

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

DECEMBER 5, 2017

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and a regular meeting on Tuesday, December 5, 2017 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DelSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

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

Alternates: Peter Santago, Joe Coviello & Ted Cabata

Ex-Officio: Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development

James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer  
Mark J. Sciota, Interim Town Manager

Absent: Ross Hart, Alternate

A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance being led by Student Francis LaFramboise (sp).

#### **4. Approval of Minutes**

A. Regular Meeting of November 21, 2017

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

The Chair recognized students in the audience who are all in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade and here for a civics project with Mr. Hart:

- Frances LaFramboise
- Alexandra Carrabetta
- Emma Small

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

## **5. Public Hearings**

A. Joann and Matthew Oakes, Home Occupation application for home office for auto glass company, 216 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, in an R-12 zone (HO#68).

Matthew Oakes, 216 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, presented. He explained he needs this to be approved for paperwork. He does a lot of insurance jobs and it is important for this to legitimate.

The appearance of the house will not change. The business will be subordinate to the house. House is for family and business is secondary. No replacements or work done on site. The glass gets recycled by the supplier.

The glass is delivered to me but it is stored in the back of my van. I would like to get a parts drop box for when they drop it. It would be approximately 5' wide, 4' tall and 2' deep.

I don't expect additional traffic coming to my house. He explained the way glass replacement works. I go to the clients selected place and replace the glass there.

I would like to have this established to give my customers a feeling that they have a place if they have a problem with the warranty or something. A general issue.

I would like to have a small lawn sign put in the front of my house, 2' by 2', maximum allowed by the zoning department.

I would like to say my real office will always be in my van. Auto glass is a mobile operation. I'm open to any of your suggestions.

The parts drop off is a place they can put the glass. Some type of wooden box. I plan to put it on the side of my house.

I have spoken to my neighbors and they were fine with it. No issues.

The work van will be on site parked in the driveway.

The lawn sign will be a wood sign out there.

Mr. Phillips commented the storage structure for the materials that is going to sit on the side of the house next to the garage or something, just on the ground. Mr. Oakes confirmed. It is not necessary, either. I get maybe three deliveries a week.

Mr. Phillips suggested if and when this is approved we leave it up to the zoning permit regarding the sign. We can handle it at that level.

Ms. Clock suggested if people are not coming to the house, a sign might not be necessary. Can you put the name of your business on the drop box to represent your business? The applicant said he could do that. Mr. Phillips again reiterated it should be left up to the zoning permit. It may not fit our requirements putting it on the drop box because of the size.

Mr. Sciota said if nobody is going to your house, a sign doesn't seem to make sense. This is to fit a residential area. You already have a truck parked there with your name on it. To add the extra sign, I question if that is absolutely necessary. I think a sign would be overkill with the truck in the driveway. The applicant said he is open to what the zoning board allows. Mr. Sciota said he would not put it with the zoning permit, he would just not allow it here.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against this application.)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing.

B. J.R. Clisham, Special Permit application to construct multiple buildings on one parcel, property owned by Fifteen Eighty-Eight Group, LLC, located at 1588 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, in an I-1 zone (SPU #587).

Jim Sakoncheck, engineer and surveyor, with the firm of Kratzert, Jones and Associates. My client, J. R. Clisham, is with me tonight. He is applying to build a self-storage facility, which is a permitted use, in this industrial zone. He has numerous facilities of this nature in Connecticut. (Rocky Hill, Bloomfield & Milford)

It is an operation that specializes in self-storage facilities. We are here on a site that used to be kind of like a nursery and is presently unoccupied other than a building. The building exists on the site and is partially demolished right now and will be removed. It's next another industrial facility that is adjacent to the Manor Inn across Clark Street.

He showed the proposed building on the screen. This is a one-story building. There is no occupancy up here, it is just to make the building more impressive. The street entrance, parking lot and access to two other building with faces without doors was pointed out.

He showed the Rocky Hill facility while still under construction. He noted the materials and architectural features.

This is a nice building and their sites are kind of an upgrade and they buy properties on main roads so that the customers feel comfortable. Explained.

The Meriden Waterbury Road entrance was noted with the parking lot. A driveway goes to the building with a second exit over here. A lot of this layout is made for the fire department to be able to come in and get around the buildings. Explained.

The reason for the public hearing is because we have one site with three buildings. This same development could be done as one large building, we find splitting it up has advantages for easier access to individual units within the facility. We don't the long walk you have with a large building.

This is site big enough that if we chose, and we don't want to, we could've subdivided it into three separate parcels. Explained.

We need a special permit because we have three buildings on one site but it is compatible with the intent of the zone because it's laid out as if it could be three buildings. This building is 50' wide and this one is 75'. Those fronts facing the street are comparable to the existing buildings in this neighborhood. It should blend right into the existing neighborhood.

We are adjacent to a residential neighborhood of condos for elderly housing. We have twice the normal vegetated setback. We have 60' of vegetation and normally you're looking for a 30' vegetated buffer adjacent to residential.

A business lot is currently used residentially so we are maintaining a current landscaped buffer (indicating).

A lot of greenspace around the perimeter. It should blend right into this neighborhood. This is an industrial zone and as industrial development goes, this is almost like a transition type use. I believe it is a good transition. It is not heavy industrial, not big tractor trailers coming and going. It is a nice compatible use for this neighborhood.

Buffers were pointed out and explained as being enhanced.

This showed the 500' area map. We did send out the appropriate notices. The building to be removed where the office is going to be was noted. There is a clear, long sight distance along Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike.

He noted surrounding buildings were about 60' long, similar type of development, set back.

He noted buildings by the Manor Inn of about the same width and frontage and similar height. We'll be able to blend right in.

In summary, this can be developed. It'll blend in and not create any public health, safety or welfare problems. It should have a positive affect on property values in the area. It is in harmony with the neighborhood. Building widths are comparable. We are maintaining wide buffers around the back and the sides. These are not tall buildings and comparable and compatible with the type of buildings in the neighborhood.

In terms of traffic generation, for an industrial use, I believe almost nothing generates less traffic than a self-storage type of use. Maybe five cars coming and going in an hour and quite often days with only ten people coming and going in the whole day.

I believe for an industrial zone on the Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike this is a good use and a good development for this area.

Mr. Hammersley asked if they had reached out the neighbors to have a conversation and if so, what is the nature of the conversations. Mr. Sakoncheck said they sent notice to those in the 500' radius.

To the side over here, we spoke with him tonight and showed him our plans. He is comfortable with that, I believe.

In terms of this neighbor (indicating), the Shweky House, I did not speak with the family directly. A family member called and let us know their facility is for sale. But it had no advantage for us so we didn't pursue that further.

The neighbors across the street, no, I have not reached out to them but certainly each received notice.

Discussion.

Mr. Sakoncheck pointed out the more than 60' buffer between the condos and their buildings. Twice the normal 30' buffer.

Discussion of what the current buffer will be enhanced with (trees, shrubs, caliper size, height, species, et cetera). Sheet S-1 in the plans was referred to for the listing, as well.

No outdoor storage is allowed on site. (No boats, vans, R-Vs) All is housed inside.

Fencing and gates (on electronic control) to be installed on site were discussed.

There is no security fencing out in front in order to be compatible with the neighborhood. It will look like a typical development.

Lighting on the facility are wall packs. On the side of the building we have lights over here (indicating) that are directional, cut offs, LEDs. Lower than the roof of the buildings. No light spillage. We are able to keep our lights on our site.

The hours of operation are until 10:00 pm.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated you mentioned a couple of times this is a permitted use. Can you tell us where that is in our regulations?

Mr. Sakoncheck responded: Under industrial uses, storage is permitted and historically other self-storage facilities have been located in this zone.

Mr. Chaplinsky stated in our regulations this would fall under an SPU or the commission would have to find, Section 5-01.1f, it would have to be considered another use which in the opinion of the commission fits the zone and not detrimental to the surrounding area. I am not sure it is permitted unless the commission finds it is permitted.

Mr. Phillips said the language in the industrial zone, I-1, other uses which are in the opinion of the commission are of the same general character to the permitted uses which will not in the opinion of the commission be detrimental to the zone. In regular practice, the planning department, we look for in uses, something similar to what is listed. At the end of the day, when you are before the commission, the commission determines whether it is similar and not detrimental to the zone. There is nothing specifically in here that says: contained inside self-storage.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Comments are prepared summary style. You can refer to the video online for the full discussion.

(1) Jeffrey Adams, 1573, directly across the street, is my building, The Willows. 1573 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike. He's my neighbor and I'm reaching out.

The building looks nice and maybe there's a few things I can add to it since I grew up there. The retention pond in Shweky's yard, there are three chestnut trees in there that are extinct and rare which I think are more valuable than the turtle. If we could identify them and try and preserve them. That would concern me.

From a wildlife perspective, you have the canal back there which starts behind the old barber shop and it goes behind The Willows, all the way through and makes a complete circle. That is a definite wildlife avenue for deer, bear, fox and a nice coyote. They cross the street right through there. The fencing is a problem and trying

to travel over riprap. You can push it over so they can continue to go through there.

Discussion.

Is the 6' chain link fence with plastic slats through it going to be permanent? If so, it'll block that corridor off.

Do we need guardrails?

The pond overflow structure, about where the chestnut tree is, is it one of those big obtrusive ones? Can we do better than that?

What is stored in there? Anything at all? Are there garage doors?

Are there any outside spigots? Is there going to be car washing?

Is there going to be a loud alarm on the gate? Is it going to be noisy? Tone it down a little bit.

My building is 20'6. Thing is 55' high. Is that right?

Another problem is turn arounds all day long. People turning around in my lot.

The dumpster, you have to police it.

(2) Robert Pisco, 1610 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike. I'm speaking in favor. Property values are number one. I own a very small manufacturing facility right due west. I like the clean, modern design. The tax base will improve, I think. I think it would be minimal noise. And, the environmental impact, I'm sure has been taken care of. I'm for it.

(Those speaking against the application.)

(1) John Mattis. I live behind the rear buffer area. 51 Brookview Place. I'm not for or against. I have questions.

I have no issue with the buildings per say. I question I have is there is a stream there that serves not only the wildlife but serves as a watershed area when any precipitation occurs around the immediate area. That stream continues throughout our residential area and comes out the neighborhood and goes around.

A 60' buffer was talked about, if that is accurate, that stream may or may not be included in that buffer.

Discussion.

Spoke about the wildlife's use of the stream.

Mr. Phillips advised there is wetlands on the property and the application was submitted to wetlands for review and it was approved.

The Speaker advised if the stream is obstructed, it would cause flooding.

I'd like to know what the buffer zone would include, how close to the stream is going to be impacted and if there are going to do major excavation back there, there are huge trees with root systems that go along that stream.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Sakoncheck answered the questions/concerns.

With regards to the fence, there is a gate 30' long between these two buildings and one 30' long between these two buildings (indicating) and that would prevent people from coming in here after hours. Then there is a fence that connects the back of this building to this building (indicating). That is the extent of our security fences.

There is a fence around the retention pond which is per town regulations. As it relates to the ability of wildlife to traverse the site, I don't believe we will hinder that.

The wetlands are pretty close to the property line (indicating). It was flagged by a soil scientist and reviewed by the wetlands staff and the wetlands commission. And, there is a 50' general buffer adjacent to it. All that is being retained and maintained and enhanced with plantings.

Discussion.

It is a relatively flat site and there is no reason for guardrails as part of this development.

The outfall structure is going to be a modified catch basin, very similar to one in front of this building (indicating) between the two parking lots and is used throughout Southington. They have stood the test of time.

There will be no outside activity. Certainly, no washing of cars. No sesames.

In terms of noise, we do not allow people to maintain vehicles or put hobbies together. It is passive storage. It is not flex space.

Discussion.

The maximum height of our building is 26'. The 55' was maybe referring to the width of the building or one of the buffers. I apologize for any confusion.

The dumpster is going to be within the fenced area (indicating) and independent in its own fenced area per the regulations for dumpsters.

We are not touching the watercourse other than improving it by removing invasives. We are staying out of the wetlands and the wetlands buffer.

In these two buildings (indicating) there will be garage doors 10' on center. And, then a pass way door for some of the interior units.

Not going near the stream. No obstruction planned.

In terms of excavation, it is a nice flat site and we're able to work with the existing grades. Our drainage will follow that same pattern. There is no major excavation as is customary for industrial development. Flat site.

In terms of the trees, most of the trees are along the back. The site is pretty well cleared already. We are removing trees only when it is really necessary to develop the site. Our goal is to stay away from this back area to the extent possible.

I have not noticed the chestnut trees. I did notice a few large trees but I did not do that type of identification.

Mr. Phillips clarified for the commission. In the I-1 zone, warehousing for finished good is a permitted use and I think this is pretty similar to that. There may be some precedent of your allowing similar uses in similar zones in the past.

I also note for the record we did have two letters of concern. One was Jack Wenz, Homeowners Association, 84 Rivercrest Drive and Ralph Campochiaro, an abutting property owner. These have been supplied to the commission electronically and also in the file, as well.

A question for the applicant: Are these storage units going to be climate controlled? Mr. Sakonchcheck explained they would be.

Mr. Phillips added any rooftop mechanicals need to be screened.

Another question: I know this generally a low traffic generating use, do you have any kind of statement to that affect as far as trip generation? Mr. Sakonchcheck said the trip generation is very low. Less than the 75 trips per hour used as a threshold. Even during initial bid up, we still don't get a lot of traffic generation as it might be six percent a month of the number of units. If we get a hundred trips per day, that would be a busy day for us.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about ZIRO on the site. There is a lot of buildout here. Mr. Grappone explained ZIRO and they can make some minor modifications to the existing plan to make it better as far as ZIRO. So, no major concerns.

Another comment, they did not get fire marshal approval.

Mr. Phillips confirmed they did not get a chance to review revised plans requested for fire apparatus on site.

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

## **6. Business Meeting**

A. Joann and Matthew Oakes, Home Occupation application for home office for auto glass company, 216 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, in an R-12 zone (HO#68).

This is ready for action, no staff concerns. Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve with a stipulation saying no exterior signage. And, that little storage area just be that. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky discussed the stipulation of no signs. Mr. Sciota pointed out this is a home occupation and if the applicant doesn't show a need to have a sign, it doesn't make a lot of sense. Mr. Hammersley pointed out the applicant was okay with no sign and the fact he'll have his van in his driveway.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. J.R. Clisham, Special Permit application to construct multiple buildings on one parcel, property owned by Fifteen Eighty-Eight Group, LLC, located at 1588 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, in an I-1 zone (SPU #587).

Mr. Phillips said as far as the SPU permit, the commission can entertain a motion on this one. Staff recommends there be no outside storage, only internal. Other items discussed are on the record.

Mr. Morelli made a motion to approve after stating he liked the use. Ms. Clock seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky had general concerns about the use. It is quite a built out in this area for me. The size of the buildout on the lot is significant. The multiple buildings, if you look at the regulations under special permit, the discussion with respect to the building design and size, consistent with the neighborhood, is the use consistent with the adjacent business zone to one side and business zone to the other side. To the south there is a residential neighborhood. I know it is industrial land but we have to consider the general character of the neighborhood around it, as well. And, the impact on the neighborhood.

For me, I think the structure is quite big. The use, as a storage facility, for me, the frontage on Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, I'd much rather see something that's bringing in more trips to the area, more people to the area. (Office, professional type building)

I have some concerns with the wetlands. I have a concern about the impact in that area. I know it went before the wetlands commission.

I have concerns about the use and I am not sure it is consistent with the area. I think it's different than Spring Street.  
Discussion.

I do have some concerns.

Mr. Hammersley agreed with Mr. Chaplinsky. In addition to what he enumerated, I am concerned about the buffer as to how it is going to be enhanced and maintained. I heard: we'll try our best and that is not something I feel comfortable with.

I would hope for a stipulation that they do maintain the current buffer and build it out to the extent the plans show.

The outdoor storage, they say there is no outdoor storage, but if there's no stipulation, I don't know what prevents them from doing that in the future if they deem that to be economically beneficial.

I don't think this is in keeping with the character of that part of town. I'm concerned with traffic flow. The use of turn arounds in that area is an issue.

I wish that the applicant had gone to their neighbors and had a conversation and I would have viewed this a little bit differently. They get the notice but it is not too much for us to have them do some sort of outreach.

In keeping with the character of the area, I don't think this is something that keeps in the character of that area. That area has more professional buildings, a daycare on the other side of the street, then a residence to the east.

For those concerns, I plan on voting no.

Mr. Morelli pointed out if you look at the potential uses that could go in there and the fact they doubled the setbacks with wetlands, et cetera. I think a lot of things could go there that people would not like.

You are not going to generate a lot more trips to the area, is a positive to those in the area. They won't have turn arounds because they have a gate.

I don't see it as being intrusive. I think it will look nice and enhance the look of the neighborhood. And, it'll be quiet.

We can stipulate they can't have outside storage.

Ms. Clock agreed with Mr. Morelli. I think this would greatly enhance the look of the area. Right now, we are in desperate need of some newer buildings there. This wouldn't generate a lot of noise and traffic which is a main concern in controlling the area.

Ms. Locks totally agreed. Plus, we have a letter from the citizens that live in Rivercrest. I think would be less invasive, less noise, less traffic for all the local residents.

Mr. Chaplinsky offered the following stipulations if this goes forward:

- Instead of a chain link fence could we go with a full vinyl fence, wooden fence. Something more permanent.
- No outside storage in the SPU.

The Chair agreed with Mr. Morelli and Ms. Clock. He indicated he felt bad for the wildlife, but this is an application by someone who is going to put a business in. It's an industrial zone. I think this will enhance the area. There are manufacturing businesses adjacent to this. I think about what could go there and this is a low trip count, low noise, low light business.

Mr. Morelli added the following stipulations to the motion:

- No outdoor storage.
- Vinyl fencing to the maximum amount allowed by the regulation.

Ms. Clock reseconded.

Motion passed 5 to 2 with Mr. Hammersley and Mr. Chaplinsky opposed.

C. J.R. Clisham, site plan application for a 59,975-sf storage facility, 1588 Meriden/Waterbury Turnpike, in an I-1 zone (SPR #1742).

Staff recommends a table in light of the unfinished issues on the site plan. Mr. Sinclair so moved the motion which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

D. F & F Concrete, site plan modification to change location of building and associated parking, 111 Atwater Street, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1715.1), tabled from November 21<sup>st</sup>

Applicant requests a table to accommodate some of our issues with at least one violation on the site. We will need an extension as our next meeting is January 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Sinclair made a motion to grant the 65-day extension. Mr. Hammersley seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Sciota said he couldn't stress enough from the administration standpoint how important it is not to approve sites that have current violations on them. You are a very important part of our enforcement and I hope you continue that.

Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Bagno Estates, reduction of Erosion and Sedimentation bond from \$28,000 to a new amount of \$10,000 (S #1307).

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

F. Fral, LLC, reduction of Erosion and Sedimentation bond from \$15,600 to a new amount of \$10,000, Fragola/Fral Drive S#1310).

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

G. Lake Compounce, reduction of Erosion and Sedimentation bond from \$23,400 to a new amount of \$15,000, Mount Vernon Road (EE #119).

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

H. Lake Compounce, release of \$130,000 EE bond, Mount Vernon Road (EE #119.1).

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

**7. Administrative Items**

**- West Street discussion**

Mr. Chaplinsky appreciated the commission's continued support on West Street. Since then Mr. Hammersley has crafted a Proclamation that we all received a copy of a little bit earlier. The goal, if everybody agrees, is to get agreement from the commission on the general wording of this, the direction and if everybody is okay, a blessing on it. Then we would present this at the Meeting of the Chairs tomorrow. Then hopefully, if it passes, it goes to Town Council for support. Get the ball rolling and hopefully keep it rolling for the Town of Southington.

Mr. Hammersley read the Proclamation. (Attached)

Thirty Minute Discussion followed (please refer to the video for the full presentation.)

The following changes were requested to the Proclamation:

Paragraph 3: He wants to insert the word "Connecticut" before general statutes.

Paragraph 5: It will read: Therefore, it is proclaimed that:

Strike: be it resolved.

In the last paragraph, the proposed reading is:

The Southington Planning & Zoning Commission supports the securing of Connecticut state funding as well as appropriate supplementary Southington town funding to facilitate a collaborative and comprehensive examination and analysis.

Joe Coviello further recommended the following change:

Paragraph before the last paragraph: Instead of calling it a comprehensive effort, just call it a comprehensive study.

Mr. Santago offered if everyone is good with this and what it implies, he's good with that. But I think that in any other public discussion it's important for us to say in front of the town council what this is and what it is not for public record. West Street is a sensitive thing in town. Not everybody knows the lingo as you do. Publicly, we need to be very clear about what we're asking for and what we're not asking.

Mr. Coviello felt it was a must. It spells out the intent of what we're trying to do. He offered the following change, instead of calling it a comprehensive effort, we call it a comprehensive study.

Mr. Morelli said it says we want the study to determine the deficiencies and needs. This is a Proclamation, a statement from a board saying hey, we've been asking but we're not getting. We'll put some skin in the game, but we need to get this moving.

Ms. Clock liked Joe's change. That puts a little more specificity into it. I like the change of taking out full funding and adding state funding. I think the goal would be to get as much as possible so that as little as possible is on the town. It is line with the POCD.

Ms. Locks commented: We go from Southington in Bristol and they're starting to have the same problems. Why can't we share a little of this with them? Mr. Sciota suggested Mr. Phillips send the Proclamation to the Planner in Bristol to look at.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips will reach out to the Planner in Bristol. It's a good point. If we are going to CGROG, this would be a regional thing. I'll reach out to see if there is any interest.

Discussion.

Mr. Sinclair said he was in favor with the suggested changes.

Mr. Cabata was in favor. He brought it up at the last CGROG meeting. No meeting until January, 2018.

Mr. Sciota asked for the paperwork on the application for the grant so we can go to the council meeting in January to make it official. I need documentation.

The Chair added this is long overdue. This has been Paul's passion for ten years now. In 2009, Paul was named as the head of the subcommittee for West Street. He has been fighting tooth and nail. I respect the finances, but this board generates funds (tax dollars, developments, industry) and the town could spend a little money on this board. You've got to spend it to make it.

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

#### 8. Items to Schedule for Public Hearing

- Matt Cusson, Special Permit application for garage in excess of 3 spaces, 136 Sheffield Place, in an R-40 zone (SPU #589).  
January 2, 2018

Mr. Phillips added:

- The AAA modifications.

9. Receipt of New Applications

Mr. Phillip listed the new applications to-date:

- Cusson, SPU
- Two AAA modifications (SPU & Site Plan)
- Ridgeview Village, reapproval, site plan of 60 units.

The Chair noted this is the last meeting before the holidays. He wished everyone a very Merry Christmas and time spent with family and a Happy New Year.

We'll see everyone back here on January 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mark, thank you for all of your years of service. In the 16+ years I've been on this board, you've been nothing but invaluable. When I first started I sat next to you and I get the best advice and the best information. You will be missed, but we know where to find you.

Mr. Sciota responded he served under five chairmen of this board and you rank right up there with the top of them.

Thank you very much because I probably learned as much from you guys as you learned from me. Of all the boards, I must say I probably had more fun and spoke more at this board than the other boards. I wish I could say I'll miss most of the late nights, probably won't. but I will be picking up the slack on other boards.

Merry Christmas everyone!

10. Adjournment

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 o'clock, p.m.)

**Southington Planning and Zoning Commission**  
**West Street Corridor Proclamation**  
*Unanimously Approved December 5, 2017*

Whereas, the town of Southington is a political subdivision of the State of Connecticut;

Whereas, pursuant to the authority granted by Chapter 126 of the Connecticut General Statutes, Section 112-1 of the Town of Southington Code creates the Planning and Zoning Commission;

Whereas, the §112-3 of the Town of Southington Code grants the Planning and Zoning Commission all the powers and duties specified in Chapters 124 and 126 of the Connecticut General Statutes and designate it as a planning and zoning commission for the Town;

Whereas, West Street is a main thoroughfare running south-north in the northwest portion of the Town of Southington for a total of 4.1 miles; and

Whereas, State Route 229 is a roadway that traverses through the Town of Southington for a total of 3.3 miles.

Therefore, it is proclaimed that:

The Southington Planning and Zoning Commission recognizes West Street has a primary corridor for economic vitality and development in the Town of Southington;

The Southington Planning and Zoning Commission supports consideration of the effects on Southington residents (particularly along and adjacent to the West Street corridor) as the primary consideration in any future economic development along this corridor;

The Southington Planning and Zoning Commission supports a collaborative and comprehensive study to examine and analyze the deficiencies and needs of the West Street corridor to maximize its potential;

The Southington Planning and Zoning Commission believes an examination and analysis of the West Street corridor should begin at the

intersection of West Center Street and West Street extending to the Southington-Bristol line for a total distance of 3.4 miles;

The Southington Planning and Zoning Commission recognizes that such an examination and analysis should include participation and input from the Southington state legislative delegation, the Connecticut Department of Transportation, the Southington Town Council, the Southington Town Manager (and any department representative deemed necessary), and the Southington Planning and Zoning Commission;

The Southington Planning and Zoning Commission supports the securing of Connecticut State funding, as well as appropriate supplementary Southington Town funding to facilitate a collaborative and comprehensive examination and analysis.