

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
TOWN OF SOUTHLINGTON  
JUNE 6, 2017

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing & regular meeting on Tuesday, June 6, 2017 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:

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

Alternates: Ted Cabata & Joe Coviello

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

Absent: Robert Hammersley, Regular Member  
Ross Hart, Alternate

The Chair seated Mr. Coviello for Mr. Hammersley. A quorum determined.

Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance being led by all the students.

**4. Appointment of Alternate Commissioner**

Mr. Chaplinsky nominated Peter Santago. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Santago approached the dais. The Town Attorney administered the oath.

(Sworn, sworn)

Congratulations!

(Applause, applause)

Mr. Santago took a seat at the dais.

**5. Approval of Minutes**

A. Regular Meeting of May 16, 2017

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

**6. Public Hearing items**

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Gary Musciano, applicant, Special Permit Application to install an additional 33' x 24' unmanned telecom equipment shelter; property owned by Cox Communications Connecticut, Inc., 76 Atwater Street in an R-12 zone (SPU #577)

Mr. Musciano, architect, on behalf of Cox Communications. This is a fairly simple application. If you are familiar with the site, it is a sliver of property at Exit 30 of I-84 East when you make the acute right turn. I know it's there but I never see it. It acts and seems like it is in the I-2 zone as it is surrounded by I-2 and buffered by the highway. There is a sliver south of us with single family homes and then the condos in the R-12.

Cox originally was granted permission by this board and right now it is developed with a 600-sf unmanned equipment shelter. It's like an oversized garden shed full of data equipment which serves households and businesses. Explained services: internet, phone, provided by Cox.

We all have smart phones now. The capability has to get expanded, also. They can do it simply. They do it because things become more miniaturized. Since 1997, this is the first time we've had to expand this site at all.

The expansion is we're going to set another, nearly identical unmanned equipment shelter next to the one that's there now. The one there now is 600 sf. The new one will be 800 sf. Also, prefabricated. We sit it on a foundation and we're good to go.

A colored rendering of the site has been provided to you. The properties are 300' long along Atwater Street and about 300' at the back side which is the ramp. To the left of center, the rectangle, is the existing shelter building. The rectangle to the right of that is the new one. We've tried to zero out impervious coverage.

Where we had paving we are going to put the new shelter. Trying to keep the runoff net zero. He pointed to air cooled condensers for the air conditioning system and the electrical switch gear. It will have its own underground electrical service.

It is a standalone, passive use. It has no water, creates no sewage, no smoke, no noise, no vibrations. It's unmanned. A cox tech is maybe there twice a month. It's monitored and alarmed back to Cox's headend which is Manchester. They know what's going on all the time.

There are two existing generators on the site now and they'll stay unchanged. We are going to screen the front of the new shelter with the same white pines that were for the old shelter.

Fairly neutral development, compatible. Across the street is the concrete plant, buffered by the highway, flirting with the I-2 zone. I think it is a good development in this case.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair moved on.

B. Kris and Michelle Belanger, Special Permit Application to construct a 12 x 32 carport which will be in excess of three garage spaces, 749 Mount Vernon Road, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #578)

Kris Belanger and Michelle Belganger, 749 Mount Vernon Road. We're looking to build a carport structure off the side of our existing garage. We'd like a little bit of extra shelter. We have a son who is special needs, he is handicapped and in a wheelchair. It is a little too closed and tight to load and unload him in the garage. We just want a little shelter there to be able to park and make it easier in inclement weather.

The carport will be a roof structure with three posts with the sonotubes in the ground and attached to the garage. The face of it is going to be vinyl siding with asphalt shingles matching the pitch of the garage. Just regular wood construction.

It's over an existing driveway that is already there so it is not changing the land or anything like that.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against this application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing and moved on.

C. Joseph Cofrancesco, Special Permit Application for a parent/grandparent apartment, 10 Sandy Pine Drive, in an R-40 zone, (SPU #579)

Joe Cofrancesco, 10 Sandy Pine Drive, Southington, CT. And, Brian Panico, 876 South Main Street here from Harry Cole & Son.

Mr. Cofrancesco explained we applied for an in-law apartment on our current structure at Sandy Pine Drive. We are still working with the appeals board to finalize our plans with our architect. My in-laws are looking to sell and downsize. They are travelling a lot these days and we wanted to be sure we gave them a nice, safe, comfortable place to come back to. Harry Cole is doing a lot of our engineering work.

Mr. Panico added this lot is right on the corner of Sandy Pines Drive and Pine Hollow in an R-40 zone. Site is 1.15 acres. We've been working with an architect to develop plans. The project as submitted would require a variance which we are seeking. We are working on reducing our impact to the side yard. Right now, we are just asking for an approval of the use.

All of the architecture and designs are meeting all of the town's requirements for an in-law apartment as far as the forty percent of the first floor, et cetera.

Mr. Panico discussed moving back the in-law apartment back. Right now, we are at 11.4 feet. We're continually trying to work it back and make it less impact. Right now, the architect has gotten a couple of extra feet.

Mr. Cofrancesco said the in-law apartment will be built to the same specs as the house. Flooring, windows, everything will be the same quality. Siding. Our house is 3 and a half years old, we're still on the newer side.

Showed the elevations.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

Patrick Baldino, 172 Maplewood. I want to move into that house and that's why I am in favor.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

**7. Business Meeting**

A. Gary Musciano, applicant, Special Permit Application to install an additional 33' x 24' unmanned telecom equipment shelter; property owned by Cox Communications Connecticut, Inc., 756 Atwater Street in an R-12 zone (SPU #577)

The SPU is ready for action.

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

B. Gary Musciano, applicant, site plan application to install an additional 33' x 24' unmanned telecom equipment shelter; property owned by Cox Communications Connecticut, Inc., 76 Atwater Street, in an R-12 zone (SPR #1732)

This is ready for action with the suggested stipulations: accessible space to be van stall designation with proper sign. The revised plan shows a regular space. And, provide design for the proposed 4-inch roof drain from building to existing catch basin.

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

C. Kris and Michelle Belanger, Special Permit Application to construct a 12 x 32 carport which will be in excess of three garage spaces, 749 Mount Vernon Road, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #578)

This is ready for action.

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

D. Joseph Cofrancesco, Special Permit Application for a parent/grandparent apartment, 10 Sandy Pine Drive, in an R-40 zone, (SPU #579)

This is ready for action with the stipulation that no building permit will be approved under the variance is granted by the ZBA should they continue with that process.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve with the aforementioned stipulation. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a roll call vote.

E. Milldale Holdings, LLC, Floodplain application to construct a 255 +/- s.f. addition to exiting car was facility, 1132 Old Turnpike Road, in a B zone (FF #252), tabled from May 16

Mr. Phillips advised the next ZBA meeting is June 13<sup>th</sup>, so this needs to be tabled. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to table. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

F. Lovley Development, Inc. 4-lot subdivision application, 1095 West Street, Assessor's map 131, Parcels 11, 43 and 45, in a "B" zone (S#1317).

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones representing the applicant. The proposal before you is for a 4-lot subdivision which basically follows the lease lines of different parcels that we are creating.

Lot #1 is this lot (indicating). Lot #2 is the lot in the back (indicating). Lot #3 is the one that is under construction right now which is retail and a bank site and Lot #4 is the existing UCONN Building. All lots are served by public water and sewer. All lots exceed the minimum requirements in terms of frontage which is 100' minimum and lot area which is 20,000 sf. Smallest lot is 20,754 sf.

All cross easements are in place in terms of driveways. These parcels have the right to come through this driveway (indicating) to the light. One curb cut for this property which is at the signal.

For utilities, there is a sewer line in the front of the property and a water line that was extended here to serve UCONN. These lots (indicating) are served by that one main line. And, this building (indicating) will be served through West Street. And, the hotel is under construction right now.

Any questions, I'll be glad to answer.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked the purpose of doing this carve out. Mr. Bovino explained it gives the developer options to either lease or sell the properties.

Discussion on the cross easements.

Topography was discussed.

Vehicular pathway and pedestrian pathway was discussed.

This is ready for action noted Mr. Phillips. Mr. Sinclair made a motion to approve and Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Garrett Homes, LLC, site plan application for a proposed 9,367 sf building, 1724 Meriden Waterbury road, owned by 1724 Meriden Waterbury Road, LLC in a B zone (SPR #1733).

Matt Bruton, engineer with BL Companies represented the application. He walked the commission through the plan. We have an existing 2-acre parcel in a business zone. It is on the corner of Meriden Waterbury Turnpike and Canal Street.

It is an existing residential home on site with a single access drive to the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. The remainder property is undeveloped with landscaping, woods or lawn. All the surrounding abutters are in the B zone. They do contain residential homes. The closest homes were pointed out.

There is currently no storm water management system on site and in general the topography slopes from the northwest corner to the southeast corner with an existing 15-inch pipe under Canal Street here (indicating).

There are no wetlands on site. We are outside the 500-year floodplain.

The proposed plan calls for about a 9300-sf single story Dollar General which complies with zoning regulations. It has 29 paved parking spaces on the front and side of the structure. The main entrance to the building will be facing Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. Handicapped parking stalls in the front. There would be on the side a dumpster enclosure for loading and unloading. There is a single pass door on the side for emergency exits. We are only proposing a single driveway exit from Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. If approved here, it goes to the DOT for an encroachment permit.

Because we are increasing impervious area, we have to comply with Connecticut Storm Water Regulations and we propose a storm water management system. Explained.

This provides quality and quantity control and we removing more than 80% TSS removal and the peak discharges for the 2, 10 and 25 year storms are reduced.

Other site utilities: electric, telephone, water, sewer and gas all come from Meriden Waterbury Turnpike.

Site lighting plan was discussed.

Landscaping plan was discussed.

Erosion controls were discussed.

The Storm Water Management Report was submitted and discussed.

Architecture was discussed.

The applicant answered various questions from the Commissioners.

A traffic memo has not submitted noted the applicant in response to a query by Mr. Chaplinsky after discussion about the distances between the proposed driveway and the intersection.

Canal has not been explored as an in/out. There is an opportunity to connect here noted the applicant, however there is a slope there. He didn't think it was completely restricting but there is a possibility to connect to Canal.

Mr. Chaplinsky pointed out there is no access to the rear of the building. The applicant said customers enter the front and employees and deliveries can come through the front and the side door. No planned access to the rear of the building.

Mr. Chaplinsky thought a business zone requirement is access to the rear of the building for safety purposes. Mr. Phillips said the application is still under review by various departments. The fire marshal's office should be able to comment on that. I am not aware of any regulation that specifically states that. Mr. Chaplinsky cited: Section 4-00.2. (Read)

The applicant's engineer said he would look into that. Town staff --- planning & zoning provided comments yesterday and in engineering it is still under review. This is a work in progress.

The existing homes are both zoned B zones. But there are residential uses abutting. Mr. Chaplinsky noted the requirement for a light proof

fence. The applicant noted a fence across the back and also the plantings along the back are arborvitaes providing an additional screen along with the fence. On the western side, you'll have to do that as well added Mr. Chaplinsky.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips advised as to the reference to the regulation Mr. Chaplinsky made, he would still rely on the fire marshal's office to comment on that as far as what they consider accessible.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky felt they were trying to squeeze a building on a very small lot. It's a big building. The contours are very tight in my opinion, he further added. That's what is prompting some of my discussion.

The Chair referred back to the rendering. Can you find out if that is all Dollar General has? I mean, that's bare bones. We're looking for something with a little more pizzazz. See if they have something else that may be a little more attractive.

Discussion.

Attorney Sciota pointed out Rob knows what the commission is looking for. In dealing with staff, Rob can give you ideas.

Mr. Chaplinsky suggested if the staff has discussions with the applicant, he would suggest some of the beautification techniques used on West Street and some other areas. This is Southington and we should hold people to the standards of some of the beautification standards we like to see here in town. Standard aluminum buildings are gone in my opinion for this.

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

H. Mandatory 8-24 referral re: train depot restrooms (MR 3511)

And

I. Town of Southington site plan application to install restroom facility and connect to public water and sewer, Tran Depot, 447 Canal Street, in an I-1 zone (SPR #1737).

Attorney Sciota introduced the applications. This is for the Depot. We are looking to do something that has been in the plans for probably six or

seven years and that is to put public restrooms on the Trail. We have four miles of trail in this down and not one public restroom. It has been a goal of the open space committee and the council.

You are not deciding on whether we are building them, or not. That'll be a financial decision the council will make and there'll be discussions about that on Monday. Your decision is to allow it to go in assuming the council wants to do it.

Jim Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer, presented. As to the Depot, we are proposing a 10.2' x 19' restroom facility at 447 Canal Street. The property is serviced by water and sewer.

He pointed out the existing train depot on the screen. This location is approximately 1,500' from the north of the Cheshire town line. There are no restroom facilities on the Trail. The location in Southington is being built right now to get a connection into Cheshire which will continue to Hamden and southern locations. Quite a bit of lineal park installed over the next few years. It's continuing to Plainville, Farmington and Unionville, as well.

The site is relatively flat. Open in the front. There is a grove of trees along the residential property line. It's I-1 zoned. The site has presently the Train Station which is being used as a museum that is open to the public.

The restroom facility is going to be at about this location on the site (indicating). Approximately 50' from the road and 50' from the residential property. We are proposing to make a connection at this facility and extend the water and sewer which is already on the site. Explained they will be re-used.

Electric will be available for lighting. We are proposing full cut-off lighting LED fixtures on the building.

As far as the architectures, we are looking into the Cortex CXT which is a pre-concrete facility (indicating). A simple building with a men's and ladies' entrance. The back side will have a service entrance for utilities. Pretty simple. Windows on the sides of the buildings. Two single user restroom facility. Basic. Comes in different types of facades and roofing materials (indicating). We'll do our best to match the facility at the Train Station right now.

The locations of the restrooms, when the open space was looking into where to position them on the trail (referring to Item J now, as well), why didn't they move them a little more north so one was more downtown Southington and one was more downtown Plantsville? Attorney Sciota responded we've always been looking at Goat Island. Only in the last year or so we also looked at the Train Station because we were talking about adding

on to the Train Station. But we got a historical grant for that building and they wouldn't allow a bathroom addition, I'm sure.

Discussion.

We did choose the Train Station because Cheshire has connected to our trail. I'm not saying in the future we may not look to the north, farther up, but it's not on our radar right now, stated Attorney Sciota.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the placement of the bathroom on the Depot site. Is there a reason why you wouldn't put it in line with the Train Station and bring it closer to the trail? A concern I have is it being set back from the trail, it is a little bit more out of sight from where the public will be traversing the trail. He was concerned about vandalism and graffiti, et cetera.

Mr. Grappone explained the driveway entrance has a gate. It comes in and it's a gravel area. We want to leave room for parking.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he would be suggesting putting it further east so it would be closer to the trail. Mr. Grappone showed the setback area and pointed out the picnic area.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky was concerned it would be a site for people to hang out in and do bad things as it is set back far.

Cameras were discussed.

Attorney Sciota said it was set back because we did not want to put a bathroom directly on the Trail. For aesthetic purposes, we wanted to set it back. The neighbors report anything that goes on there. Ever since we've had the cameras and the motion lights, it's been pretty good as far as vandalism.

Mr. Chaplinsky did not want to see it just written off. Is there a way to talk about that with pros and cons. I won't stipulate it. I do think however it is worth batting around and discussing before you finalize it.

Also, it is a historic train station. Can we make it more aesthetically pleasing?

Mr. Grappone said they could look into matching the building. We do want a non-maintenance exterior. We'll do the best we can to match the coloring and texture.

Attorney Sciota said the town knows the area very well. The open space committee has jurisdiction over it. We'll try and match as best we can. It is going to be a concrete structure and we must make the exterior a material

which is resistant to vandalism. We will try our hardest, but we have the balance it.

Materials were described by Mr. Grappone. It's a close fit.

J. Mandatory 8-25 referral re: Goat Island restrooms (MR #512).

AND

K. Town of Southington, site plan application to install restroom facility, connect to public water and sewer and constriction of trail crossing, Goat Island, 5 East Summer Street, in an I=1 zone (SPR #1736).

Attorney Sciota advised the council is looking for you to consider putting the same type bathroom structure at Goat Island which is off of East Summer Street.

We want to do the same thing here except that the access will be from a pathway from the Trail heading in an easterly direction towards the Quinnipiac River to this structure.

Mr. Grappone explained we are proposing again the same type of restroom facility at 5 East Summer Street known as Goat Island. Described the location.

The site has public water and sewer. There is a maintenance facility used by the public works department. There are wetlands on the site which were flagged by a certified soil scientist.

The walk path was pointed out on the screen. It is a 10.2' by 19' restroom facility being proposed. Two stalls. Same material as the previous location.

This location to the location on Canal Street is approximately 2 miles. Right now, we have approximately 4 miles of trail, as previously mentioned. About 2.25 mile from the north of the Cheshire town line.

We are approximately 105' from the residential property and the same to the Trail location. No wetlands disturbance. The wetlands agent reviewed the application and he is in favor of it.

Attorney Sciota explained about the bread oven on site and the UNICO Club's plan to revive it.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he felt this was very far off the Trail. He has a lot of concern about safety. It's a highly wooded area. Is there going to be a lighted walkway? I have concern about walking into the woods.

Mr. Grappone said there is security lighting on the building but no consideration for lighting the walkway.

The Trail closes at sunset and these facilities will be locked.

**As to Item H:** Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

**As to Item I:** Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the comment that I think staff should look at the placement and the architecture getting as close as we can to the train depot design and as close to the Trail as we can get it. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

**As to Item J:** Mr. Chaplinsky said he had a difficult time with the distance from the Trail on this. It is in the woods. It is a Goat Island preserved area owned by the town. I would be more excited about another option. I don't want to deny it.

Attorney Sciota explained this was always the number one location for a restroom. We're hoping there will be more activity there if the Italian Clubs do what the Town allows, i.e.: put in an oven and possibly have elementary school children look at the Italian heritage in Southington, I think it's important we are ahead of the ball. It's been through staff and reviewed. We feel comfortable this bathroom will be as safe as is currently there. We'll light it and have a trail to it. This has always been our number one site to have a restroom.

Other towns that have public bathrooms on the Trail were discussed.

Attorney Sciota said as staff, we are holding ourselves out as the Trail being our economic driver. Inviting people to walk and bike on it. As a service as a community, if we can't hold out a bathroom for people who are using our four-mile town park, in essence, then I think it's something we have to look at.

Finances is up to my superiors. But we all agree you have to have bathrooms on this Trail and it's just a matter of when they'll go in.

Ms. Locks made a motion in favor of the 8-24 referral. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

**As to Item K:** Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Sinclair seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

**8. Regional Planning Commission Update**

Mr. Cabata had no report. He was unable to attend the meeting. The next meeting is in September.

**9. Administrative Items**

Nothing to report this evening.

**10. Items to schedule for public hearing**

Petition of John Senese (Calco Construction and Development company) to change the zone from R-12 (residential) to Business Overlay Zone (BOZ), properties located at 3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11,12,14,15,16, 17 Chaffee Lane; 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8 Stoughton Road and 2,4,5,6,7 Upton Drive (Assessor's Map 181, Parcels 31,56,32,55,33,39,46,40,45,44,41,43,42,47,54,48,53,49,52,50,51,37,38 and portions of 34,35,36) (ZC #558), June 20<sup>th</sup>

Attorney Sciota advised he will not be at the June 20<sup>th</sup> meeting. It is high school graduation that night.

**11. Receipt of New Applications**

Mr. Phillips reported on eight new applications which were all on the Agenda this evening except for Applegate Estates which is a site plan modification for Phases 4,5 and 6. They want to create two big buildings (6 - unit buildings) and split out the duplexes to single family.

Diversified Unlimited at 200 Executive. There's some minor site changes there to the parking lot.

And, the zone change noted.

The Chair announced he did get an invitation from the owners of CHIPS Restaurant. The ribbon cutting is on Thursday and we are invited. It's 3:00 pm on Thursday, June 8<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the subcommittee's progress on the preserved space subdivision regulations with town staff. Thank you to Rob for your efforts on that. Appreciated.

We've had offline meetings with good feedback on the information initially provided to the commission. I think in general we're heading in a direction that is supported.

I think at this point we are ready to put some final touches on it and get it back in front of the commission. We just have to run a couple of simulations to see what some past applications might've looked like using these regulations seeing current versus proposed. What is the impact to the lots? Get a better handle on that.

We'd like to have something for the last meeting in June to get a public hearing scheduled for July.

Attorney Sciota cautioned about summer public hearings.

## **12. Adjournment**

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

**(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:14 o'clock, p.m.)**