

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

JANUARY 15, 2019

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a regular meeting on Tuesday, January 15, 2019 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	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Peter Santago & Val Guarino

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

Absent: Dagmara Scalise, Susan Locks & James Morelli, Commissioners
Joe Coviello, Alternate

The Chair seated Mr. Guarino for Ms. Locks and Mr. Santago for Mr. Morelli. 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 December 4, 2018

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

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Lovley Development, Inc., application for Zoning Text Amendment for proposed new section of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations: Section 3-09 – Age Restricted Cluster Housing Zone (ZA #597)

(The Minutes are presented Summary Style and you may refer to the video on line to hear the full 45-minute discussion.)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant. The proposal is to amend the zoning regulation text to include a new Section 3-09 to allow Age Restricted Cluster Housing (ARCH).

This would be allowed in the R-12, R-20/25 and R-40 zones. Served by public water and sewer. On properties of a five-acre minimum. Located in arterial or collector streets as outlined in Section 3-09.6.

Section 3-09.7, the section in front of you for text amendment, shows the requirements. Some important points are the five acre minimum, maximum number of units is five per acre, the minimum separation between homes would be 25' and the requirement for density calculation is 50% of floodplain, steep grades and wetlands should not be included. Only single-family homes would be allowed with 10% to be dedicated to workforce housing as outlined in Section 3-09.4.

Section 3-09.14 requires that 20% of the land space be greenspace to be protected with a conservation easement. This section outlines the criteria for greenspace preservation.

(Example of a potential development on the screen. It is 5.58 acres. The green you will see on the screen to be preserved.)

Section 309.16 deals with lighting. Low density lighting, LED, fully shielded with the maximum height of free-standing poles to be 12'.

Section 309.15 deals with landscape, buffers and foundation plantings. Very detailed description of what needs to be done to make the project look better.

Section 309.18 requires the best management practices for stormwater management as outlined by the DEEP.

Section 309.22 outlines the requirements for a zone change and a conceptual application.

Section 309.23 outlines specific requirements for the final site plan and special permit application.

To summarize, the applicant will have to go through multiples stages of an application process. First a preliminary layout and a zone change will have to be requested. Second, the special permit and final site plan will have to be applied for. All that requires a public hearing and notification per Section 8 of the regulations. And, then in all of this they have to address drainage, landscaping, lighting, buffers, proper layout, architectural plans, traffic and greenspace.

I'll be glad to answer.

In response to a query by the Chair, Mr. Bovino reiterated that 50% of the area encompassed by wetlands, flood zone, floodplains and steep grades will be discounted 50% in the calculations. So, in addition you have to remove that area from the calculation.

Mr. Chaplinsky questioned 3-09.3, permitted uses. Discussion about the choice of language used. Item A is clear. Item B is the question: and/or a spouse or other occupant who must be aged 18 or older. Does that mean we would exclude someone 60 years old who does not have another occupant

in the house?

Discussion.

You mean to say the second person does not need to be 55, spouse or another occupant, as long as they're over 18 years of age. Mr. Bovino clarified: We are saying anybody under 18 cannot live there. That's what we're trying to say.

Discussion.

The Chair questioned the maximum of two people.

Mr. Phillips offered it does not mean a maximum of two people. It just means anybody over 18. Anybody under 18 is not allowed. The verbiage needs to be clarified.

Ms. Clock asked about Section 3-09.4(B) requirements, (B): workforce housing units shall only be sold or rented to eligible households. Who would be doing the renting? Who would they pay their money to? How would they be rented? Mr. Bovino said someone 55 and older, the owner of the unit. Somebody buys and then decides to rent, it has to be rented to those particular individuals as indicated in the regulations.

Mark Lovley, President of Lovley Development, 710 Main Street, Plantsville spoke. He noted he was before you in September of last year talking about the South End Road parcel and that's what became of this regulation and what you see on the screen.

After that hit the papers, we have 23 names of people interested if this does get approved. There is a big interest and need for this in the community. That's the reason we're looking to do this.

You are correct, our intent is to sell these to people and nobody living there full time under 18 -- - maybe a grandchild visiting the grandparents or something.

Ms. Clock asked about the site requirements, minimum of five acres, and how you came to that number? Mr. Lovley said he sat down with town staff and looked into that and reviewed some of the parcels that might be available and that's how we came up with five acres. There are two, three- and four-acre parcels where this could be done, but we used that as a happy medium for right now.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted Section 3-09.14 (A) is a minimum of 20% of the project shall be dedicated to greenspace in perpetuity through conservation easements. How did you arrive at the 20% and the conservations easements, would they be owned by each of the parcel owners? How would that go? Mr. Bovino explained he took various projects they did and we felt that we could provide the 20%. (See the example on the screen. This is actually a little bit more than 20%.) Mr. Lovley added they went back and looked at subdivisions they had done before and did calculations of what those ended up being and we came up with the number.

The idea is if this is contiguous to a parcel like this is – 40 acres of open space that town has – we can work with the town to add on to its open space or we can leave it in the association depending on the town's liking. They will be taken on a case by case basis.

We can leave it in the association and make it greenspace with a conservation easement with the condo association.

In talking to staff, it would be reviewed by the PZC before it got on the land records or the condo docs.

Mr. Hammersley brought up 3-09.13. He asked for clarification on that. Explain to me how and why you have that in there. Mr. Bovino responded this is more restrictive than your current regulation, the underlying regulation. In the event the requirement is not addressed in the ARCH regulation, that requirement shall be in addition to the ARCH requirements. So, if something is not addressed in the zoning regulation in this proposal, that requirement shall be in addition to what we are proposing now. The two can be combined. That's what we are trying to say here.

Mr. Phillips added that basically if the regulation in your current zoning regulation is not in the ARCH proposal, that would still apply. If there is a regulation that conflicts with the ARCH versus what you have in your current regulations, the ARCH would take precedent. That's basically what it is saying.

Mr. Bovino added the PZC has the sole authority to evaluate and render a determination on that.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought up Item 6-B on tonight's agenda and asked Mr. Phillips to summarize the main differences between that proposal and this one so that we can comment on that. Mr. Phillips said the main difference is the one that's been on the agenda (Item 6-B) has the ability to have multifamily dwellings, larger buildings with multiple units in a building, single family detached, townhouse duplexes. There are various options there. Even though in the draft regulations there is no maximum density requirement, so you don't know how many units would be on a given piece depending on where it is and the site constraints. Those are the main differences.

This proposal is specific for single family detached homes. There is a density requirement. Also, this is only subject to R-12, R-20/25 and R-40 whereas the other one can apply in more areas. It's basically limited to major travel ways, connector type streets. Those are kind of the main differences.

Otherwise, they are both special permit processes. They are both floating zones, if you will, and have to approved and planned for a certain area. It's a multi-step process for both.

Mr. Hammersley questioned: You could still get this development through a special permit application? Mr. Bovino said no as there is no land zoned R-12 that would allow this kind of development.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips said Section 8 of our regulations is made effective once you determine what use it is and if it is subject to a special permit regulation. We don't have anything like that right now. We have the ability to do multifamily developments and add elderly units at a higher density, non-restricted units. It's already on the books and it is in the CB zone. That's the closest thing. The next thing would be a subdivision of a clustered layout.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley asked why the need to change the regulation. Mr. Phillips said in the case of a cluster subdivision, it was a certain yield and you are locked into the minimum lot size allowed under the reduced lot sizes of that regulation. They're fee simple lots. You'll get public roads, single family homes of any size. In this case with this development, everything is private. A little bit denser. It allows more

of a comprehensive type development. It's all age restricted. It is more of a unique type of development. The density is higher and the houses are clustered a lot closer.

Mr. Bovino noted on the other item (6-B) there was no open space. This will provide for open space.

Discussion of layout on the screen.

Mr. Chaplinsky talked about Section 3-09.3 and the language therein. He wondered if it would be good to talk about that change. I would propose based on our discussion that 3-09.3 --- At least one individual aged 55 years or older (B) may have a spouse and/or other occupants who must be age 18 or older. Mr. Lovley agreed with that.

And, Section 3-09.14, we talked about the 20% minimum. We talked about conservation easements. Should we put something into that sentence that talks about how the decision will be made for conservation easements? Do we want to say it is at the discretion of the PZC?

Mr. Bovino noted 3-09.14(B) says that it is at your discretion. Quoted the language.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking against this application)

(Minutes are prepared Summary style and you may refer to the video on line to hear the speaker's comments in full.)

Larry DePaolo, Blatchley Avenue spoke against the application. He clarified this is a minimum of five acres and they can put five per. They're showing 15 but they could put ten more units on that lot. They're allowed 25 homes.

Discussion.

The two-step application process was described.

He didn't think this was good for the town. Why are we lowering our standards for the Town of Southington? What is the benefit to the residents of Southington by doing this? I don't see any benefit for the residents of the Town. No benefit.

He explained how this will affect the schools with those downgrading from their three- or four-bedroom homes to these smaller units. People who buy the three- or four-bedroom home have children that go to our schools.

Spring Lake Villages have unoccupied units.

I don't see any benefit for the people in Southington with cluster homes for senior citizens. We have plenty of senior citizen homes right now that are vacant because they can't sell them. A lot of open homes. It's not going to do anything for the people of Southington.

Thank you.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Bovino spoke about the layout on the screen and the maximum.

With regard to the text change, it is a floating zone. It's town wide and has to be looked at individually with your approval for each parcel. The difference between this proposal and the other one is that this one is five acres minimum and the other is a two-acre minimum. That's the difference.

We have to go through multiple approvals. With regard to vacancies, in the marketplace there is always houses for sale. Typically, it's five or ten percent. Even in a great economy.

Mr. Hammersley asked what are the benefit to the town of doing this? Why is this needed?

Mr. Lovley said when we looked at this at a preliminary meeting and we were talking about the basic --- you would have six lots with no open space and with this regulation you are going to have 15 units with almost 40% open space. You'll have an association to take care of the roads, no town maintenance of the roads. No children in the school system.

If you look at the tax difference from the six homes to these homes, you are talking about almost \$40,000 to \$50,000 for tax benefit to the town with no services.

If there wasn't a need in town, I wouldn't be getting 23 calls for people looking for this type of housing they can't find.

And, the additional open space is a benefit. Explained.

Mr. Santago asked what prevents you today from doing this in our current regulation? Mr. Bovino said there is not a regulation in place that would allow you to do this age restricted, clustered housing with flexible design.

Discussion.

In response to a query by Mr. Santago, Mr. Phillips explained again the difference between the two proposals. This one has a maximum density per acre, restricted to detached single family homes and does have a 10% affordable component to it. It attempts to match the state's goals for each municipality of having at least 10% of housing stock affordable. Separation distance of 25'.

The other one has no maximum density. Could be any form of units, multifamily, duplex or single family detached. Does not have an affordability to it. Those are the main differences.

This one has to be in R-12, R-20/25, R-40, public sewer and water. This is more specifically restricted.

The other one is more open-ended.

The Chair stated you have to understand that any piece of property just because it's five acres, doesn't mean you are going to fit 25 houses on it. I don't think there is a piece of property left in town where there is no wetlands, et cetera. This calls for 20% back for greenspace.

Mr. Phillips added the minimum size for this is 5 acres and 2 acres for the other one.

The Chair left the public hearing open.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if it would be possible to staff to give us an analysis of the zones, R-12, R-20/25, R-40 and are these types of developments more intensive on the town or less intensive on the town from a financial perspective?

Can you ask the assessor's office to do an analysis between now and the next meeting to disprove or approve that these are tax positive to the town? Is there any recent research out there that suggests that? Mr. Phillips said he would look into that.

The public hearing is left open.

6. BUSINESS MEETING

A. Lovley Development, Inc., application for Zoning Text Amendment for proposed new section of the Town of Southington Zoning Regulations: Section 3-09 – Age Restricted Cluster Housing Zone (ZA #597)

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

B. Kratzert, Jones & Associates, Inc., Petition to Enact a Zoning Regulation Amendment of Text for a proposed Elderly Housing Opportunity District (EHOD) regulations (ZA #595) tabled from December 4th

Mr. Phillips advised because the hearing was closed on December 4th the 65th days runs out after the February 5th meeting if you want to consider it. This is ready for action. There is a concern with the lack of maximum density. Mr. Phillips felt that when you are considering a new regulation that meets a new market, a new niche, that is possibly in demand, I think it's best to try to be as clearly restrictive as you possibly can be. This proposal is a little bit too open ended. He worried about the outcomes. Where you don't know where these properties might be because it's pretty open ended as far as on collector streets. Where they would be? Two acre minimum means a lot of different areas. The maximum density means it could be fairly dense in those areas which in some ways could be good. There is definitely a positive to infill development in existing denser areas, but I think there is a little bit too much wiggle room, it's too loose to me from a professional standpoint.

I did talk to the applicant trying to pull it together, but I never quite had a feel for exactly what they wanted to do and where they wanted to do it as far as specific examples. I feel as though it would need more work.

Mr. Grappone had no engineering standpoint input at this time.

(Pause)

The Chair advised it concerns me when staff tells me they're concerned. That's a problem for me.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley said he didn't agree with the underlying proposition that we're short of elderly housing in our town which we heard a lot about from the applicant. I don't see it. I don't feel it. I am and foremost very leery of the change of regulation that comes before us. I think it has to be looked at very carefully before we start doing like that. Given the fact that I don't see the need for restrictive elderly housing at this stage to address, I'm not sure why it's needed. I still haven't been convinced or shown anything that shows why it's specific to Southington. We have plenty of housing.

Specific to 55 and older, I live on Hobart Street and I'm surrounded by it. We have Spring Lake and we have housing on Flanders and off of Queen Street down by the Plainville line. There is also one located off of Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. I actually think we do a pretty good job with providing elderly housing opportunities in our town. I can't see why this would be needed.

Mr. Chaplinsky agreed but he is more concerned about staff's concerns of this than the over 55 component. I think the over 55 component, we can look at inventories and maybe the applicant could come the next time with more data. We can get that from staff and see if there is or isn't a need for that.

He asked if the POCD talked about an aging population in town and looking at regulations with respect to that or not. Ms. Clock responded, yes. And, Rob can elaborate. But it did show projection of an aging populations, so I do believe there is a need for elderly housing but I agree with staff in that the looseness of it doesn't follow along with the plan.

Mr. Santago said we are talking about a text change and for that means to be specific and the text change that is not is not something that I would be willing to support from a language standpoint regardless of what it is intended for. Text should be clear and specific. If staff has a concern that it is not clear and specific, then don't think that text should be approved.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to deny for the stated reasons of the commission. It sounds like they have given their reasons. And, really staff's, for me the biggest thing is staff is uncomfortable with the open-ended nature of the language and the potential it may have. Mr. Hammersley seconded.

Motion to deny passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. Southington Water Department, 8-24 referral for the installation of a 12" water main through Plantsville Center from the intersection of Summer Street and West Main Street to the intersection of West Main Street and Rt.19 (Phase 1) and the installation of a 12" water main from the intersections of Summer/West Main Street to the intersection of West Main Street/Rte.10 and then South on South Main for approximately 900 feet (Phase 2) MR #522)

Bill Casarella, Superintendent of the Southington Water Department explained the application. Phase I will be going through Plantsville Center. There are currently two mains there now. One is an 8" main dated 1883. The 12" main is dated 1950.

Phase II is the installation from the intersection of Route 10 and West Main Street going southerly on South Main Street, is a 6" main dated 1889.

The mains are very, very old. Usually when the town does stuff, the safety improvement project has more or less spurred us to do this project. It encapsules their improvement project area.

Each customer is going to be notified. We plan on having an open meeting for each resident/merchant in the area to explain our plans and meet individually with each one of them. I am very sensitive to their concerns.

We're looking for a spring start date of April 1st, depending on the outcome of the 8-24 approval.

It will take approximately 3 months. We have retainage in there so there's no dilly-dallying. Get in and get out.

Discussion about the center of Plantsville. It is going to be one lane open at all times. It's not going to be easy.

Route 10 is going to be done at night at the intersection and approximately 300' going south. It's DOT requirements. Anything other than that we'll try to do during the day. The PD will have a big say in this, too.

Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve the 8-24 referral for Phase I and Phase II. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Chris Matusik, site plan modification to expand parking lot and drive thru lane, 1731 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in a B zone (SPR #1769), tabled from December 4th

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, presented on behalf of the applicant. I did present this application at your last meeting. This is an expansion of the drive thru lane and parking at the Dairy Queen facility on the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. We did make some minor revisions to the plan including softening up the radiuses along the northerly drive thru lane for larger GMC pickup trucks.

(Chuckles)

And, we did respond to staff comments with revised plan. We met with staff late last week and I believe we addressed their concerns as well.

Mr. Phillips said it is ready for action.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Hammersley seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted he visited this site frequently and the drive thru needs to be extended because the queueing is not optimal right now. Also, I am not a big fan of blacktop surfaces for parking, I think there is a parking problem here. I think the additional parking spot will be good --- maybe more than you need --- but I think this is overall a very good plan and will alleviate a lot of problems there.

Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Southington Development Partners, LLC, site plan for proposed one story Dunkin restaurant with a drive through window service, 1825 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in a B zone (SPR #1770), tabled from December 4th

Jim Cassidy, professional engineer, presented. I was before you last month at which time we put on our presentation for a proposed new Dunkin which is to be constructed at 1825 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. I am representing Southington Development Partners, LLC.

At the last meeting we went through the full presentation. We were waiting for engineering comments. We did receive those and responded to them. They have all been addressed.

Mr. Phillips advised this is ready for action.

Mr. Chaplinsky questioned the one-way circulation. I wondered if that would be beneficial or not beneficial here. The engineer said they prefer to have the two-way traffic during the parking area and then the by-pass.

Discussion.

Mr. Grappone stated that from an engineering standpoint we prefer the design presented.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. Torrey S. Crane, Co., site plan modification application to construct a 260 sf loading dock, property located at 480 Summer Street, owned by 480 Summer LLC, et al, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1771)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones, presented on behalf of the applicant. The property is located at 480 Summer Street. It is a 34,133 sf. Zoned I-2. Just north of West Main Street.

The reason we're doing this proposed loading dock on the north side is eliminate the traffic situation whenever we do a loading/unloading as the park trucks in the middle of the street. This is a safety issue we'd like to address. The loading dock is proposed on the north side of the building. We have 70' from the face of the loading dock to the sidewalk. There's plenty of distance for the truck to be there and you can still walk and not be impacted by the truck.

We received a variance on the setback from the loading dock corner to the property line.

We addressed all comments. I did receive one this afternoon from Jim Grappone & Mr. Phillips regarding the dumpsters. Right now, they are located on the left and the right of the loading area --- small dumpster about 3' x 7'. They're sitting on top of the wall of the loading area. Very convenient to that location. The trucks come in, pick up the dumpster and unload them. There is not really any room for screening. Probably 4' of space there. No room for a fence or any kind of screening.

Mr. Phillips said they are visible. This is an existing site. But when you have a site plan modification you get another bite at the apple. They're visible in this case. The trail is right there. We brought it up again. At the end of the day, it's up to you.

Discussion.

The Chair suggested a stipulation that the applicant would work closely with staff to rectify the issue. Mr. Bovino stated he doesn't know where to put it.

Discussion.

Mr. Chaplinsky said the safety issue is paramount to him. This used to be a walking zone for JFK. In the mornings when they're busy with shipments and the afternoons when kids are walking in that area, I love this. I am going to support it.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve as is. Mr. Hammersley seconded, but he wanted a stipulation that they would try to work with the staff to make it look pretty.

Mr. Bovino suggested the dumpsters could be painted.

Mr. Chaplinsky amended his motion to approve with the stipulation the applicant work with staff to see if there is a solution that's possible. I don't want to make it a hard requirement. If there is a way to conceal it, shield it and the parties can agree, that is obviously preferable. But the safety for me -- they're exposed today and the safety is paramount to me in that area. I haven't heard any complaints about the visibility of the dumpsters. Mr. Bovino said if there is a recommendation from the staff as to a place that makes more sense, we'll be glad to move it. Mr. Phillips responded staff supports that angle because in looking at the regulations, it specifically calls out in business but not necessarily industrial.

Mr. Hammersley seconded.

The Chair noted this applicant has been around for a long time. They're a good product of Southington. Good move by the Commission.

Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Treden Properties, LLC, request for 5-year extension of site plan approval, 214 Canal Street, (SPR #1433.1)

Attorney Anthony Denorfia, principle of AA Denorfia Builders and also Treden Properties. Offices at 133 Main Street, Southington. I am up here with Andrew Quirk of Kratzert, Jones.

He gave a brief overview of this project that had been hanging around for a lot of years – 14 to be exact. We're the owners of two parcels of land on Tridel Drive, #27 and #54. The property is located in the B zone. Under the old regulations, what happened in B zones is that you could apply for a special permit use for multifamily. During the crazy years of the 90's and early 2000's, the commission found they wanted to get rid of that zone which slowed down the development of multifamilies for a number of years. But now I think it is having a detrimental effect on a lot of the B zones and maybe someday you will reconsider it.

Basically, you ended up denying this application. In December of 2005, it was approved for 50 multifamily units after a court decision. The site plan was then approved for 45 units in 2006. It was on the market and sat there until we purchased it last year.

We presently are constructing the 26 units on the south side of the cul de sac. The other buildings are up. We have these last few to frame and get COs on the first five.

We have building permits for the 19 units. We have cleared the land and are set to go. Again, the only thing we are before you today for is the approval of these five units which would be the remaining five that were permitted under the SPU.

Andrew Quirk, professional engineer and principle at Kratzert, Jones presented on the five units off the cul de sac and for the site plan modification for the units 46 thru 50.

He pointed out the construction limits on the north side of the cul de sac are the same as the site plan previously approved. The impervious area has a reduction of 11%. The storm water management plan has been constructed and in place based on the previous numbers which achieves ZIRO thru the 100-year storm. The reason is the unit style is a little bit smaller.

We've addressed staff comments. We had a small modification on Sheet L-1 and we are continuing to work with the water department for their review.

Mr. Phillips said there was nothing else outstanding.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 6 to 0 on a roll call vote.

H. Cusano Realty, LLC, request for 5-year extension of site plan approval, 214 Canal Street, (SPR #1694)

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

I. Release of \$18,720 public improvement bond, Courtyard by Marriott, 1081 West Street (SPR #1513.2)

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

J. Reduction of \$42,000 subdivision bond to maintenance bond amount of \$8,000, Glenwood Park Estates (S#1301)

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

K. Reduction of \$384,500 subdivision bond to maintenance bond amount of \$45,00, North Ridge Estates, Phases 3 – 5 (S#1302)

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

L. Release of \$38,000 E & S bond, Steeplechase, East Gate Subdivision (S #1298)

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

7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Sign Subcommittee report

Mr. Hammersley said he had draft revisions to the regulations and we'll take it up at the pleasure of the commission. The Chair asked for them to be sent around to the commissioners for review and then bring it up at the next meeting. We can schedule it at the next meeting.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked if when circulated, this could go to Sign Pro to get their comments. They're a big supplier to signs in this area. Everyone was okay with that.

Any questions, reach out to Mr. Hammersley or others on the sign subcommittee.

B. Cannabis Committee report

Mr. Santago asked if the commission members have had a chance to look at the proposed text changes. The Chair indicated this was ready. We want to get ahead of the state's action.

Discussion.

Mr. Santago noted this proposal is apropos and serves the town well.

The Chair advised to send it out.

C. Open Space Grant Support

The Chair read the letter to David Stygar, DEEP which would be signed by the Chair on behalf of the Commission. (Letter on file in the Planner's Office for review.)

This is basically a letter in support generally for pursuing any grants with the state for open space.

Everyone agreed to the letter.

D. Open Space and Land Acquisition report

Mr. Chaplinsky reported most recently there was an Eagle Scout project the open space committee had approved for Crescent Lake. Mr. Guarino continues to be on the open space committee, as well. This project was to rebuild a bridge that was rotting. That was brought before the committee and approved. The project is done and they're going through punch list items to finish up.

The Chairwoman, Dawn Miceli, did a really nice job of putting in a grant for a pollinator garden at the Novick property. It is going on the north side of the field. That'll occur in 2019 once we get some better weather. We have one downtown by the water department now.

Discussion.

There is continued activity identifying, vetting, future acquisitions. There's a number of irons in the fire that are constantly being looked at. Hopefully, sometime soon we will have more to report on specifically.

Ms. Clocked thanked the Eagle Scouts. I think this is the third project they've done in the past couple of years. They've made improvements for the town. Really great.

Discussion.

8. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- B & R Corporation, special permit application for construction of one additional building to be used in support of ongoing site activities, property located at 49 DePaolo Drive, in an I-2 zone (SPU #617), February 5th

This can be scheduled on the 5th.

Mr. Phillips brought up the POCD Implementation Committee just met at 5:30 pm today. We're looking at a few different angles of trying to prioritize what they want to do next. Jenn was here, as well as others. Just letting you know we are going to be meeting quarterly.

Another thing is the question about West Street and the status for the Corridor Study, the Transportation Planning Study. I confirmed with engineering we have not heard anything, yet. We know the Naugatuck Valley and CCROG are still negotiating and trying to figure out a way to combine the two projects. It's two different regional planning agencies and they need to work together. We have no updates, yet.

The Chair advised we need a CCROG representative. Mr. Hammersley volunteered.

The Chair also advised that the Democratic side is working on having a replacement for Mr. Cabata. Hopefully at the next meeting we'll have a Democratic alternate.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Mr. Phillips advised the list distributed, A, B & C were already on tonight. D & E were just mentioned for the public hearing. We have four others. We are getting pretty active again. Economic Development advises to expect some long agendas in the spring.

10. EXECUTIVE SESSION to discuss pending litigation

A motion to go into executive session to discuss pending litigation barring the press and public but inviting the Town Attorney, the Town Planner and the Commission members was made by Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Hammersley seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned to executive session at 8:33 o'clock, p.m.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington entered into executive session on Tuesday, January 15, 2019 at the Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT in order to discuss pending litigation.

The following persons were present:

Paul Chaplinsky	Jennifer Clock
Robert Hammersley	Michael DelSanto, Chair

Alternates: Peter Santago & Val Guarino

Ex-Officio: Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development
Carolyn Futtner, Town Attorney

Absent: Dagmara Scalise, Susan Locks & James Morelli, Commissioners
Joe Coviello, Alternate

No motions or votes were taken.

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

(Whereupon, executive session was adjourned at 8:46 o'clock, p.m.)

REGULAR SESSION

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:47 o'clock, p.m.)

Robert A. Phillips
Acting Secretary

