

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

JANUARY 2, 2018

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 2, 2018 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
Dagmara Scalise**	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Ted Cabata

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

James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer

Absent: James Morelli, Commissioner
Joe Coviello, Peter Santago & Ross Hart, Alternates

* Seated for the meeting partially.

** Seated for the meeting partially where noted in the
Minutes.

The Chair announced that James Sinclair is moving on to the Police Commission. So now there is a vacancy on this board. Therefore, I'll ask are there any nominations for the Planning & Zoning Commissioner position to fill this vacancy until November, 2019.

Ms. Locks nominated Dagmara Scalise for the Planning & Zoning Commissioner vacancy. Mr. Hammersley seconded.

Hearing no further nominations, the Nomination for Dagmara Scalise passed 5 to 0.

Ms. Scalise assumed her seat at the dais.

Congratulations!

Mr. Sinclair, acting as a Justice of Peace, administered the oath to Ms. Scalise.

(Sworn, sworn)

(Applause)

Congratulations!

(Mr. Sinclair left the meeting at this time.)

The Chair seated Mr. Cabata for Mr. Morelli for this evening's meeting.

A quorum was determined.

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

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of December 5, 2017

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

5. Public Hearings

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

A. Matt Cusson, Special Permit application to construct a garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to in excess of three, 136 Sheffield Place, in an R-40 zone (SPU #589).

Matthew Cusson, 136 Sheffield Place, applicant, presented. He wants to add a detached garage at the end of the present driveway. This is going to act as a garage and a pool house. It will house pool equipment for the pool installed two years ago.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the setbacks. It is 10' in the rear in the R-80 zone confirmed Mr. Phillips. This is planned for 12'.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Cusson presented two letters in favor of the application which Mr. Phillips put into the record.

Exhibit A: Letter from John & Janet Miani, 124 Sheffield Place.

Exhibit B: Letter from Ray Hardy, 143 Sheffield Place.

(The Chair closed this public hearing.)

B. Karen Perzanowski, Special Permit application to construct a 30' x 30' detached garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to excess of three, 40 Nunzio Drive, in an R-20/25 zone SPU #590).

Stephen Guidice, Harry E. Cole & Son, presented the application. He submitted the certificate of mailing to the Town Planner.

There is currently an existing two car garage and we will another two-car garage. We will utilize the existing driveway and put another two-car garage at the end of the driveway. The garage is 15' from the property line where 10' required. This is a pretty straight forward application we think.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the significant hill in this area. Is there any flow that goes from property to property? Mr. Giudice said the catch basin is just for this property and didn't believe there was a right to flow. I don't think we would be redistributing the flows. We will try to maintain the natural flow as much as possible.

Mr. Chaplinsky mentioned the grading assuming the catch basin is not a drywell and it goes to the road? Mr. Grappone wasn't sure if it was a drywell or regular catch basin. But they are proposing no change in grade, no effect as far as drainage.

They're having the cross walls act as retaining walls.

They're putting it into the hill, basically.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against this application.)

None.

(The Chair closed this public hearing.)

C. Wonk Road Partnership, Special Permit application to construct an age-restricted multi-family development of 40 units, property located at 37 & 43 Hunters Lane, in an R-12 zone (SPU #588).

Attorney Bryan Meccariello, 200 Executive Boulevard, Southington, CT introduced the application. Steve Giudice from Harry Cole & Son, engineer, is here, too about the details of the application. Jeff Gworek from Diversified Environmental Services for the environmental services is here to speak about the ELUR. Scott Hesketh, traffic engineer, is here as well. John Lamontagne (sp) is the appraiser and he is here, as well.

In March of 2014 the 19-lot subdivision known as Hunter's Lane was approved. It was approved as a compromise for a zoning appeal taken by a group of neighbors at that point in time. The appeal was of a 9-lot industrial subdivision. There were other appeals, as well.

A stipulation was produced as a consolidation of all the other appeals and the stipulation was, I'll paraphrase, whereby the parties would agree that the zone change from Industrial to R-12 that this 19-lot residential subdivision would be put before the PZC. The other part of the condition was for the remaining 24 acres, that the Plaintiff was given the opportunity to find a municipal or nonmunicipal entity to take over that. So, 18 months after the approval of the 19-lot subdivision, he had.

The Southington Land Trust was not interested in the property. All other attempts were unsuccessful and the property remained with the Wonk Road Partnership, LLC.

Section 8-02 are the considerations which make up 8-02.1 thru 8.02.15. The four professionals mentioned are here to answer any questions you may have or provide responses to the residents.

I'll ask that you be guided by the POCD, particularly two sections. One section encourages the use of brownfields, and I don't suggest this fits right into that peg, but also the need for affordable senior housing.

This is being proposed right now as a 40 unit 55 and older. It is rental units and not for sale.

The Chair asked Attorney Meccariello to re-emphasize what was agreed upon in the Stipulations.

He referred to the Minutes from the March 18th, 2014 meeting. The Stipulation was entered into on January 23, 2014 in the New Britain Superior Court. Caption: Frank Punzo, etal vs the Town of Southington Conservation Commission Inlands and Watercourse Agency, etal. That was one the three appeals pending.

We consolidated that into the Stipulation. (He read the Stipulation which may be reviewed in the Town Planner's Office.)
Discussion.

The ELUR is the contaminated portion of the property, for clarification. It can't be used for development.
Discussion.

The buildings will be on the 5-acre portion in the back and you will have to go over some portion of the ELUR to get there.

Mr. Phillips noted for the ELUR, the pollution concern is VOCs. The determination is the ELUR restriction has limited the construction of buildings or enclosed structures within that area as soil vapors could be an issue. In this case, they're showing all buildings and contained areas are outside of that area. The roadway going through it is not a concern.
Discussion.

Jeff Gworek, Diversified Environmental, 93 Industrial Drive, Southington.

Mr. Hammersley asked a question about the road going over the ELUR site and any digging that might be necessary would disturb the soils. Mr. Gworek said the ELUR for this site specifically states it is a building restriction which means you cannot have an enclosed building or structure inside the ELUR. The site itself, in 2010 the environmental firm was Camp, Dresser and McKee and they stated the soil was remediated for unrestricted use. The only thing outstanding was the ground water and that's why the VOCs were a concern. So, the road should pose no issues.

The site will use public sewer and water.

Mr. Giudice went through the history of the site and the legalities of the site and we'll answer any questions you might have. I'll explain our proposal and the concerns and how we are addressing those concerns.

This is a 24-acre parcel, R-12 zone. It has some wetlands on it (indicated). We have access from Hunter's Lane. And we have non-access along I-84. Metals Drive is an industrial subdivision and this is a private road.

The ELUR is shown on this map (indicated) and gives you an idea of the area we are proposing to develop. To get to this area, we are required to come through an existing corridor (driveway) to the facility which was on the site in the past. There is some existing infrastructure and that will be abandoned and we will be bringing in new utilities.

We did receive wetland commission approval for our proposed activities and we do not have any wetland impacts but we do have buffer impacts for proposed drainage improvements.

I want to make clear about the ELUR is that there was a final determination this could be used for construction purposes and our original subdivision was for a 9-lot subdivision with proposed construction, buildings, parking lots, sewer systems and so on within the ELUR. That is permitted by DEEP requirements.

Discussion.

Things have changed and we've come back with tonight's proposal. We are not proposing any residential construction on the ELUR. We propose a road that follows the existing road that come in through the wetland area and we have some existing drainage we'll fix and we'll put the driveway in and around the property to our proposed units in this triangle area (indicated).

We have carports proposed and some are in the ELUR. They're open walled, just roofs for cars to park under and this is a permitted use.

Our proposal is for 5 buildings comprising the 40 units. Eight of those units would be one bedroom and 32 units would be two bedrooms. Our driveway is from Hunter's Lane and we are using a good portion of the existing driveway that is there. It will be resurfaced, repaired and restored.

We are proposing 88 parking spaces on the site. We have some garages, carports and some additional visitor parking.

We did receive wetland approval. We are proposing low impact development design standards here. Explained.

As we laid this out we took into consideration the safety of fire truck movement, et cetera, through the site. From what we've put together we believe that we meet your requirements.

It is our opinion that these buildings are in harmony with the character of the area. We think it will be an improvement.

(Audience outburst)

The units are proposed to be rental so the Wonk Road Partnership will maintain the property and the roadway and all the ground maintenance associated with the development.

We do believe there is adequate emergency access to the property. We did an analysis and the streets are adequately sized for this type of use.

We did submit a traffic report for this application identifying no serious concerns.

We think the property is sufficiently sized for what we are proposing. We have a large area of unused property. We are proposing to consolidate our site into this corner. We could've expanded certain facilities into the ELUR but we felt we were trying to keep most of it outside the ELUR.

Mr. Giudice explained the landscaping to be incorporated according to your requirements. We have buffers around the property, 35', as required. Ornamental trees and shrubs throughout the site. All is consistent with your site plan requirements. The site will be buffered from the surrounding properties.

All proposals comply with local, state and federal regulations. We believe this is compatible with the neighborhood.

This plan is also consistent with the goals and objects of the POCD. We feel there is a need for this in town and this plan is a good plan for the town.

There is no risk to acquihires with this development. Environmental protection and consideration and conservation is something we have to look at when proposing an application like this and we think we are proposing proper buffers to the wetlands.

Public water and sewer on the site. Explained.

Mr. Hammersley asked about the rental duration. Mr. Giudice said it would be annual rental. On the southeast portion, is there any noise barriers in that area? Mr. Giudice explained along Panthorn Park and Carrington Companies and Gibbs there are none.

Ms. Clock asked if this would be a phased development. Mr. Giudice said it would be constructed by buildings. As they are completed they would be occupied. We haven't specifically designed a phased plan for it.

Ms. Locks is concerned about the traffic on Wonx Spring Road. With the large trucks coming out of Gibbs Wire and traffic in the area, a lot of children. What is going to happen?

(Audience applause)

Mr. Giudice stated this use is a very low traffic volume counts. The lowest probably that can be proposed for inside this type of residential use. Our traffic engineer can speak more about that.

Discussion of other permitted uses in this zone in response to a question by Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Giudice explained the compromise.

In response to a query by Mr. Cabata, Mr. Gworek explained the ELUR stays with the land unless somebody wants to spend the money to reinvestigate. There are 63 ground monitoring wells on the property, overburden and bedrock groundwater, and 2007 was their last round of

sampling. They filed the ELUR in 2010. It is possible that through natural attenuation ---- but it is expensive to go back out there.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if the applicant would consider a conservation easement over the ELUR area preventing future development. Mr. Giudice said they would consider restricting additional residential development of the property.

The units will have no basements.

Scott Hesketh, licensed engineer with firm of F.A. Hesketh & Associates. Author of a December 4, 2017 letter outlining the traffic impact of this proposed development. (On file in the Town Planner's Office for review.)

Mr. Hesketh reviewed and explained his December 4, 2017 letter. (Please refer to the video of this meeting for the full presentation.)

He noted very minor impacts as a result of the proposed development with this application. The residential roadways in the area with the traffic coming to and from this residential development will go through those residential roadways and it is going to be more traffic than currently exists but it is not a significant volume. We believe that volume of traffic can readily be accepted by the existing roadway network without significant impact to the existing public.

Ms. Locks discussed the traffic patterns in the area with Mr. Hesketh.

She noted her concern was with the school buses on that road. Further discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked Mr. Hesketh, in your professional opinion, is this a better scenario of traffic for the Wonx Spring Road neighborhood? Having residential traffic coming in and out or if this were a 9-lot industrial subdivision, what would that be like? Mr. Hesketh explained the typical trip generation with residential development as opposed to industrial trip generation. From a pure volume standpoint this type of development is much better than an industrial development.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice asked John LaMontagne (sp) to come up and talk about property values.

John LaMontagne, real estate certified commercial appraiser, for 42 years spoke about the property values and market study. I did a market study evaluation on this property of the proposed subdivision. (Please refer to report on file in the Town Planner's Office.)

He stated he found there would be absolutely no negative impact to the residential homes in the area from this development. Actually, he found it to be more beneficial to the value of the homes. He

reviewed and explained his report. (Please refer to the video for the exact presentation.)

The Chair asked for his opinion on multifamily housing being adjacent to single family house. He explained his personal experience in Middletown and Rocky Hill, CT. No impact whatsoever as values have been going up.

Mr. Giudice stated that concluded their presentation at this time and they will be available to answer residents' questions.

The Minutes are prepared summary style and below is a briefing of who spoke and what their concerns/questions were. Please refer to the video on line for the full presentation.

Those speaking in favor of the application:

Frank Castellano, 112 Wonx Spring Road. I approve with some questions. I say yes as the major concern is traffic and I have no problems with this project. I didn't take the opportunity to more vehemently oppose the change from Industrial to Residential and that's one reason why I'm here. He spoke about cars versus truck traffic. Drivers seem to be courteous and professional. School buses versus trucks/cars, I didn't see how that would negatively impact the neighborhood as the bus stops now at the intersection of Wonx Spring Road and Hunter's Lane. He discussed the proposed traffic counts. I am saying yes to this project.

Why the special permit use? Mr. Chaplinsky explained in an R-12 zone, multi-unit housing is allowed under special permit. It is a use that is allowed but it goes through a special permitting use process.

Those speaking against the application:

Michael Scott, 125 Roxbury Road. He spoke about property values. Carports will be in my backyard. How is that helping my property value?

Spoke about the wetlands and flooding on his property. Won't this push more water to my yard causing a series of channels?

The court document keeps getting brought up. Why? When it was ruled on by the court it closed the book on that chapter. We read it was a 55-year old and older community in that document. Wouldn't this be commercial as they are rental properties?

Hunters Landing was listed as 19 properties. Is that 19 properties built or 18 properties with a property left there knowing they'd put a road through it?

We weren't told there was potential to have development in our backyard when we built.

Traffic, industrial or rental, which is better? Why does that hold value. The court ruled it wouldn't be zoned for industrial.

Discussion of rental units and the tenants and how will that help my property value.

Kayla Kennedy Swain, 27 Hunters Lane. (Lot 19) Spoke about the building process of this home. We chose this because of the big backyard lot size. This is a shock to me finding this out. Spoke about traffic.

Misleading. We were told 19 lot subdivision. We were told Lot 17 was being saved for the builder's child/grandchild. It wasn't an option for buyers.

Andrew Banderski, 61 Hunters Lane. Spoke about misleading information.

All the traffic with the 40 more units was discussed.

Derek Platz, 53 Hunters Lane. (Lot 16) Told that lot 17 was unavailable.

He spoke about 19 lot subdivision and not 18 lots.

Restrictive Covenants on the subdivision were discussed and noted as for single family homes.

Now we are going to be a corner lot and not next to a single-family home which is a reduction in our home value.

Traffic, construction noise and new development traffic were discussed.

Environmental issues are a big concern overall. ELUR was discussed.

This facility is inconsistent with the surroundings.

Jeffrey Martin, 91 Hunters Lane. I did send a letter to Mr. Phillips earlier today. The Chair noted the commissioners had received it.

Spoke about traffic volume versus traffic safety.

Don't look at just the elements of the POCD as it relates to providing housing for an aging population in Southington but it also speaks clearly to maintaining the single-family home character of Southington, as well. A balance is important.

Never was I made aware of this development when I went through the planning and purchasing phases of my home.

David James, Meriden. President of the Quinnipiac River Watershed Association.

My concern started in 2013 when the original application was put in for the industrial development. Environmental testing results were cited.

Bedrock being not parallel with the topography so toxins were showing up outside the perimeter of the ELUR is a concern.

Culvert on the property that is a direct drainage into the Quinnipiac River is a concern with the sewer line contingent (sic) to that.

Detention was a concern.

Ken Galfert, 42 Hunters Lane. Traffic safety is a concern with the children in the area.

Home values were discussed.

Kristin (Inaudible), 149 Wonx Spring Road. Brought up the Chief of Police's Report which as done in 2013, July 10th, and it emphasized not only truck traffic, but all traffic. It includes his findings and pictures of the area, width of the roads and issues with trucks going through and the traffic. He discusses increased vehicular traffic, also. (Read parts of the report.) The report is on file in the Town Planner's Office.

Discussion of traffic patterns, narrow and dangerous road.

Divot in front of her house is slammed every day by speeders.

Drivers don't stop for stop signs.

Property values with rentals was discussed.

Eighty-eight parking spots were discussed as not being enough. What about visitor parking for the over 55 units?

I hope we can table the public hearing until we can get a Chief of Police response to the report he wrote in 2013. I would like to know his response on a 40-multifamily home development back there.

Very dangerous road. Traffic patterns were discussed.

The QRWA was one of our helper's in the issue three years ago.

ARMY Corp of Engineers spoke to? That was an issue three years ago.

Sidewalks on the private road up and down?

There were hints of stuff on the ELUR other than the carports. Changes in law and we can start building other things. What is the long-term plan for this?

Discussion of the conditions of the stipulation.

The point is keep it single family homes and we can argue against the multifamily rentals.

Kathy LaForest, 160 Wonx Spring Road. Submitted a Petition with 67 signatures from my neighbors.

Exhibit D: Petition.

Please deny this application as it is too much for what they want to do. I don't understand.

Property values decreasing was discussed.

Privacy is gone.

This is a single-family development.

This is not appropriate. Concerns about the senior bus, ambulances.

Spoke about future residents not being told about the ELUR.

Traffic volumes were discussed.

Environmental concerns were brought up.

Buy the five acres not contaminated and make it part of Panthorn Park. The rest of the ELUR can become a nature preserve. Great idea.

Wetland damage was discussed.

Flooding in her basement was discussed.

Contamination and mitigation was discussed.

Stipulation says no less than 19 building lots and you take one away, that's 18, which is a problem, too.

(Applause, applause)

Exhibit D: Email from Frank Punzo submitted.

Exhibit E: Unsigned memo to the Conservation Commission originally dated August 31, 2013.

Raymond LaForest, 160 Wonx Spring Road. Spoke about crime, vandalism and this not being a benefit to the town.

Frank Castellano, 112 Wonx Spring Road. Talked about sidewalks, traffic, safety concerns, water pressure and drainage.

Charles Moss, 105 Roxbury Road. Spoke about buffers, setbacks, density issues, open carports and the access road not being straight. He also brought up this is an over 55 rental development and how it is governed and how are we assured it will stay that way in the future.

(Rebuttal)

Attorney Bryan Meccariello and his team of professionals addressed the following:

- Why carports and not garages. This is a site plan issue, but the restrictive covenants for Mr. Scott's subdivision would not apply to this property. A valid question, though. Perhaps Mr. LaMontagne can respond as to comparing houses with garages to carports.

- The concern for children. That's the job of the PZC. We have professionals that talk about the traffic count but we are not going to come up here and say children aren't going to get injured. That's what this commission is charged with doing under the general and specific considerations. Valid questions.

- The traffic count is the traffic count. These are projections. We rely on the expertise and experience of the you guys and the professionals.

- The misleading, in terms of marketing, I am not coming to comment. It is a topic that should be discussed in a different forum, if discussed at all. Not part of your considerations.

- I remember the Southington Police Report having to do with traffic. That have to do with the industrial piece. It's a fair question. You want to get all of the pubic safety departments. You may want to get the fire department to confirm they can get their apparatus in based on the size. We welcome the police department's opinion on this and if there are suggestions that would make sense those are something we could consider.

I think we do need a report starting from scratch for residential. Maybe they can take into consideration the existing industrial use on the adjacent property.

- I don't think it is fair to age shame. We are age shaming. Calendar House buses and ambulances can pick up seniors at residential properties as well. I don't think it is fair to characterize that.

- The occupancy would be limited to residents 55 and older and occupancy per unit as well.

- There wouldn't be any children for education or a bus stop.

- Crime. I can't talk about that. Perhaps the SPD can address if it is an issue the people that are 55 and older committing crimes versus anyone else that could come in that neighborhood. Fair question to have the SPD address.

I think there were a lot of common concerns. Any particular questions?

The Chair enumerated:

- Sidewalks inside the development.
- Army Corp of Engineers.
- QRWA bedrock leaking or sewage spilling into the Quinnipiac River.

- What type of contamination issues could arise while digging there, if any.

- Property line, landscape buffers.

- Why is the access road not straight?

Discussion of the misleading information issue. Attorney Meccarriello reiterated it should be brought up in a different forum and not an administrative. It is not a consideration for this board. Everyone has a remedy to that.

- Why 55 and older versus single family homes.

- Density.

Mr. Giudice replied we are applying for a SPU to allow multi family housing within and R-12 zone. It is a permitted use in the TOS by special permit. It does not differentiate between condos, rental or owner occupied. That is not a zoning issue.

The zoning is: Can this property support multi family housing and our presentation feels it can. It should be defined as multi family age restricted housing. Gave examples of other developments in town like this. (Spring Lake Village, Liberty Square)

Rental is done throughout town. It is permitted. (Carter Lane)

The applicants propose a nice facility that will compliment and not be detrimental to the town.

He reviewed the density requirements.

As to flooding, as we go through the process we look at drainage on the site and this is more of a site plan issue. There is ponding that happens behind the houses on Roxbury and this issue came up during the Hunter's Landing subdivision. And, that is an existing condition that would remain, however our application will not increase that situation. He explained the storm drainage pattern for this application.

The court document says the applicant has the right to come back with another application and that's the reason it was brought up. This shouldn't be a surprise to the neighbors.

Discussion.

He wondered by the residents take advantage and own this property and preserve as has been suggested.

On traffic, I'll let Scott talk to you about that. The thing misunderstood is peak hour trips. It's the busiest hour in the morning and the busiest hour in the afternoon. Explained this development will generate 3.4 trips per peak hour.

As to the ELUR, Jeff can talk about that. It is well documented and on file in the land records. Not a secret. Been there for a very, very long time. It is on all the plans.

The Chief of Police letter specifically is written about the industrial subdivision. I don't think it is appropriate to be submitted into the record for this application. If you desire an opinion by the Chief of Police, you should get a new letter.

Parking requirements were discussed based on the planning & zoning regulations. The regulations permit us to have 88 spaces maximum.

Discussion.

The Army Corp of Engineers has been brought up. There is a vernal pool at this location (indicating). I don't think an application was ever submitted to them and it wasn't really necessary. There wasn't any disturbance to the vernal pool or that area of wetlands. Wetland disturbance was very minor impacts.

Sidewalks are internal which run from Hunter's Lane along our proposed roadway throughout the site on one side of the road.

Crime rates and rental properties, I think the applicant has built nice homes on Hunter's Lane and he is going to build nice homes on this development. That's not an issue for this commission to think about.

The reason we proposed open carports is because some of them are in the non-ELUR areas and some are in the ELUR area. To comply with ELUR requirements of an open structure, we proposed carports.

Discussion.

As with any development you approve, 55 and older, the requirement is placed on the deed as a restriction with specific requirements the applicant has to follow through with for the application. The town doesn't police 55 and older developments. Typically, the residents police the developments. That's how it is done throughout the town and the state.

As to the entrance into the property, there has always been an access to this property. A 20 or 25-foot strip of land that had access to this piece for future development. Our intention with this lot --- we'd rather not give that lot up. But with the technical aspects of the 55 and older requirement, we needed additional frontage so the idea was to take that lot and create lot frontage out of it for this application.

The shape of the road is more or less just following the edge of the wetland. I can talk to the applicant about modifying that.

DEEP has given a final determination on this property and given their blessings on what can happen on this property. DEEP has been involved in this process from Day One.

Jeff Gworek, DES, explained what is permitted in an ELUR. On this plan there are no enclosed structures being proposed on the ELUR. That's not a concern.

As far as off-site contamination noted in a report from HRP, I have not reviewed it and have no knowledge of that.

The verification report and the ELUR, it was filed in 2010 by Camp, Dresser and McKee. I've reviewed that specifically for this case. The summary said the bedrock wells they installed along 84 because groundwater flows from west to east, in those wells, there

was no contamination found. So, it did not flow off site. That's all I know as far as offsite contamination.

The groundwater under the land restriction does not pose a risk to human health provided that a building is not constructed. But you are allowed to design buildings or any kind of enclosed structures on the land use restriction provided you come up with some kind of soil vapor prevention to pump the air outside of the foundation.

Anything built enclosed on the ELUR has to be approved by the DEEP Commissioner.

Soils on the site, when they filed the ELUR, met the DEEP standards for unrestricted residential use. So, the soil has been cleaned and remediated.

As far as digging up more soil for the road, the soil has been deemed clean per the state.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice addressed the sewer issue. Our proposal is to bring our sewer to the existing sewer system (indicating) and come through the property and service our units.

Storm drainage has been kept to a minimum. Explained.

The water line is the only thing to be dug through the ELUR.

Scott Hesketh clarified that what we are proposing is an age-restricted development. In the ITE trip generation report, they provide estimates for many different land uses. Explained his trips per day estimate.

These are smaller units. People are retired and don't have to go to work or spend significant amounts of time in Florida or somewhere else and they may not be here for several months out of the year.

Some, but not all of them, work 9:00 to 5:00.

Per the ITE rates for age restricted developments based on traffic counts conducted at existing facilities has an average daily trip generation is about 3.5 trips per unit. Single family about 10.

Two distinct types of land uses generating two types of traffic volumes.

Explained further research he had done to support this statement.

Mr. Giudice stated that concludes their presentation.

The Chair suggested it was a good idea to have the police chief conduct another study with residential versus industrial. We'll leave the public hearing open.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice was concerned about the police chief rendering an opinion on this after you read the previous letter.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice felt the report should be from a professional who prepares traffic reports.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips suggested another option would be to seek a second opinion.

Discussion.

Discussion of preparation of the Chief of Police's previous opinion letter.

The Chair said he would speak with Ms. Futtner and get her professional, legal opinion with regards to this and if the town needs to look into our own traffic analysis for this site, so be it.

Ms. Scalise asked how many single-family homes could be built on the same footprint you're showing for the development. Mr. Giudice will provide that information.

Mr. Chaplinsky advised in R-12 it could be single family and/or duplexes.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley felt it was worthwhile to get a second opinion or have somebody else look at this. The numbers are statistical numbers.

Discussion.

The Chair indicated this public hearing would be left open to the next meeting.

Vince Baggetta, 112 Roxbury Road. Talked about the infrastructure in that area being able to support 40 units and rentals living in the area.

(Whereupon, the meeting was recessed at 9:35 o'clock, p.m.)

(Whereupon, the meeting was resumed at 9:41 o'clock, p.m.)

MICHAEL DEL SANTO, Chair, resuming the Chair:

D. Midland Retail, modification of special permit approval to construct multiple buildings on a lot for a proposed 46,211 s.f. commercial building/public service garage for a AAA facility properties located at 775, 785, 801, 811 Queen Street; 2,4,6 Upson Drive; 3,5,7 Chaffee Lane; properties owned by: Lot 24- FCP, LLC; Lot 25,26,36 - East Queen LLC; Lot 27,32 - West Queen Developers, LLC; Lot

28,29,33,34 - John Senese; Lot 31 - Dana Dipietro; Lot 35 - Twinco Corp., in a B zone (SPU #564.1)

John Schmidt, civil engineer with BL Companies representing the applicant.

Tonight, we have several items including the special exception site plan application for a AAA facility proposed to be located on this property.

One item is for approval for special exception for multiple buildings on a parcel of property. There are multiple buildings on the existing parcel. He noted the Aldi's, a restaurant at this location.

We propose to develop this parcel of property (indicating) as a AAA facility. It's a new unique facility for AAA. They don't have any in Connecticut at all. It is a combination of their standard office with travel services, insurance, driver's ed, drivers' licenses, that sort of thing. The component they are adding is the rear of the building is an 8-bay service garage.

The public garage would be open to the public. When we went through location approval permitting there are stipulations on the use such as no sale of gasoline, no bodywork, no paint shop. It's minor repairs, only. Tire changes, brake changes, oil filters, that sort of things that would be the use.

He showed and explained the floorplan.

The building is on slab with no trenches or pits. There are no hydraulic lifts into the ground.

The building would be served by all utilities that are currently available in the road.

Storm drainage was outlined and discussed.

Erosion and sedimentation controls were outlined and discussed.

The landscaping plan was discussed.

We did receive staff comments along with questions. He pointed out foundation plantings around the perimeter of the building. No plantings are proposed along the garage bay doors in this location (indicated).

The front of the building is mostly the sidewalk and entrance. We have parking located throughout the site. There are 44 parking spaces.

The dumpster location was noted. It would be a split face block masonry wall structure with brick and a door to access the dumpster for trucks.

The main access drive would be off of the existing driveway here at Queen Street. (Indicated)

The existing development currently the four buildings operates under a OSTHA certificate for traffic. We would be adding this building (indicated) and vehicles, we would have to go back and modify that certificate subsequent to making it through local permitting. We would go back to OSTHA for them to review the application for traffic flows. We did provide a traffic memo to staff for guidance as to what we felt was appropriate. That would also get submitted to OSTHA at that time.

With regards to the use of the garage, there was some question about the noise. It was stipulated that the garage doors were to be closed while cars were being worked on. The building will be air conditioned so the doors will be closed and no open when doing tire changes which would negate any noise issues.

Ms. Locks asked about the storage of the oil and brake fluid. Inside or outside? Mr. Schmidt added in the dumpster location area there is a storage area for some used tires to be picked up daily.

And, as part of the traffic review, this is unique, there's no use like this in the ITE manual. We spoke to AAA and they gave us some numbers on a similar facility and they process about 500 cars a month for service. That breaks down to about 17 cars per day.

They will be closing their Plainville Office and moving those jobs to this facility. More people working here as there is no service at that facility.

Ms. Clock questioned the hours of operation and the earliest time for a tire change. Mr. Schmidt said it was discussed at the last hearing for the location approval.

Ms. Clock asked if there were going to be student drivers navigating out of this lot. Mr. Schmidt noted there is a classroom for drivers' ed. I'd have to find out about the drivers. Mr. Schmidt noted that if there is, that person would be with an instructor. Following the law. They're allowed on town and local roads. Ms. Clock wanted to know for sure.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up a site plan issue. For me, when we get to the appropriate time, if this is sent forward, I would want to see renderings of the elevations of what this will look like. There is a certain look and feel we'd be looking for.

I would also ask staff to consider in the SPU stipulations for cross easements to the east and south for future development. We have an easement to the north. Mr. Phillips commented it is connected to the north and west. I don't think it would be appropriate at this point in time to have access from Upson. Mr. Chaplinsky clarified he

is not asking for access, but cross easements on the parcel so if there is development the cross easement is on this as an approved cross easement for future development. That's the standard language we've been doing. Mr. Phillips was not sure we would want to have something that close to the intersection. To the east, we could. It will continue to develop over there and it would be a moving target, in my opinion. Mr. Chaplinsky pointed out if we don't have anything, we have nothing. Having an easement allows access somewhere. To the south, we want to continue to have access. Staff will discuss this with the applicant.

Staff has asked for renderings but the applicant has not submitted that, yet.

Mr. Schmidt said they have no issues with the comments we received and we're working on them.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Matt Cusson, 136 Sheffield Lane. He asked the following:

- Where is the compressor located? Is it roof mounted?
- Dumpster for tires located in the resident's side/back yard? How can the truck have access to that tight corner? When will the truck come by?
- And, the 80% particulate removal system, who is going to maintain that? Is it registered with the sewer department? Maintenance done by whom in the future?

I'm all for it, by the way.

(Those speaking against the application)

Mark Adams, owner of 7 Stoughton Road. He advised the times discussed at the ZBA were 7:00 am to 7:00 pm.

And, zero outside storage.

The building is 28' high at its highest point. Mean height is about 22'. Think about that with a 7' fence.

Zero outside storage. The dumpster has an area next to it with an opening for the doors. This is for outside storage.

Traffic. Go up there when the businesses are busy and the traffic lights aren't in sync. Try to take a left.

Discussion.

The garage doors are to be left closed? I'd like to see that stipulated. How will it be managed?

There is supposed to be no service vehicles there. What does AAA do? They do road calls. Where are these service vehicles to be parked? They say they're not going to have any on the site.

How do you like the way the site looks? How would you like to own one of our houses? Bring your kids up there to play on weekends?

We told you this would happen from the start. The fence isn't up. Now we have to wait until spring. We get stuck looking at Queen Street.

Lighting comes from Queen Street. All the noise.

Demolition was a joke. Explained. Where are the certified contractors regarding lead laws? There is lead in those houses. They were built in 1950's. I have video of the dust flying down Stoughton Road.

You don't take this into consideration but we have to live there.

Midland Retail from Cincinnati, Ohio. Who are they? I thought we were dealing with John Senese.

Discussion.

Why are they discharging their sewers into our residential discharge? Why are they gaining their water from our residential intake? They don't want to pay the cost to go to Queen Street.

Discussion.

The residents have been shown little or no consideration in the decisions made. If you're going to continue to rubber stamp everything this guy puts before you as the town wants the tax dollars, just tell us and we'll stop wasting our time.

Thank you.

Fiagrio Ramirez, 6 Stoughton Road. I go with Mr. Adams' sentiments. I still remain opposed to anything John Senese wants to development --- Midland or any other shadow company he's using.

The northbound entrance to the plaza is consistently used by southbound traffic and I know from experience.

I remain opposed.

The Chair asked Mr. Grappone to talk about sewer discharge and storm drains and water hookups. Is it the right of the applicant to hook in where he feels appropriate? Or is that something the town

directs him to do? Mr. Grappone explained the plan shows connection into Chaffee Lane. We commented that a video condition survey be submitted to the engineering department. That's an easy test to be done.

Discussion.

I'm certain there is a concern with the amount of construction activity involved police protection. It's a deep cut, larger pipe in Queen Street. It was decided by the engineer which would be the most economical route which was Chaffee. The Town's concern is it should be videoed.

What happens to the pipe tying into Chaffee if there is future development asked Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Grappone said it is a commercial use. It's low. It's really just domestic with some floor drains. They have to apply for a DEEP permit for vehicular discharge from the floor drains. Not a large use as far as water consumption. Just one commercial building connecting into a town line which is not uncommon.

Discussion.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Schmidt said it was his understanding the compressor was inside the building.

As to trucks accessing the dumpster, we have been asked to provide a truck turning plan. We do show how trucks can make the maneuvers and get into the space.

As to the opening, that is for a person to walk through. We can put a door on that. Not a big issue.

There is zero outside storage, I believe.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips reviewed the ZBA approval from 10/24/2017 with stipulations. When you get to the approval stage, you can basically stipulate these to carry forward.

Clarification discussion on the outside storage.

Dumpster area location was discussed. Mr. Schmidt explained said he is not married to the location. We can put it anywhere we can make it work. Plantings and fencing was discussed.

Discussion.

As to service vehicles, they are not going to be part of this facility. Tow trucks aren't going to be part of this facility.

As to the 80 percent total suspended solids removal, it is designed to be maintained by the owner as required under a commercial

discharge permit. DEEP requirements were discussed.

Discussion.

Closing time is 4:00 pm on Saturday with no Sunday hours.

Traffic lights are part of the state system. Explained how they would have to be tied together to coordinate them. That's outside of what this application is about.

It was my understanding as to the demolition; the buildings were remediated before they were demolished. I'd have to defer to the applicant on that.

Sewer and water hookups were explained as being where they made sense to the applicant.

Midland Realty is a development extension arm of AAA. John Senese is still the landowner and involved. These folks handle the development for AAA.

The north drive is a right in / right out. The geometry of that was stipulated by DOT as part of an earlier application.

Ms. Scalise clarified the business hours: 7:30 am to 7:00 pm weekdays and 7:30 am to 4:00 pm on Saturday. Closed on Sunday.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky again brought up future development and access cross easements. Do you see why that would be an issue?

Discussion.

Mr. Schmidt said that would be deemed a blanket easement for access. We are not opposed at all to show or provide language for cross easements for access.

Discussion.

(Pause)

Timing of the lights on Queen Street was discussed. We are tied to the DOT. (West Street, Queen Street, Route 322)

Having no reason to keep the public hearing open, the Chair at this point closed the public hearing.

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Matt Cusson, Special Permit application to construct a garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to in excess of three, 136 Sheffield Place, in an R-40 zone (SPU #589).

Ready for action. Mr. Cabata made a motion to approve with a second by Mr. Chaplinsky. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Karen Perzanowski, Special Permit application to construct a 30' x 30' detached garage which will bring the total number of garage spaces to excess of three, 40 Nunzio Drive, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #590).

Ready for action with the stipulation not to be used for business. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the stipulation which was seconded by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Wonk Road Partnership, Special Permit application to construct an age-restricted multi-family development of 40 units, property located at 37 & 43 Hunters Lane, in an R-12 zone (SPU #588).

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

D. Midland Retail, modification of special permit approval to construct multiple buildings on a lot for a proposed 46,211 s.f. commercial building/public service garage for a AAA facility properties located at 775, 785, 801, 811 Queen Street; 2,4,6 Upson Drive; 3,5,7 Chaffee Lane; properties owned by: Lot 24- FCP, LLC; Lot 25,26,36 - East Queen LLC; Lot 27,32 - West Queen Developers, LLC; Lot 28,29,33,34 - John Senese; Lot 31 - Dana Dipietro; Lot 35 - Twinco Corp., in a B zone (SPU #564.1)

The Town Planner advised this is ready for action and if you'd like to entertain an approval on the SPU portion of it and carry forward the ZBA stipulations/conditions --- there were 12 conditions approved on 10/24/2017, I would recommend that.

Ms. Clock had some comments. She indicated she was concerned about some of the unknowns. To me, a tire is a part of a car, and if the ZBA is saying there is not supposed to be any parts storage, that, to me, is tires.

And, I guess the applicant is not sure if there are going to be student drivers and in talking about how abysmal the Queen Street situation is, why would we contribute to that?

For those two reasons I would not support a motion.

The Chair agreed with the comment about the tires. They are coming every day to pick up the tires, why can't they store them

inside? The Town Planner reread stipulation #3 from the ZBA and you could make sure that includes tires.

Discussion.

Ms. Locks made a motion to table so we can have them come back with some explanations. Student driver's, storage. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded the motion to table. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Midland Retail, site plan modification to construct a proposed 46,211 s.f. commercial building/public service garage for a AAA facility properties located at 775, 785, 801, 811 Queen Street; 2,4,6 Upson Drive; 3,5,7 Chaffee Lane; properties owned by: Lot 24-FCP, LLC; Lot 25,26,36 - East Queen LLC; Lot 27,32 - West Queen Developers, LLC; Lot 28,29,33,34 - John Senese; Lot 31 - Dana Dipietro; Lot 35 - Twinco Corp., in a B zone (SPU #564.1)

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

F. J.R. Clisham site plan application for a 59,975 s.f. storage facility, 1588 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in an I-1 zone (SPR #1742), tabled from December 5

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the application.

This property is located at 1588 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike in an I-1 zone. Served by public water and sewer. Land area is 3.95 acres with a gentle slope to the rear of the property or south.

The proposal is for a storage facility 59,975 sf with three buildings and related office area. The office area is about 900 sf. It is in the westerly building, Building #1. (Indicated)

They are providing 14 parking spaces for employees and clients.

Showed an elevation of a typical building being built all over the state.

He noted the proposed greenspace on the plan. He pointed out Buildings 1, 2 & 3, the office area and related parking.

We received wetlands approval and special permit approval.

Sidewalks are proposed along the frontage.

Lighting is full cutoff fixtures, LED lighting.

Appropriate landscaping and buffers are shown on the plans. The drainage system meets ZIRO, provides groundwater recharge, removing silt and pollutants via deep sumps, riprap aprons, stone dams, grass

swales, forebays and micro pools which are low impact development features that are incorporated into the plan. He noted the detention area and the drainage flow.

The SPU required a vinyl fence to be installed and it is shown on the plans. (Indicated location) Chain link fence will be in front for the gates.

All appropriate E & S controls and details are on the plans.

Notes call for a meeting with staff before starting construction to make sure all are in place.

We received comments from staff and all were responded to in writing. As to the request for a stop sign at this location (indicating) it is indicated on the plan with a stop bar.

The Chair brought up the fire department issues outstanding. The Town Planner said they have been resolved and there may be a couple of small nickel & dime issues to resolve. If you move to approve, my recommendation would be you stipulate that the fire department is satisfied with the final plan.

Discussion.

The Chestnut tree we are not even close to as noted in the previous meeting.

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve with the aforementioned stipulation. Mr. Cabata seconded. Motion passed 5 to 2 with Mr. Hammersley and Ms. Scalise opposed.

G. 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 December 5

The Town Planner explained he has not heard at all from the applicant regarding the issue with the building permit. They're under extension and are good until February. We recommend a table.

The applicant is not present and the Chair asked why we would table this? I'm concerned no one is here to represent the application. And, we are asking for a table?

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked for staff to get back to the applicant and let them know we are going to make a decision at the next meeting.

Mr. Hammersley mentioned that the onus is on the applicant to make sure they follow through with what they put before us. For us to sit here three, four or five times --- we can just keep on going or we can decide to do something about it and then it is on them again.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Hammersley opposed.

H. Request for approval under Section 8-24 for the South End Pump Station (MR A#571)

James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer, presented. He noted the following points:

- The Town maintains ten pump stations in town.
- The South End Pump Station is at the intersection of South End Road the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike.
- The pump station is located on McDonald's property. We do not own the property but we have a permanent easement the town acquired a number of years ago. We do not own the land in fee.
- We've acquired from them a temporary easement which is outside the 40 by 40 permanent easement area.
- Within the 13 by 10 building, there is a generator, existing electrical components, electrical panel, HVAC controls and the entrance tube that the crew goes down to inspect and maintain pumps.
- The key drivers for the project:
 - The pump station was constructed in 1973 and is mostly all original parts. The main focus of the project is to replace aging equipment.
 - To increase efficiency, resiliency and reliability of pumps, electrical controls and the stand by generator which is currently in the existing building.
 - It's predominantly located in a residential area but there is mixed business and commercial use that flow to this pump station.
 - The steel can is an underground structure that was built in 1973 and that structure --- we are able to save a little money as we had that can evaluated. It is structural steel. Almost half an inch thick all the way around. We hired Corrosion Probe to evaluate whether or not corrosion is happening on that steel can. We are able to save some money on that.
- = The project cost and schedule:

We are requesting \$900,000 for the total project which is made up of \$785,000 for construction including contingency (about 20%). We have received a proposal from Tighe & Bond for resident inspection and review of shop drawings for the project at \$90,000. The bonding costs are estimated at \$25,000.

- This has gone through Board of Finance. It was introduced to the Council last month. If we get a favorable 8-24 recommendation, Monday will be a public hearing before the Council. We anticipate bidding in January of 2018 with a bid opening in mid-February. Award by the end of March for April construction. It'll take approximately a little over a year.

This is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to send back a favorable 8-24 to the Council. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

I. Ridgeview Village, LLC, request for reapproval of site plan for 60 units originally approved on February 3, 2004, 1985 West Street, in a B zone (SPR #1360.3)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented along with Attorney Richard Case.

This is a condominium project, over 55 community, approved years ago. The new sixty units look similar to these units in terms of size and quality. (Showed plans on the screen.)

It is at 1985 West Street across from the recently built Cumberland Farms with the traffic signal (indicating).

The original approval was 60 units. There are 60 units left to be built in these four buildings (indicating).

The cul de sac is in place. There is an existing building right here that uses the cul de sac now. The entire system of roadway, drainage and sewer, all power, is in place.

Along the southerly boundary there is an MUT zone that was changed from Industrial. (Indicating.)

There is a proposed planted buffer of 20' along this side (indicating).

We received staff comments. We feel that none are a problem for us to address. We sent a response sheet this afternoon and we will be working to implement the recommendations and resubmit plans for the next meeting.

Mr. Chaplinsky indicated his biggest concern on this is it is a B zone. It was approved quite some time ago. And, since then, we've had some development down in that area and it's a pretty valuable

piece down there. Albeit I see there is an existing facility there. There's been issues with the facility with the neighbors and stuff for years.

From my perspective, this is a B zone. We're giving up a lot of opportunity for commercial use for the over 55 community. Residential. It doesn't matter if it is age restricted, or not.

The fact that we're allowing residential in a B zone on this, I personally wouldn't want to see it continued to be honest with you. I think there is a better use for it.

Mr. Bovino said it is enclosed by residential use at this point. You have a roadway that services the community but this building is already in place. Business use of parcels we left in place are along West Street which eventually will be developed as business.

This location here (indicating) I don't think you want to bring business inside that property.

Attorney Case referred to the plans. There are two parcels, one to the north of the road that services the facility and one to the south. There is a plan to go to a use of the property to the north which will be business. The buildings not yet constructed inside that cul de sac area --- one reason for the delay is the market collapsed in 2008 and 11 of the buildings have already been built. Forty-two of the units have been sold. Explained.

Litigation with the homeowner's association has been resolved. Explained the upper loop will be done in the Spring. And, then the balance will be done as soon as the four buildings are constructed.

The Special Permit was issued for the residential use of this property 14 years ago.

Mr. Chaplinsky felt it would've been much better used as business. It was a long time ago.

Mr. Phillips said there are a number of staff comments. The applicant knows. We'd rather not condition an approval on 27 steps.

Ms. Clock made a motion to table. Mr. Hammersley seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Chaplinsky opposed.

Mr. Cabata advised he needed to be recused from Items J & K and left the dais.

J. Southington-Cheshire Community YMCA, request for 5-year extension of site plan, 1000 East Street (SPR #1630).

Mr. Phillips explained the earth excavation permit expired and the site plan is joined to it. As I understand there has been a delay to dredge the water body. It might be due to the USACE review which takes forever. We need to extend them.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion for a 5-year extension. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

K. Southington-Cheshire Community YMCA, request for extension of earth excavation approval, 1000 East Street (EE #141).

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to extend the earth excavation approval for 2-years. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Cabata resumed his seat at the dais.

L. Carpenter Realty Co., request for release of \$20,000 performance bond, Lots 5 and 6, Triano Drive (S #1211.3)

Ready for action. Mr. Cabata made a motion to approve. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. REAPPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO CRCOG

Ted Cabata has volunteered and accepted the reappointment. Next meeting is the end of January.

8. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Mr. Phillips explained a proposal for a repackaging building at the Supreme Industries at DePaolo Drive. Basically, it's within the footprint of the previously approved organic waste to energy plant. It is going to basically bring about an interior closed piece of the operation so the potential odor transmission from this facility is going to actually be even better contained.

I find it to be very minor and I was hoping the commission would see it as an administrative approval. The Chair agreed to let staff take care of it and go forward.

9. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- Maryellen Nilson, Allison and David D'Urbano, Special permit application for parent/grandparent apartment, property owned by

AA Denorfia Bldg & Dev. LLC, located at 129 Aspen Way, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU A#591) January 16

And, we do have tonight's continuation of the public hearing for Wonk Road Partnership.

10. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

- The depackaging building just reviewed.
- Gary Eucalito for a site plan for a retail building at 2091 West Street. B zone.

The Chair welcomed Dagmara Scalise. I rushed it a little, but some accolades for Jim Sinclair. He served on this board for a long time and his comments are always right on and he looks out for the people of Southington and I wish him the best of luck in his newest endeavor with the Police Commission. I'm sure he'll do very well over there as well as he did here.

11. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 11:07 o'clock, p.m.)