quorum was determined.

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

Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of October 4, 2016

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve the Minutes. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Chaplinsky abstaining. Mr. Sinclair advised he listened to the video and read the Minutes.

Public Hearings

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Zoning Text Amendment to amend Section 12 (Automobile Parking and Loading Area Provisions) of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations (ZA #589)

Mr. Phillips advised at the direction of the commission he looked at primarily the ITE Manual for parking generation and basically cross referenced other sources with our regulation and looked at it from a parking demand or requirement standpoint and found that most of it was not inconsistent with the resource numbers.

Some that deserve attention:

Section 12-01: New language that says that any lot altered or developed for office, business, industrial purposes shall be provided with adequate but not excessive space. Our goal was to not create undue pavement, impervious areas and looking at low impact development, storm water benefits, as well.

Section 12-01.1: Number of parking spaces required. Under (e) for retail storage and service establishments, basically reducing the parking requirements to our per 1,000 sf would be more indicative of what we see out there as opposed to breaking it up between under 200,000 sf and over 200,000 sf. The key to add language that if there is any additional parking over what is necessary, it consist of pervious surfaces such as grass, grass grid systems or similar materials.

Section 12-01.1 (f) under business offices and financial institutions, there is a slight change. Basically providing three parking spaces for each 1,000 sf of gross floor area instead of one for each 300 sf of net floor area.

Section 12-01.1 (g) restaurants, nightclubs, taverns or other eating or drinking places and private clubs, reducing it from one parking for 25 sf used for customer service to one parking space for every two seats. A more common methodology.

Section 12-01.1 (l) theater, auditoriums, stadiums, places of assembly for amusement and recreation, reducing it from one parking space for every three seats to every five seats. More consistent with what is out there.

Section 12-01-1 (u) one parking seats for every four seats rather than every three seats or spectator equivalent.

Section 12-02.1 just some language that all vehicle parking areas shall be constructed of bituminous and masonry, as it read now, but also adding or impervious pavement or concrete. Any overflow parking

in excess of the requirements shall consist of pervious materials. Or set aside as overflow parking for the peak or flow needs or if additional parking is deemed necessary by the ZEO with the exception of municipal parking.

Section 12-09 mixed uses. Equivalent credit will be given for shared uses offsetting peaks as proposed by the applicant and accepted by the commission or staff under procedurally delegated authority. I would suggest based upon some feedback from the CRCOG, I would suggest changing the language to read with up to a 15 percent reduction being given for shared uses consisting of two or more primary use classifications (residential, commercial, office, industrial) accepted by the commission or staff under procedurally delegated authority.

All in all, the regulations aren't too bad. This brings them more current in a few areas.

We have no comments in the file either for or against nor did we receive any phone calls or inquiries.

Discussion of the Lowes/Target parking lot as it would apply to the new regulations.

Discussion of provisions for overflow parking.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

(1) Arthur Cyr, 105 Berlin Avenue. Too many parking spaces have been required in the past per our Town Planner.

Some of these changes will have a direct on the parking authority, i.e.: waivers. This will serve that problem well.

Discussion.

Moving forward as a town, anything we can do to not have these monster parking lots is beneficial.

Discussion.

I wholeheartedly thank Mr. Phillips for all of his efforts in changing and updating these regulations because we should have done it about ten years ago, maybe.

Thank you.

(2) Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates. I am here to speak in support of this regulation. I do have a couple of comments for your consideration.

Item e is right on the cusp and that works well.

Item f, actually if you adopt this, you actually increase the requirement for business offices and financial institutions. If that

is your intent, that's okay. But I thought we were trying to reduce parking requirements. That's something to look at.

Item g is okay. That is what we were looking for.

Item h, in case the hotel has a restaurant inside, then the requirement should be the same as for Item g.

Discussion.

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing for this item.

B. Town of Southington, Special Permit Application for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new senior center, Calendar House, 388 Pleasant Street, in a R-20-25 zone (SPU #569)

Attorney Sciota stepped down as he is on the building committee for this application and left the dais.

Algis Kalvaitis, from BL Companies, the architects and engineers for the project presented.

We have been involved with this project for some time now. Last year we did a physical conditions assessment and survey followed by a space and needs assessment. And, then later we were working with the building committee and KBE to do a cost estimating/value engineering exercise.

Now we are currently putting together construction documents for the project.

Ray Gradwell, Senior Project Manager with BL Companies, Hartford, CT. I'll run through the site plan really quick. High level and not a lot of detail just showing what we are proposing with respect to the project, location of the project and some key features of the project. Talk about erosion control measures, drainage and planting and landscaping.

Al will then talk about architecture. We have a little movie to present at the end which is our visualization of the project to give you an idea of what it will look like with respect to the site and the building.

The location is 388 Pleasant Street, Southington, CT. About a 4-acre site at the corner of Hobart Street. The existing senior center building is located opposite Pleasant Street (indicating). We have a pavilion structure in the back and a parking structure is located opposite Hobart Street at the corner of Pleasant Street.

The proposal is to remove and dispose of. A lot of the improvements on the site, the building, portions of the parking field, drainage improvements will be removed and disposed of and rebuilt as the project develops.

There is a portion of the parking field we are looking to reuse based on grade, based on conditions and it is a cost saving item on the site.

As to phasing, a key aspect of the project is to have the senior center open while this building is being built. We are proposing three phases:

1. Utilizes the reuse of the existing senior center as a senior center as this back building is being built out. That's the reason the new building is pushed back so far.

To protect that phase during construction we have construction fencing and construction egress throughout the site perimeter.

2. Demolished old senior center.

3. Complete the parking lot in the front and alongside the building.

The next key item is how do you protect the soils and your neighbors from erosion that may happen during construction. A number of measures and ways are proposed. We have construction entrances off of Pleasant and off of Hobart Street. We have perimeter erosion controls such as waddles and silt fences around the perimeter. The trees we are preserving and saving are being protected with a tree saving device such as an orange fencing system.

The back corner which is an existing storm water feature, we are looking to reuse that during construction to collect storm water and drain it consistently and appropriately off site to the south and southwest.

As drainage structures are built on site they'll be protected with inlet protection. We have a small stockpile of material as topsoil is being reused on site, we have a storage area.

Key features on the site were discussed:

- Front area is the drop off area for the seniors. It will have a canopy over it.

- ADA parking spot locations were discussed.
- Flagpole, bike rack and benches were discussed.
- Walking path around the perimeter of the site was discussed as providing passive/active recreation for the seniors.
- Parking spaces proposed is 132.
- Street trees were discussed.
- Drainage and utilities were discussed.
- The lighting plan was discussed.
- Planting plan was discussed.
- Fencing provided to screen the neighbors was described.
- Driveway locations were discussed.
- Loading zone and trash enclosure was explained.
- Van storage under the canopy was explained.

Mr. Gradwell answered specific questions from the commissioners regarding his presentation.

Mr. Kalvaitis showed a rendering of the building and described the materials to be used.

Please refer to the video on line to hear the full presentation, see the slides and the movie.

That completed the applicant's presentation.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

(1) Arthur Cyr, 105 Berlin Avenue. All of those who had input into the project were acknowledged. An incredible amount of input from everyone. He praised the building committee.

JAD parking/traffic was discussed.

Set up of the parking lot in this proposal was discussed and it is handled the best they can.

I am in full approval of the presentation as done tonight.

Thank you.

(2) Kim Thompson, 22 Willow Court. Several of our neighbors have questions about the fencing and walls provided. While we are in

support of the building and the betterment of the senior center, we did want to let you know we have concerns about the fencing. We hope we could get that addressed for the safety of the children in the neighborhood that are butted up against the construction site.

Discussion of the location involved.

The mention of a 35' buffer between the building and neighbors during the presentation asks the question what type of wall or structure will be between the building site and if there is a wall which will then provide privacy, is that going to provide more coverage for people to be behind the scenes and there is going to be another level of a construction fence or structure that will keep a further distance between the backyards and the construction site, specifically. Is there going to be a 6' screened fence? Is it going to be one layer of fencing or another area of staging materials?

(Those speaking against the application)

No speakers.

Mr. Phillips clarified on Sheet Dn-9 that is a four-foot sump catch basin and not a 2-foot sump.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Gradwell addressed the fencing issue. It is construction type fencing proposed around the perimeter, chain link fencing on pillars along and around the perimeter to protect and cordon off the construction from the neighbors and the existing senior center and parking. (Showed the proposed location on the screen.)

After construction, there is a small retaining wall along here (indicating). It is two to three feet high. On top of the wall will be a 4' high ornamental picket fence.

Around the storm water feature, there is a chain link fence around that, as well, to protect any of the neighbors after a rainfall event.

Mr. Hart noted the requested fence from the speaker, could that be applied to the other two properties next to her --- just continue fence all the way down.

Discussion.

Denis Rioux, BL Companies, explained a concern was the parking lot that abuts a neighbor's lot. (Showed on slide)

Discussion.

If the intent of the board is to extend the fence, we have no issues with that. Part of the reason we didn't is to integrate the building into the rest of the neighborhood. If we put a fence across, it will isolate this property from everybody else.

Discussion.

Mr. Morelli had a concern with neighbors walking around the building at night and being in danger from people running through the neighborhood. You need to look at protection for who is on what side of the fence. Also, I wanted to ask about lighting back there.

Mr. Rioux said the fence doesn't give an added sense of security. It reduces that.

Discussion.

Cut through by pedestrians from Hobart to Pleasant Street was discussed by Mr. Sinclair. The neighbors might want privacy in their backyard.

Mr. Rioux had no issues with that.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted a positive with the fence at that one spot with the traffic headlights on that one house would be buffer.

Ms. Thompson clarified no one from the neighborhood was asking for a permanent, privacy screen. But if it is not posed tonight, does that mean we give up our right for input into the process.

The Chair advised once we approve it, that's the way it has to be built.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky suggested a "privacy" chain link fence during construction, only.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

Business Meeting

A. Zoning Text Amendment to amend Section 12 (Automobile Parking and Loading Area Provisions) of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations (ZA #589)

This is ready for approval. The suggested language modification over what was proposed was noted. Under Items F for banks and businesses, it is a 33 sf difference, so the change was to the calculation conventional. Under Item H, if you would want to align that and G for the residential portion of it. I have no issues with that.

As to the wording, where it says: plus one parking space per each 25 sf of all area devoted to customer service for any included restaurant or banquet hall, I would just change that to: one parking space per every two seats of any included restaurant and banquet hall.

12-09 under mixed uses, was to change the proposed language to read: with up to a 15 percent reduction being given for shared uses consisting of two or more primary use classifications (residential, office, commercial, industrial) as accepted by the commission or staff under procedurally delegated authority.

There may be a situation where we can do a zoning permit and we don't have to always come before the commission.

Mr. Chaplinsky spoke in favor of the changes. It helps businesses and is environmentally friendly. Anything we can do to make more flexible parking arrangements is better for the environment and it is a really good thing.

Mr. Sinclair made the motion to approve with the town planner's modifications. Ms. Clock seconded.

Ms. Clock thanked Rob for working on this. This was previously discussed at the POCD meetings. I'm glad to see this moving forward.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call.

Effective date: 15 days from publication.

B. Town of Southington, Special Permit Application for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new senior center, Calendar House, 388 Pleasant Street, in a R-20-25 zone (SPU #569)

Mr. Phillips asked if the commission had any favored direction as far as the sidewalk, how it is proposed it goes up the topography here and connects up to the existing sidewalk. Are you comfortable with that or if you'd rather see something along the parking field to tie up to this tee (indicating) over here. There is an argument that is good for either option.

Attorney Sciota noted that the building committee wants to connect the front sidewalk to the crosswalk. That is not an issue for the committee. And, engineering was fully in favor of leaving the angles the way they were.

Mr. Phillips added another potential condition for modification would be the water department approval. Their board doesn't meet for a few weeks. We'll put it on the record.

Mr. Grappone went over his list. Mr. Phillips suggested adding it to the SPU portion.

- Internal grease trap reviewed by staff.
- Retaining wall design to be reviewed by staff.
- Clarification as to open bottom catch basins. This is in the area of a private water well, we'll have to work that out and it might be a water department stipulation.
- The current pond has an outlet we can't find. I don't think there is a connection physically with Heather Lane. So we are in favor of the way it is designed. We have some issues to work out with the drainage calculations.
- Four foot catch basin sump instead of a two foot as noted on the plan.

Discussion of a chain link fence around the whole perimeter of the detention pond. Green or black would be a stipulation.

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

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Town of Southington, Site Plan Application for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new senior center, Calendar House, 388 Pleasant Street in an R-20/25 zone.

Ready for action. We incorporated everything said I the SPU into this application.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Cranberry Cove, LLC, site plan application to remove existing structures and parking areas and construct multiple retail and restaurant buildings and associated parking, 102 West Center Street, in a B zone (FF #248/SPR #1719) tabled from October 4th

Brian Panico, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, CT.

We'd like to respectfully ask for another table. We're still in the process of working with the conservation commission and getting their questions addressed and taken care of.

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

E. GR Engineering, LLC, site plan application to construct a 17,400 square foot industrial building with associated parking and circulation space, property of Tradon Realty, LLC, located at 168 and 176 Town Line Road in an I-1 zone (SPR #1721) tabled from October 4th

Brian Panico, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street. This is Lot 3, 168 Town Line Road. Zoned I-1 industrial. Currently a vacant lot about 1.5 acres.

No wetlands on the site.

We are proposing a 17,400 sf building. Industrial building, warehousing. Also a little bit of retail.

Two accesses to the building, both off the access road which goes to Jensen's. There is an easement over that currently. Primarily tractor trailer access and we have spaces in the front for vehicles coming in for employees, et cetera.

We are meeting ZIRO on the site using a detention basin to the south of the parking area. We are also using pretreatment filter strip and catch basins. It is designed up to the 100-year storm.

We've added a loading space to the south of the building. Explained.

We had to remove a small portion of one of the berms existing on the site and we replaced it with a bunch of different street trees.

I believe we've addressed all comments of the PZC and engineering department. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Lou Perillo, Southington Economic Development explained the access driveway goes to Jensen's.

This is the last lot in the Strawberry Fields subdivision on Town Line Road. (Approximate 15 lot subdivision)

For the retail, this is a heavy steel manufacturer. It's more of a wholesale operation. People come in and get their heavy steel worked on, manufactured. It's not going to be a high traffic area.

The layout provides great circular movement for his access for heavy equipment so from a safety standpoint, that's why it is designed like this.

The access road was discussed. It is a private driveway.

There are no sidewalks.

Applicant, Don Turcotte, 481 Country Club Road, Cheshire answered questions. For safety they won't necessary always go in this way. We don't get a large number of tractor trailers - three or four a month. It works out well to go around the building, off load and then exit out. That is a big safety factor.

Mr. Phillips added this is ready for action with stipulation that the applicant comply with Item 9 on the engineering letter dated 10-6-2016.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the town planner's aforementioned stipulation. Mr. Morelli seconded.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. Meadow Wood Estates, release of \$12,000 maintenance bond, Madelyn Lane (S#1286)

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

G. Adoption of 2017 meeting schedule

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the 2017 meeting schedule. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. Subcommittee Reports

We are working diligently, advised the Chair. Mr. Morelli said the "Jims" went over the distillery regulation and we decided it is working and we are not going to break it. We like the way it is working.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said there was a request for a subcommittee to look at the regulation wherein the residential subdivisions required a

number of acres for open space. We debated that. It came back. Are we still interested in doing that?

We were talking about proposing a change that required more open space and we also debated whether we should include any incentives for more open space --- incentivize a developer to get more lots in exchange for giving open space. Is that something we want to pursue?

If we do have a subcommittee go forward, do you have ideas of things you want considered or you want to stay away from?

The Chair said last time it was just us. We've heard from the public, landowners and developers. Now we're including them in the discussion. If the majority of the board is not interested, we're going to drop it. If we're interested in hearing what folks have to say about open space in subdivisions --- Mr. Morelli interjected it was by far the single largest issue in the POCD. And, the fact we have to be builder friendly, but we need to curb development some way, somehow. I think if we don't address it, we are going to be in trouble.

Ms. Clock agreed with Jim indicating she'd like to be part of that subcommittee. She'd like to include those we heard from to find a solution or come together in an agreement to make both parties happy.

Ms. Locks agreed to have a well-rounded subcommittee would be the best.

Mr. Sinclair wanted to be on the subcommittee, as well.

Mr. Hart agreed with everything that's been said.

Attorney Sciota pointed out if your requirement is to transfer to the town and pay taxpayer money for it and to maintain it, it's got to be for the public good. The little slivers in a subdivision, give them to an association or part of the property owner. It's not fair to the taxpayer to pay the money to maintain the stuff they're never going to use. A large piece that the public has access to, by all means, take title to it and go from there.

Discussion.

Mr. Macchio agreed with Attorney Sciota's comments.

Mr. Chaplinsky will get the subcommittee together.

8. Administrative Items

The list of items we had like the caretaker reg and things of that nature and I cleared some other things out. I'll be working on that and should have a draft for you to look at for the next meeting -- nothing official.

I may have some suggestions as far as the industrial and residential solar application. A definition and what zone it should be in.

Mr. Grappone will lead the discussion on the introduction of going back to the MS-4 requirements not beset upon the town which is starting to incorporate low impact development, best management practices, and really do some changes to our regulations on subdivision development.

Mr. Grappone referred to his handout which he briefly went over. CT DEEP has just approved a general permit for MS-4 which stands for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System for a means of conveyance for storm water. They made some stringent requirements to municipalities for mapping the existing drainage structure, mapping outlets, finding out conditions of the outlets, trying to get elicit discharges repaired and things of that nature. And, best management practices. One of which is low impact development.

Due to development and urbanization, there's more blacktop that is applied on sites. With that is a degradation of habitat, impaired aquatic life, high pollutant loads. The Quinnipiac River is an impaired water body.

DEEP is looking to towns to make improvements.

He reviewed the benefits to the LID. A lot of towns are getting on the bandwagon here.

He noted those that had actually enacted regulations for low impact development. We'll be working with the planning department to draft regulations and bring before you.

9. Items to be scheduled for public hearing

A. V Squared, LLC, 8 lot Resubdivision application property of Baccus, LLC, properties located at 460 Marion Avenue (Map 062, Parcel 181) Marion Ave Rear (Map 062, Parcel 180) Marion Avenue (Map 062, Parcel 182), Marion Avenue Rear (Map 051, Parcel 054), and Marion Avenue (Map 051, Parcel 055), in an R-20/25 zone (S #1315), November 15

We have the Clearwood Place application hanging around. We're waiting on variances from ZBA and it will be on a future agenda.

10. Receipt of New Applications

1. V Squared, LLC. This is a resubdivision of a previous subdivision going from 7 to 8 lots.

11. Adjournment

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 o'clock, p.m.)