

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

JANUARY 16, 2018

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 16, 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	Dagmara Scalise
Robert Hammersley	Jennifer Clock
Susan Locks	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Joe Coviello & Peter Santago

Ex-Officio: Robert Phillips, Director of Planning &
Community Development
James Grappone, Assistant Town Engineer

Absent: James Morelli, Commissioner
Ted Cabata & Ross Hart, Alternates

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

The Chair seated Mr. Santago 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 January 2, 2018

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

Before starting the public hearings, taking an informal poll, Mr. Phillips asked how many people in the audience responded to any public hearing on the agenda via newspaper legal notice?

(Not much response)

Most said via website.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 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 #591).

Attorney Andrew Denorfia, AA Denorfia Bldg & Dev. LLC, represented the applicants. This is for permission to build a parent/grandparent apartment at 129 Aspen Way. The apartment will be occupied by Maryellen Nilson who is the mother of Allison D'Urbano.

The apartment area will be 671 sf and located on the first floor of the home. As the plan shows, the apartment has an open floor plan and consists of a kitchen, living room, one bedroom, a walk-in closet and a full bathroom.

The application does meet all of the other requirements in the zoning section, 11-22 and the applicants have submitted the required affidavit.

Allison D'Urbano is here if there are any questions.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None

(Those speaking against the application)

None.

Mr. Phillips confirmed the applicants met the regulations and there is an affidavit on file. If you are going to approve, the standard stipulations 10 thru 13 should be noted on Sheet 1 of the application.

(The Chair closed this public hearing item.)

B. 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) APPLICANT HAS REQUESTED A CONTINUANCE TO THE PUBLIC HEARING OF FEBRUARY 6TH.

The Chair advised the applicant has requested a continuance of the public hearing until February 6th. There will be no presentation tonight from the applicant. Public will still be allowed to speak for or against. New information, only. Anyone who spoke at the last public hearing, all of your comments are part of the record.

The Minutes are presented summary style and you can refer to the video on line for the full commentary.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against the application)

1. Kathy LaForest, Wonx Spring Road. She wondered if the town has sought out more testing of this land. The last time it was tested was in 2010. After some research she did she wondered about contaminated wells

located off site. Are there any testing results recorded to the town or the state?

Discussion.

She is concerned as her sump pump is just starting again and she gets water in her basement as the water table is up. I like to know what is in the water. She had her water tested prior to digging.

She's concerned about digging down on the ELUR portion of the property because of Allied Control being there previously.

Discussion.

She wants answers from the town. She voted a vernal pool behind a house on Roxbury Road that is not being recognized besides the vernal pool behind our house in the woods.

I would like the town to consider further testing for groundwater, not the soil. We were told there is still quite a bit of contamination left there. With remediation, you can only get rid of so much.

Discussion.

2. Stephanie Plaza, 68 Hunters Lane, Lot #6. She spoke having been misled when purchasing this property. We're devastated to hear about this project. In addition to that, if this project were to continue there are several regulations that would be violated.

She quoted Section 10 regarding a PUD, Section 10-01.

She quoted Section 10 regarding a PUD, Section 10-03.

Forty rental units will tremendously increase traffic flow which will impact the safety of the children.

For over a year, we have unfinished streets and sidewalks. Our mailbox is still at the end of the street. We have no streetlights. Why would we add properties to this neighborhood when our street and homes are not completed?

I hope you understand our position. Had we been told the truth and no misled in making this purchase, we definitely would have made a different decision.

I beg you to not allow this project to happen.

(3) Alexa Bandurski, 61 Hunters Lane, Lot 15. I feel sad and taken advantage of. This development was advertised as 19 single family homes on a cul de sac. If rental apartments were built off our road, behind our home, this is a complete misrepresentation of what we purchased.

We were told no one could build behind us because of the protective wetlands.

If this is approved, my husband and I will be forced to sell our home and start over. Take into consideration the young hardworking families on Hunters Lane when making your decision.

If they were to build single family homes, I wouldn't be as upset about it. But apartments, that's not what I wanted for my future children. I wanted a place for them to play and not worry about traffic.

(4) Andrew Bandurski, 61 Hunters Lane. Two questions:

(1) How many single-family homes can be built on that property?

(2) Would the traffic study you are conducting be able to look at the difference between the proposed apartment complex and the proposed or estimated number of homes on the street and show what would be best for that neighborhood?

(5) Pat Lenz, 190 Wonx Spring Road. She questioned the traffic study results.

She noted some people over the age of 55 are still working and not retired as was noted in the public hearing.

Discussion.

What is the impact of the volume of cars on the development?

Will there be an age limit on minor children who are in custody of the grandparents? Will they be allowed to live at this 55 and older complex?

Discussion.

There is an impact on the school system and the volume of traffic going in/out.

Will government money be used to help build this complex? If so, how many units will be set aside for Section VIII individuals with either physical or mental disabilities? I'm ask just for the number of traffic trips that will bring in. Disability vans and all that.

I'm still trying to figure out what exactly is going on here and I would like some disclosure by the company on these questions.

(6) Kristen Keska, 149 Wonx Spring Road.

Questions for the next meeting on February 6th:

- Has there been a request for a traffic study? The Chair said the matter was continued as the town procured someone to do a peer review of the traffic analysis.

- Questions asked, are they going to be answered during the public hearing or during the business portion of the meeting? The Chair said they would be answered during the public hearing portion of the meeting.

- As to the sidewalks, are they planned to be just in the neighborhood or the whole length of the driveway going up to Hunter's Lane.

- The number of single family homes vs the proposed special permit.

If we want to see the peer review of the traffic study beforehand, what should we do? Mr. Phillips said there is no specific deadline. Once I have the review, I would distribute to the commission. I recommend checking in with our office at the end of next week.

- Whether or not this is restricted? Can the commission limit with certain restrictions on this rental property to make sure?

The Chair stated typically with these types of housing, the rule of thumb is no one under the age of 18 is allowed to live there. But we'll get that answered for you. There is an applicant representative here who is taking down these questions and at the next meeting, the public hearing should open with answers to these questions and you can stand up and ask clarification questions.

I still say I support no special permit and support keeping it the way it is which is single family housing units. I look forward to the answer to those questions next time.

(7) Michael Scott, 125 Roxbury Road. Submitted a picture of his backyard where there is 2' of standing water as of Saturday. With what they're proposing, the water will flow back into my backyard so I'm curious to see how they will remediate that. (Handed in picture for the record)

Hearing no further speakers, the Chair kept the public hearing open and continued it to the February 6th meeting. There will be no action taken on this application at the regular business meeting.

Continued to February 6th, 2018.

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. 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 #591).

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action with the standard stipulations.

Mr. Hammersley made a motion for approval with the stipulations.

- Either the accessory apartment or the main unit shall be owner occupied.

- The parent/grandparent apartment permits are nontransferable and terminate upon the sale of the property or the death of a parent or grandparent for whom the apartment was permitted.

- The parent/grandparent apartment shall never be offered for rent.

- The commission shall have the power to revoke any special permit granted under this section in terms of any condition not being complied with.

Those are to be entered on the approved application.

Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Wonx 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) tabled from January 2nd.

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

C. Midland Retail, modification of special permit approval to construct multiple buildings on a lot for a proposed 46,211 sf 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 Street LLC; Lot 27,32 - West Queen Developers, LLC; Lot 28,29,33,34 - John Senese; Lot 31-Dana Dipietro; Lot 35 - Trinco Corp., in a B zone (SPU #564.1) tabled from January 2nd

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

Since the last meeting, we've submitted revised plans addressing staff comments from planning and engineering. There were a couple of items you had questioned and we have some answers.

As to the compressors location, it is located inside the building as shown on the floor plan.

Concern about used tires being placed in the dumpster enclosure, they said it would not be a problem at all to keep those tires inside the building. They will find a spot for them that's out of the way.

The question about the driver's ed classes, they indicated that they only teach classroom instruction in the building. All on road instruction is done from the student's residence. The instructor picks up the student at the residence and drops them off.

We did exchange some additional correspondence with the town staff today. We are looking to remove the 10 parking spaces that were shown on the site plan on the righthand side of the drive aisle. Right now, we are proposing 333 spaces and with the 10, it would knock it down to 323 spaces. We adjusted the parking ratio based on the new amended zoning criteria for our building.

Discussion.

Lastly, I have a copy of the OSTA certificate. (Submitted)

There was a question about future access connection. The condition of approval for OSTA, #14, notes that internal connections between site property and adjacent properties be allowed and not precluded subject to an agreement by the owners and no future access to the site property from any adjacent properties be established without review and/or approval by OSTA.

Discussion.

Ms. Scalise asked if the increased traffic we are seeing now thru the new businesses, is that going to force people to do a cut around through the residential neighborhood. Mr. Phillips said there is no impact to the residential roadways as far as traffic concerns.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action with stipulations:

- Final revised plans to be approved by the Fire Marshal's Office.
- Remove the 10 spaces to the east of the access drive along the property line.
- Provide required easements to the east and south, understanding that they may move as necessary when abutting properties are developed.
- Modify the OSTA Certificate as necessary.

Mr. Grappone had one comment/question and stipulations.

The comment is the 7' high fence along with the berm, there will be a portion that they do not have enough room to install a berm. It's my understanding that is in an immediate parking area that would affect the neighborhood? Mr. Schmidt said that is in the area directly to the rear of the building where there is the driveway and there is no parking along that section of the fence.

Question with respect to floor drains: The floor plan submitted, does not show interior floor drains. Is that because the plumbing plan wasn't developed? Mr. Schmidt said that was correct and he would get a copy of the plumbing plan. We will be submitted to DEEP for our permit.

Stipulation:

- Final engineering approval of the drainage.
- The underground storage system shop drawing to be submitted to the town engineer for final approval.

Mr. Phillips noted in the construction sequence, the installation of a privacy fence is high on the list and I want to make sure the applicant is aware that we are going to be looking for that very quickly. The neighbors are impacted by this development. Especially at this point as it is all opened up over there.

Discussion of when it would be done. Mr. Schmidt said that it is not an issue to install that first. They would be looking to start in April.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up the issue of shielding the neighbor to the southwest. The house along Queen Street and Chaffee Lane. What are the plans for insuring that that house doesn't get impacted by lights, cars, et cetera.

Also, there was a discussion about sewers and having them looked at and analyzed as part of the process. Is there a stipulation on that?

Mr. Schmidt said the ZBA put a stipulation that the fence comes along Chaffee and run along the property line. There is a fence there now which is owned by the property owner. We'll be putting a new fence along the line, 7' fence that will run along the east side and north side of that property. Also, there will be landscaping around that fence on our side of the fence.

Mr. Grappone added the applicant has agreed to a precondition video of the sewer line. With that, we'll submit it for review and approval. If we

see any open joints for any malfunctioning of the sanitary sewer, we will impose that correction on the developer.

One other thing which was part of our checklist and I'm not sure if you want to stipulate anything on it:

- Construction activity access would be off the common driveway. I don't know if you want to stipulate no parking, no construction vehicles on Chafee or any of those neighborhood streets.

The Chair said it has to be on site. Absolutely. Mr. Schmidt agreed.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with staff's stipulations including the sewer recommendation stipulation and the no parking in the residential neighborhood.

I'd also like to add the stipulations that we put easements on the record for the east and south side of the property to staff's approval.

Mr. Phillips said it is being attached to the special permit.

After a few minutes, no second. Motion fails.

Mr. Santago said he was frustrated. There meetings ago I thought we were done on this plaza. Now they come back again and say they want a change. How many more times are they going to come back for a change? I have a hard time with it. Just a statement.

Discussion.

The Chair reminded everyone that this is a business zone. No matter what goes there, it will come back before us. I understand what you're saying about the neighbors but the neighbors are going to be there.

Ms. Scalise commented she felt uncomfortable moving forward given she had limited exposure to this particular back and forth. I do have to say from an overall what types of businesses are going in there I would think noise might be an issue with the garage. Thinking about other facets of the whole development. I understand the developer is here and it is a business area but I do feel like being thoughtful about the kind of direction we want to go in. The office part feels right but I am concerned about the garage, the noise. The back and forth with the waste. In looking at other businesses on the street and how many car repair shops we have, that's a point of consideration.

Mr. Phillips advised the location approval of the garage, by regulation had to be approved the ZBA and it was. The area was subject to an overlay zone addition. A long history here. In a perfect world the whole is would be bought out and redeveloped. The reality is in 50 years from now it is probably not going to be residential but we are in the position we are in now which is it can't be bought out completely and there are people living there. A tough spot.

Discussion of this being a tough, emotional decision for all being led by Mr. Chaplinsky. We have an opportunity to use this as an opportunity to shape something we want to see there. If you don't want to see this type of use there, there could be a lot of other business uses that could go there that may be more intrusive or less intrusive. I thought they did a good job

of putting forward plans to try to mitigate. It is indoor work. Professional office. It's moving a professional office from a neighboring town and bringing jobs here. I do think there is going to be future development in this area.

The Chair added: It is going to be developed. Prime real estate. Most heavily travelled road in town. Something is going to go there. Is it going to be a Ruby Tuesday's? Open until 10:00, 11:00 or 12:00 midnight or 1:00 am? Twice, three, five times the amount of cars?

A Sonic or In and Out Burger with a drive thru? It is going to be developed.

Mr. Hammersley took exception to the comments Mr. Phillips just made. He's offering an opinion and he is not a member of the board. He's a professional staff and he's here to give us facts.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley made a motion to table. Ms. Scalise seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

D. Midland Retail, site plan modification to construct a proposed 46,211 sf 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 - Est 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 (SPUR #1716.3) tabled from January 2nd

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to table. Ms. Scalise 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 January 2nd

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville. I'm here tonight with David Forgione, Jr.

This application is a site plan modification. This plan had been previously approved by you about a year ago. We had come before you originally with a different plan.

He apologized because at the last meeting he left and forgot this was on the agenda. I apologize and thank you for letting me speak about this before you tonight.

He showed the approved site plan about a year ago. It is for an 11,000-sf building with associated parking. There's a lot going on on this property. We saw an opportunity to introduce some formalized parking, landscaping, green grass areas, structures, and so on. Staff reviewed the plan, gave their blessings and the PZC did approve this plan.

In talking to the perspective user of the property, we decided to come back with a revised plan rotating the building and reducing some of the parking depending on the proposed user.

This is the application that was submitted with the site plan modification. We did receive staff comments and we addressed 99.9 percent of those comments. However, the issue of a hoop structure --- originally, I assumed it was the structure in the lower right corner of the property, but it is actually the structure on a separate property under a separate ownership that has become the crux of the application.

I'm here to put it before you. We would like to move forward with this application modification and not hold it up based on the structure on the adjacent property. That's my understanding of the application.

Mr. Phillips advised he has been in contact with one of the owners or managers. They've been informed many times to resolve this with the building department. To-date it just doesn't seem to happen.

The structure is on the other side of the river but by previous site plan approval, it is considered one site. It is an issue. You shouldn't be approving anything that has a building or zoning violation on it. That's the policy. We're kind of at an impasse at this point in time. Nothing has happened. I don't understand what the problem is.

Mr. Giudice said there has been conversations with the building department. The building inspector is informing the applicant, I've been told, that he doesn't think he could issue a building permit for that structure. Mr. Phillips added they haven't gotten the information they need.

Mr. Giudice stated the issue is with the manufacturer. We're stuck.

The Chair asked if it would make sense to withdraw this application, take care of the violation and then come back? Mr. Phillips said this is good until February 20th.

Mr. Giudice said if he wanted to build the original site plan that was already approved by this commission, he would be permitted to construct it. The Chair confirmed there is a policy that we can't approve something with a zoning violation on it. Mr. Giudice disagreed. He didn't think there was a zoning violation on this parcel. The PZC has approved a site plan for this parcel. The Chair said we have to take the word of staff. Mr. Phillips commented we may not have been aware of that when it was approved originally. We know now. Frankly, we were working on this issue before this modification came in.

In response to a query by the Chair, Mr. Giudice didn't think this would be resolved by the next meeting. The issue is the new structure has been up for about three to four years. It was done by Dave's father who is not as involved in the operation of the business now and Dave has been trying to pick up the pieces. He contacted the manufacturer and they have been no help in this process. He has been told now he needs to hire a structural engineer to provide plans or statements as to the capacity of the snow load for this structure. That's where we're at right now.

The Chair asked for the applicant to come up and speak to it.

David Forgione, 66 Mount Vernon Road, Plantsville. The hoop structure was constructed I believe four years ago. My father contacted a company and they came from Iowa. They were in and out in about a week. They had all the proper paperwork, so we thought, from what they said and everything was being handled as far as permits and all that and engineering. We didn't think anything of it.

Four years went by and we went to try to get this approved and it came to a head and now I'm scrambling to get ahold of this company and they haven't been much help at all. He got me some paperwork and I dropped it at the planning & zoning department. We heard nothing. Months went by and this came to a head again and I called and spoke with Rob and John Smigel. I thought that's what they wanted for paperwork.

It had the engineer's stamp and all the wind loads, snow loads and all that. We thought they'd let us know about the permits and move forward.

The Chair summarized that the information that was asked for by the town was provided? Mr. Forgione said he thought it was.

I talked with staff recently, Rob & John a few days ago. John said I needed to get a few more things and I'm working on it. Hard trying to get a hold of this company. They're out of Iowa.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if they really have to have the company built the company or can you have a professional structural engineer do some sort of analysis to get what needs to be done? Can the applicant work with somebody else locally? Mr. Phillips said he didn't know the building code but the building department is looking for the information to be able to issue a building permit, do the inspections and issue a CO or whatever for that.

Explained.

We will get something in writing from the building department as to what they need.

Discussion about the company in Iowa between the Chair and Mr. Forgione.

Mr. Grappone said the issue might be that it's an Ohio engineer that's designed this and the regulations and building codes are different there than in Connecticut. Maybe a Connecticut PE has to review that and come up with a way to stiffen the structure so the Connecticut codes will be abided by. What was submitted to John was not by a Connecticut PE is my guess. But we can get a list from John of what he's looking for.

Mr. Phillips advised a sit-down meeting is in order with the applicant and the building inspector and him. We'll figure out what we need to do and I recommend a motion to table.

Mr. Giudice requested a table. If we can't get this resolved, we will withdraw the application.

Mr. Hammersley made a motion to table to the next meeting. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Ridgeview Village, LLC, request for reapproval of site plan for 60 units originally approved on February 3, 2004, 1985 West Street, in a Bo Zone (SPR #1360.3) tabled from January 2nd

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates representing the applicant. This application was before you at the last meeting. The proposal is to allow this project to be completed, the last four buildings on this project.

There was a tabling of this to allow the staff to review the maps that were revised to address the comments. I believe staff has done so and it is ready for action.

I'll answer any questions at this time.

Mr. Phillips advised it is ready for action. Staff has no suggested stipulations.

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve. Ms. Scalise seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky hoped if this goes forward, we had quite a bit of hoopla with this development and the neighbors and I hope that things go a little bit more smoothly than they did the first time around. I think we are still kind of dealing with it.

Mr. Bovino advised the portion of this project we are talking about is on the southerly side and has nothing to do with that. Mr. Chaplinsky said he understood.

Mr. Hammersley said just because of the location on this, I will be voting "no". I'm concerned as it is West Street.

Motion passed 5 to 2 on a roll call vote with Mr. Hammersley and Mr. Chaplinsky opposed.

F. Gary Eucalitto, site plan application for a proposed 7,510 sf retail building with 24 paved parking spaces. Development also includes concrete sidewalks, storm water management system, utility connections, LED site lighting and landscaping, property owned by David Dellavecchia, located at 2091 West Street, In a B zone (SPR #1743)

Matt Bruton, engineer with BL Companies gave a brief overview of the project and answer any questions you may have.

It's a 1.15-acre parcel in a B zone. On site there is a residential home and a vacant concrete building. Topography for the site is relatively flat (238 to 231). There are wetlands presently on site. (Indicating)

We received wetland commission approval in December. This site also sits in FEMA Zone X which is a minimal flood hazard area above the 500-year flood level.

The proposed project is a 7500-sf single family story retail building. And, we have 24 paved parking spaces. He pointed out the main entrance, handicapped spaces, dumpster and loading area and single access to West Street which needs to be approved by DOT.

We have utility connections available: sanitary, gas, water, electric and telephone.

He described the storm water management.

Erosion and Sedimentation Controls were explained.

A storm water management report has been provided with maintenance stipulations for after construction (snow removal, landscaping, cleaning of the system).

Landscaping was described.

The wetland is untouched and all development is in the upland review area.

Elevations were shown and described.

We comply with setback and parking.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if you could make it more colonial looking. Peaked roofs, for example. Mr. Bruton will get back to the architect on that.

Sight lines and setbacks were discussed. However, this will be submitted to DOT.

Traffic was discussed.

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

G. Napoli Associates, reduction of E & S bond from \$10,000 to a new amount of \$2,500, 12 and 30 Knotter Drive (SPR #1688)

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

H. Napoli Associates, release of \$23,000 Public Improvement bond, 12 and 30 Knotter Drive, SPR #1688)

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

I. Mariani Construction, LLC release of \$3,300 E & S bond, 2168 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike (SPR #1565)

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

J. Mariani Construction, LLC, release of \$4,800 Public Improvement bond, 2168 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike (SPR #1565)

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

8. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Jennifer Clock gave an update on a project that she has worked on. Before that, for the new people that have just joined, she gave an answer to the question most asked: Why do you do? She then explained and gave a historical timeline on how she came to Chair the POCD Committee.

She stated she always wanted to be a part of the progressive history of Southington and she is because of that Chairmanship. Please review the document as it is a great document. It's on line.

Out of that I got a call from Dave Donnelly who helps Southington write grants and we actually received a grant to update our historical inventory which is parcel addresses we have in Southington. This is buildings and properties. Our last historic inventory updated was thirty years ago. Very outdated.

Rob Phillips was another facilitator along with an outside vendor we used, as well. Through this grant we only had a hard copy from 1986. We created in excel a historic resource database listing all of the historic resources from 1986. We conducted research using tax assessor data to determine how many resources surveyed have since been demolished. Using a map of existing resources created by the town's GIS consultant we evaluated resources that were never listed.

Then during our update, per me, Dave and Rob our specific request according to the POCD it looked at town open space adjacent to historic resources to identify visual and historical connections between historic buildings and open space that may be important to the town's heritage and identity.

They also evaluated the survey and updated the results according to the POCD. And, the number of older residents that is expected to grow significantly and will be a factor in our future which we have discussed.

This is important to our town:

- So that we can qualify to be on the Register and
- To deem qualified for any tax incentive programs.

Once you qualify to be in the National Registry, which Southington now has 34 properties thanks to this study, then they qualify for tax exemptions and incentives.

It is important that people know the heart and the time that goes into preserving our history. When we did the POCD, that was one of the main concerns of the citizens that came. They wanted the historic preservation of this town to be highlighted. I'm so proud that I was able to be a part of it.

She passed around copies of the History of Southington. I was able to meet with Phil Wooding who, if you have never met this person, he is an amazing man and he runs the Southington Historical Society. If you ever have time to sit with him for an hour, you will learn more than you've ever learned in your history class your entire school career.

The Chair noted this is so important because we've lost so many people over the last 10, 15, 20 years. Ken DiMauro who know everything about Southington is no longer with us. We have Art Secondo who is constantly giving us the history of the town. It is so great to see someone who is younger and up and coming in the town and it is just as important as those folks were to try to grasp some of the history. We thank you, Jen. Please keep doing what you are doing. Any help you need from me and others on the board are all willing to give you a hand.

Mr. Santago asked if when she started this she discovered some that people had no idea about? Ms. Clock said a lot were the same. It was really the removing --- Rob has the binder and the list is extensive. Just updating and removing things that had been demolished.

Without this update, we don't know what is important. To be on the National Registry you have to clear certain qualifications.

When the property is on the Registry, is there a plaque for something that designates it? Something tangible for people to see? Mr. Phillips said the properties are either on the Registry, an informal kind of club, or there are properties that could be subject to the Registry or have some historical significance. We have the list and look at the proposals that come forward and the commission and applicant can consider. It's kind of open. There is no requirement for plaque.

Discussion.

Ms. Clock commented linking the open space to the historic properties so that when we are looking at open space and advertising for open space, one day I hope it would be, oh, here is the historic trail and move through it. It is so important to Southington. A prime example is just driving down Main Street, the YMCA. The Olmey House almost came down. But it didn't, because they couldn't.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if she looked at the regulations and are they adequate enough to protect these properties? Are there enough fail safes in our processes for development to insure there is a checks and balances so nobody can knock one of these down unless this commission approves it or there are some mechanisms in place. Ms. Clock said that is one of the suggestions of the POCD. Take historic content of properties into consideration.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky discussed a historical checklist as part of our requirements to see if it is now on this list. If it is on that list, there has to be some sort of protections. May two-thirds majority, super majority or 7 to 0. Maybe a secondary approval process by council. We should look at updating our regulations or ordinances to insure some of these are protected for future generations.

Ms. Clock thanked Rob, too. Much time put into it.

- Mr. Chaplinsky updated open space. Dawn Miceli is the Chair of the open space committee. At our first meeting we are going through the process of defining what it is the open space committee is. How they want to define themselves.

The one item I wanted to raise is that I asked for a suggestion to have the open space committee look at some of the updated zoning regulations that we have, i.e.: subdivisions. And, talk about open space in subdivisions and open space type subdivisions.

Do they have any guidance to us or do they have any suggestions to give to us or that the conservation commission wants to give to us when we are considering subdivision review and preserving open space?

Would they prefer to see clusters of open space for wildlife corridors, buffers for residential neighbors, conservation easements, set aside chunks of parcels in a subdivision and make it passive/active open space for that community. Sometimes it is deeded to the town although we try to move away from that.

I thought it would be good to hear from another board in town. Open space is kind of a hot topic. Everybody talks about it. It's good to get the perspective of other officials in town as to what they think open space means especially when it comes to development and this board's purview.

Mr. Santago brought up the budget. It's going to get tight. In the past we might've said let's go buy the open space because it's good for the town. When you are pinching pennies it is going to be a tough thing to go and do. Unfortunately. Justify that to the taxpayers when we are in a budget crunch.

We have to be creative with open space to preserve it as the money may not be there, unfortunately. Good we're carrying this forward and open discussion about open space is a good thing.

9. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

None.

10. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

None.

11. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion carries unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:43 o'clock, p.m.)

