

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

NOVEMBER 6, 2018

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 6, 2018 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DelSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

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

Alternates: Peter Santago & Joe Coviello

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

(Note: Resignation received from Alternate Ross Hart due to his employment.)

Absent: Ted Cabata, Alternate Commissioner

A quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

4. MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting of October 16, 2018

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

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Jeffrey Zarella, special permit application for a garage in excess of 3 spaces, 1134 Woodruff Street, property of Carla V. Mongillo, in an R-40 zone (SPU #615)

Stephen Giudice, Harry E. Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted the applicant, Jeffrey Zarella, was present as well.

Mr. Morelli recused himself for this application. Mr. Coviello recused himself from the applicant. Both left the dais.

The Chair seated Mr. Santago for this matter.

Mr. Giudice stated the proposal was for a 24 by 35-foot garage off the rear of the property. Our setbacks meet the requirements for an accessory garage use. We are 10 feet off the property line and approximately 18 feet off the existing house. There is a well there we have to contend with. This is an R-40 zone. The lot is plenty big enough for what we are proposing. There is an existing 2-car garage now. Although the proposed is a 2-car garage, we are proposing one garage door. (Showed the proposed garage plan.) It would match the existing house. The garage door will match the existing. We are trying to make this conform and look consistent with the house constructed.

There is no businesses or anything associated with this use. It's just a decent sized family would like to park more of their vehicles inside, if possible.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

Mr. Phillips reminded the commission of the usual no business stipulation.

The Chair closed this public hearing and moved into the next public hearing.

B. Megan Guelakis Spahic, home occupation application for Cottage Food Operation 760 Johnson Avenue, in an R-40 zone (HO #70)

Ms. Spahic, 760 Johnson Avenue, Southington. I'm here to get approved to do a home bakery, Food Cottage Operation. I specialize in cookies, especially sugar cookies with royal icing frosting. They're custom made so people give me a theme and I go with it.

This is being operated in the applicant's home. I am a full-time teacher and I do this as a part time hobby. I love to bake. People will be ordering with me via the internet, Facebook, email, Instagram and then they come to my house to pick them up. Special orders. No showcase or anything letting you come and shop. They place an order and we'll set a date and time for them to come and pick them up.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted this is a new regulation and how did the applicant hear about the process. The applicant said as someone who loves baking, we've been waiting for this to be approved for a long time in Connecticut. Finally, on October 1st it happened. I went with it.

I debated on working out of a bakery, but I didn't have the time. I thought going after this and I talked to many people in the town hall trying to figure out where to go and finally I figured out what to do and here I am.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

C. Michael A. Pepe, home occupation application for online sales of firearms, 236 Spring Lake Road, in an R-20/25 zone (HO #71)

Michael A. Pepe, applicant, of 236 Spring Lake Road presented. It is not just firearms. It is going to be sporting goods, camping equipment and it's going to be all on line. They will drop ship from my wholesaler without me even touching the product. I take the order in on my website, it goes to my wholesaler and they drop ship for me. Like sporting goods and manufacturing a little. I have a little CNC machine the size of a microwave to make parts. It doesn't make any noise. It runs off the computer.

Drop ship was explained. The product goes directly to the customer after he places the order.

The applicant will be making some small parts for firearms with my CNC machine. It is just a little CNC machine. The parts for the firearms could be lullers, it could bolt actions. They're all custom. Just gun parts. Period. No manufacturing of weapons inside the home.

I will ship the firearm parts. I will have my own line once I get established. They will be labeled as my company's parts and they will go out UPS.

A CNC (computer numerical controlled) machine was described as being programmed off a computer. It has drills. It machines aluminum, aircraft aluminum. I just plug in a thumb drive to the computer and I hit the start button and the machine takes off by itself. It doesn't make more noise than a washing machine.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley referred to a letter by the applicant and asked in the last paragraph, who advised you and how was it done, verbally or written. Do you anticipate being given this approval by ATF. The applicant answered the ATF is holding my paperwork. I have to be approved by the town first before I get my FFL. That's the process.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the capacity of the CNC machine. In a day, what would be the maximum number of parts you could make? Mr. Pepe responded two or three. Those manufactured parts will be shipped out UPS to my customers.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about shipping of materials to the applicant's home. Mr. Pepe said there would be no traffic, no signs. It's going to be like we're just living there.

Mr. Santago asked about the metal scraps. Mr. Pepe would have a barrel for that. All aluminum. I'll bring it to Greene's. Nothing hazardous. No coolant is used as it is fan cooled. No liquids.

Ms. Clock asked what happens after the ATF provides their approval. The applicant said then he would be able to open the business. I will be subject to inspections. It is very regulated.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked Mr. Phillips about the volume trigger for machine parts done with a home occupancy business versus being required to be in a different zone. Explained.

Mr. Phillips said the only stipulations in the regulations that would come close to this is what is listed in the regulations for home occupations. It's general. He handed out a copy of our Section 2-08. There is really no threshold, no trigger that would say this is above and beyond. It is your determination under the special permit process as to whether you find it appropriate and fitting with the HO regulations.

The applicant is not doing this full time. I'm not on my feet a lot.

Ms. Scalise asked what is the sales process going to be. The applicant's daughter is going to build the website for me. I didn't start that yet until I get approved. This is my foundation where I have to start. Once this is approved, I'll get my license from the federal government and then I will proceed with a website. A long process.

She further discussed the customer offerings. The applicant said it is going to be on a camping site. Backpacks and tents. Survival equipment. Then wholesale firearms with dealers, my wholesalers. I don't touch it. They drop ship to another FFL.

The sales process is completely wholesale with no retail involved.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

None.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed the public hearing at this time.

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Jeffrey Zarella, special permit application for a garage in excess of 3 spaces, 1134 Woodruff Street, property of Carla V. Mongillo, in an R-40 zone (SPU #615)

Ready for action with the standard no business use stipulation. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the standard stipulation. Ms. Locks seconded.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The Chair reseated Mr. Morelli at this time. Mr. Coviello resumed the dais, as well.

B. Megan Guelakis Spahic, home occupation application for Cottage Food Operation 760 Johnson Avenue, in an R-40 zone (HO #70)

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Hammersley seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Michael A. Pepe, home occupation application for online sales of firearms, 236 Spring Lake Road, in an R-20/25 zone (HO #71)

Ready for action. Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve. Mr. Chaplinsky seconded.

For discussion, Mr. Chaplinsky noted a previous existing approval a few years ago which was similar. The applicant will have to go through all the state and federal requirements for this business. The only question I have is the manufacturing part and I'm not sure there is not a lot we can stipulate on the manufacturing. At what point, if this balloons to a high-volume business, maybe it is too much of a home use. I am not sure we have a mechanism right now to manage that. I don't personally have an issue with the manufacturing. I'll support it.

Is there something we should put in for a review in a few years from now? Mr. Phillips said if you look at the HO stipulations that are part of the regulations which he enumerated, there is things in here that if there is an issue there, then I think from a zoning enforcement standpoint we can say it isn't in keeping with what the commission reasonably relied upon during the approval process.

Mr. Morelli commented he saw an article that says that in the not too distant future, you'll have a box like that in your house and when you buy a component of something, you will make it yourself. They'll send you a block and the program.

Motion passed 6 to 1 on a roll call vote with Ms. Scalise opposed.

D. B & R Corporation, site plan modification to improve existing gravel access drive and paved apron with new wider crushed stone access drive and paved apron. No building changes are proposed. The access will be limited to deliveries and will not be used by facility staff, 29 DePaolo Drive, property of MW DePaolo Holdings, LLC, in an I-1 zone (SPR #1767)

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to the vide on line to hear the full one-hour presentation on the matter.)

George Andrews with Louriero Engineering Associates presented on behalf of B & R Corporation as the applicant operating as Supreme Forest Products.

We're looking for a site plan modification at 29 DePaolo Drive, currently operating as Economy Spring. And, the current owner of the subject parcel, MD DePaolo Holdings, LLC.

I'll go through a brief introduction to the site, talk a little bit about existing conditions, talk about the proposed modification and then identify the response to comments I distributed this evening in front of you.

He showed an aerial shot of the subject parcel. You can see it is about 7.6 acres. Frontage is along DePaolo Drive. It is right at the cul de sac. (Indicating)

There are two existing buildings. This one (indicating) is about 82,400 sf. There is a smaller building the back (indicating) which is about 2900 sf. The subject parcel has frontage along DePaolo Drive and also has a right of way (ROW) that actually accesses Rte. 229 directly.

The existing ROW is equipped with a gravel access drive, a gate and a paved apron at that location. (Indicating)

The proposed conditions are that we have identified this large building as essentially the principle building. (82,000 sf building)

We are looking at the rear building as a subordinate building. Those terms were selected from your regulations.

We are identifying the frontage consistent with the 1991 site plan that's on file for this parcel. We've identified the frontage on DePaolo Drive.

In summary, what we are looking to do is initiate manufacturing in this building which is currently used as storage and then we'll be providing outdoor storage of raw materials (indicating) and palletized finished product right here (indicating).

We are also proposing to improve the ROW to be able to access this manufacturing area with deliveries and shipments from the site.

We have a traffic report which I've included in the submission.

To describe the manufacturing process, it is an extension of the Supreme Forest Products operation located at 49 DePaolo Drive (indicating). Essentially, they manufacture soil erosion mulch socks. It is a giant sock they fill with mulch and use it for soil erosion protection at construction sites. They are commonly referred to as waddles.

In that process, they have mulch product they run through a process that packs that into the sock material, they coil them and put them on pallets and this is where we would propose the storage of the palletized finished product.

We are looking for 4,000 sq. ft. of palletized storage and 4,200 sq. ft. of mulch storage. Both would be 8' high in accordance with your regulations. Two separate storage areas. We've provided in accordance with your regulations, screening along this stretch right here (indicating) to screen it from this parcel which is currently undeveloped and we've also provided a screening fence along this northern boundary here (indicating) to screen it from this which is zoned business and currently used as residential.

The roadway we are proposing to actually reduce the existing apron. It is 76 linear feet and we'll reduce it to about 30. We're going to provide crushed stone as a surface in place of the

hardpacked gravel that is there currently. We did a drainage analysis on that and basically, we came up with a draw with regard to runoff. In fact, there is a slight reduction of impervious with the proposal.

We recently, as of today, acquired an encroachment permit from the DOT which is included in the packet that I delivered this evening. That is for the improvements proposed. They got the same application package, same set of plans the town received.

We did receive some comments from the town and I'll go over those with our responses. It is a two-page document with several different attachments provided. (On file in the town planner's office for review.)

That covers everything we wanted to cover.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked about how many folks work at the principle building. The response was 166 parking spaces with about 160 employees.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if there was an alternate plan that had he traffic moving through the existing property without the ROW? Is there a possible path between DePaolo Drive and the parcel you are looking to do storage on. Mr. Andrews said there is explaining you'd have to go off of the paved surface. There is an access right here (indicating) but this going to be a completely separate operation. It would be highly unlikely and certainly not permitted by the applicant for this to become an access for any motor vehicles for staff or employees. Keep this area strict to the mulch sock manufacturing process. In the area it would be a couple of staff and about two to four trucks per day coming in and leaving. Very, very limited vehicular traffic from that ROW.

Ms. Scalise asked for clarification on the statement this site should be considered as a whole. Is it currently two separate sites? Mr. Andrews said when originally submitting the application, we got planning comments with regard to the storage and the location of the storage. Planning noted the storage was in a place other than the rear yard. I wanted to be very careful in that we are identifying this as the principle building (indicating) and this (indicating) an auxiliary building. We are considering this the rear yard (indicating). We are looking at the site as a whole and this cannot be a front yard (indicating) because the access we're taking the position would be DePaolo Drive. Looking at the site as a whole from the principle building perspective, the ancillary structure back here where the manufacturing will be taking place is actually located in the rear yard of the principle building.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley said in reading the traffic report, he was not clear along West Street (Rte. 229). Mr. Andrews indicated the location of the ROW in relation to Rte.229 and the intersection with West Queen Street. It is about 650' from the ROW to the intersection. There is a light there.

In the other direction, it is about another 630' - 650' where you come to the new Cumberland Farms which also has a signal in front of it.

In both directions we are about 630' to 650' to a light. A beautiful, straight and level section of roadway with incredible sightline. And, the break from both signals is a benefit to entering and exiting the site.

Mr. Hammersley said his concern is on the turn in the northerly direction along West Street. His concern is that part of the roadway has had problems in the past and he was concerned about what

additional problems might be caused by having left hand or northerly turns on to that roadway out of this ROW.

Scott Hesketh, licensed engineer in the State of Connecticut, with F.A. Hesketh & Associates. He said the driveway would experience about four to eight vehicle trips per day. Sight distance is 650' in each direction which meets the DOT requirements for an SU 30 designed vehicle. Traffic signals on either end should create some artificial gaps in the traffic stream.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley wanting to be more clear on his concerns asked if the traffic signals were synchronized which the response to was yes. Mr. Hesketh explained they're all in a coordinated system on Rte. 229.

Discussion.

Accident data was discussed.

Mr. Hammersley asked staff if the commission has the authority to regulate or put a stipulation on this that will hold up with DOT on a northerly turn restriction.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips clarified you have the ability to condition any approval with a stipulation or modify any approval as you see fit when it comes to that, but the OSTC will look at that and take it into consideration if they find there is some unsafe aspects of it and it could potentially cause a problem, they can overrule. They take your location conditions and your local direction into consideration.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips clarified he meant the encroachment permit. Mr. Hesketh said if they had required any conditions, they would have imposed it and it's my understanding you have an encroachment permit before you on which the DOT did not require any turn restrictions at that particular location.

Mr. Grappone said Mr. Hesketh is correct in that it is not a major generator. They went in for a permit. I'm assuming because it is a modification, they went in for a request for clearing and modification of the entrance because DOT acted on it without the commission's approval. Mr. Hesketh pointed out there is an existing curb cut at that location. It is a location I think is appropriate for a driveway. The application was for clearing and upgrading of the driveway. It is my opinion that if we do work within the DOT's ROW we need an encroachment permit. They believe they have the right to review the use of the driveway but I don't see that in their language. Since they did issue a permit, I believe they did review the use proposed here. They did the traffic volumes and types of traffic vehicles in the driveway and issued the permit based on that. They were aware of the existing roadway geometries and the accident data and the sight line availability. The DOT issued the permit indicating they had no objections to this use at this location.

Mr. Grappone said the plan submitted to them, the intersection sight distance was correct? Mr. Andrews said initially it had the shorter sight distance on it and as of the day before yesterday I sent them the revised plan that was submitted to you this evening. I had shown 450 and we're up over 650.

Mr. Grappone questioned the SU-30 design vehicle. Is it confirmed you will just use a box truck on deliveries and no tractor trailer? Mr. Andrews said his office ran the turning radii and such, and we

were unable to get a semi out of the site. We opted to restrict it to an SU-30 box truck for site operations, both deliveries and shipping.

Mr. Grappone said based on that the DOT issued the permit with no restrictions on it. They need to contact the state inspector when doing the work. It means the requirement of the sight line distances must be obtained in the first phase of construction. That's part of the permit and I have no other comments he concluded.

Ms. Scalise asked where mile marker 1.92 is in relation to the actual ROW? Mr. Hesketh said that was the signalized intersection of Rte. 229 West Queen Street. She further noted all the accidents at that intersection.

Discussion.

The process for acquiring of accident data on line in certain areas was discussed.

Discussion of the accident data for that area.

Ms. Scalise asked if the existing ROW is being used for vehicle traffic right now? Mr. Andrews said the ROW hasn't been used in some time. There is a gate on it. The existing asphalt comes into the site about 75'. We just cleared and unearthed that asphalt at this time.

A slide was shown accentuating the existing screening to be provided.

The proposed clearing in that area was discussed in response to a query by Ms. Scalise. Mr. Andrews said there are fir trees and there are saplings that have come up within the ROW. The clearing we will need to do is to create the 24' wide roadway is some of the saplings. We will maintain the larger screening trees. At the exit, some trees that come out to our property line, we may have to cut the branches back so a vehicle behind the shoulder line would be able to gain that 650' sight line in both directions.

We're limited on the location of where we can trim. Explained.

The geometry used in the analysis comes back from the shoulder line about 10' and we ensure we're able to do that within our property confines. Very limited clearing essentially to our 50' ROW.

Mr. Morelli commented Supreme Industries has been there since 2013. In the last couple of years trucks from Supreme go in and out of there. How many truck trips for that business, ballpark? Mr. Andrews said about 30 to 40 with no accidents at that intersection. Mr. Morelli further commented he traveled the road quite a bit seeing their trucks on a regular basis, and they're always very courteous, polite drivers. I have a bigger problem with left hand turns at the Chic-Fil-A on Queen Street.

Discussion.

Eight trips by a box truck a day out of that site does not sound too dangerous to me, continued Mr. Morelli. I agree we need to be concerned with that but I think it is a creative use of the property and it is low impact as far as truck traffic. If the DOT likes it . . .

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley said where the ROW is, we are not talking about an area where there is a signal or a planned signal. It is an area where people're going to be trusted to do whatever they are going to do. Has any consideration been given to accessing that piece of the property thru West Street

around DePaolo Drive to get access back there? As opposed to the ROW.

Discussion.

Mr. Andrews said there is a gravel access right here (indicating) that comes into this parking lot. We're very specifically looking to segregate these two businesses. And, we are asking for your authorization for four trucks a day to come in/out of an existing ROW that this property owner owns and has for many years. We'll improve the ROW and use it as a primary access. We're very specifically looking at segregating this operation from this operation (indicating). There is no other access from this particular area over to West Queen or to DePaolo. This particular area is limited to access either directly using the existing ROW they own that goes to Rte. 229 right now or running through the parking lots. We opted to eliminate that cluster of traffic that would be running through here (indicating) and use the existing ROW.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips advised the one aspect of this that needs the commission's direction on is the prospect of the outside storage. This is an I-1 zone. It's an accessory use to the operation in an I-1 zone. It requires a special permit. It is supposed to be located in the rear yard with an area not greater than the first floor of the principle building. The applicant is making the statement that of the overall site, the larger building is the principle building and this is an accessory located in the rear yard. You should determine if you agree with that or not.

Also, there is in the regulations language that says you may waive certain requirements as far as the outside storage in an I-1 zone. Maybe you have the wherewithal to say that it isn't something for which we require a special permit. A blanket nebulous statement and probably should be reworded in the regulations given case law.

It is your feeling of whether this does not require a special permit and whether it does comply with the accessory uses in an industrial zone which allows outside storage in the rear yard.

Segregation of the activities on the smaller parcel from the larger parcel was explained. Mr. Andrews said Supreme will be operating in this building (indicating) and there will be another occupant in this building (indicating).

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he didn't like the concept of coming on to West Street in general. It'd be great if it could be at DePaolo Drive. However, I will say, when I go back and look at the West Street Business Zone and trying to plan for curb cuts, I think we were targeting 400' of frontage between curb cuts. This is north of that. And, 600' seems to be better than that. Maybe it's a positive thing if this goes there. It will encourage longer distances between curb cuts in that area.

The 20' grade difference between the storage area and the road was noted. Do we see the slope in that area as something that might impede them from pulling out into the road quickly?

Discussion.

Mr. Andrews explained the grade is 6 to 8 percent. We provided a wider 30' length apron specifically so we have about 7 to 8 feet to the shoulder which meets the dimension of a box truck. We're sure the axles would be on pavement for traction to mix in with traffic. I don't see any problems from that perspective area. The area here (indicating) is relatively flat. From a loading and tipping

perspective we don't see any problems.

Discussion.

Snow removal on the ROW was discussed.

The screening fence on the northern boundary was discussed as it is a residential use.

Business operations are Monday thru Friday, 6:00 am to 5:00 pm. One quarter of the trucks exiting would be one quarter to the north and three quarters to the south.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action if you are comfortable with it. You agree this is in the rear yard of the principle building.

Mr. Chaplinsky and Mr. Morelli felt they were comfortable with it because it is low volume. It is using an existing underutilized access which will be used at some point. Rather than having a higher intense use there which is allowed non-SPU it is a good opportunity to move forward in a positive direction. Help a good business in town that is doing a good business, expand. Also controls the traffic in the area. The left turn truck traffic is only one per day. All things considered it is a low intensive use. IF approved, the neighbors should be considered as to their privacy.

Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve this application. One northbound crossing a day is not something I'm concerned about but I agree with Mr. Chaplinsky in that if it was to grow that that might be more of an issue and at that point, we'd have to relook at it. It is pretty constrained. I would encourage them if they come before us in the future, they try to put the traffic on DePaolo Drive and West Queen Street as there is a signal which helps with the crossing.

Mr. Morelli seconded.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Denise Rivera, Floodplain filling application to fill a portion of the upland review area and floodplain for the construction of a gazebo and elevated walkway adjacent to the building, property located at 447 North Main Street, in a B zone (FF #258)

Stephen Giudice with Harry Cole & Son presented the application noting the applicant, Denise Rivera was present in the audience.

We have back before this commission on numerous different additions on numerous occasions. She has been improving her property as it grows. She's hoping to do that again.

He referred to the site on the screen. He noted she previously added an entryway off of North Main Street with a vestibule and an outside deck. We are proposing to extend the deck around the side of the building and construct a gazebo and an access directly to the parking lot.

The theater area and the hall are not great for handicapped accessibility as it is accessed through this portion of the building (indicating).

In doing this, we are proposing some piers to be located under the structure and along the walkway. It creates a floodplain filling situation where we have a pier. It is not a lot of filling. We are talking about a cubic yard (about 27 cubic feet). We are proposing to compensate for that with approximately four cubic yards of removal of rip rap in this area (indicating). That will compensate for the fill.

We did go to the wetlands commission. We had an onsite. We made some modifications based on their recommendations. We have also addressed some staff comments.

We are here to ask you for approval on this application.

The Zoning Board of Appeals application for a variance was discussed.

The gazebo is a walk thru to add some aesthetic value to the property. It is for taking pictures with small weddings and things like that.

Access was discussed.

Mr. Phillips noted it is ready for action.

Mr. Grappone clarified the piers are to be designed by others. Mr. Giudice said they have a structural engineer on board and that is their responsibility. He would be looking for a stipulation on the design of the pier, the attachment and the rip rap. Other than that, it is ready for action, he noted.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with staff recommendations. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. Release of \$5,400 E & S Bond, Walker's Crossing (S #1292)

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion for approval with a second by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

G. Release of \$18,000 maintenance bond, Walker's Crossing (S#1292)

Ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion for approval which was seconded by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- Anthony Palmieri, 2 lot resubdivision application, 445 Lazy Lane, in an R-20/25 zone (S#1329) November 20

- Blair Gianatti, home occupation application for Cottage Food Operation, 388 Mulberry Street, in an R-20/25 zone (HO #72) November 20

(Schedule both.)

8. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Mr. Phillips enumerated the new applications:

- 161 Burritt Street site plan for office & shops
- 2-lot resubdivision on Lazy Lane
- 2-lot subdivision on 200 Main Street
- Special permit application for grandparent apartment. (Public Hearing required)

West Street Discussion

Mr. Phillips explained Bristol has through their council of governments --- different than our's --- has basically brought forward a West Street Transportation Corridor Study that runs from Route 6 all the way down to the town line. In their conversations with CCROG, they knew we were interested in doing something on West Street on our side of the border, and they approached the town to see if we had interest in adding on to that project to bring the study all the way down to the interchange with I-84. We indicated we are interested in joining forces.

So far, we have a draft scope in our possession. I want to review with the commission the draft scope to see if you have any questions on it. He reviewed Task 1 through Task 5. (On file in the town planner's office for review.)

Mr. Grappone said they are thinking about putting in an additional \$250,000 for the Southington portion.

Mr. Chaplinsky thanked our Representative Fusco who helped and continued to put this before CCROG and before that, Representative Zoni and Senator Markley, as well. Mr. Chaplinsky talked about the funding requirements for Southington. The local match would be 10%. All money is coming from economic development. It is covered. The acceptance of any grant would have to be formally done by the Town Council.

Everyone was supportive. Ms. Scalise loved the idea of having a comprehensive cohesive plan for that side of town. It's phenomenal. Good to hear.

9. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 o'clock, p.m.)