

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

MARCH 19, 2019

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a regular meeting on Tuesday, March 19, 2019 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DelSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

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

Alternates: Joe Coviello, Peter Santago, & Val Guarino

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

Absent: James Morelli, Commissioner
Stuart Savelkoul, Alternate Commissioner

The Chair seated Mr. Santago for Mr. Morelli for tonight's meeting. 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 March 5, 2019

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Hammersley & Ms. Clock abstaining.

5. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. David Pepin, special permit application for garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 1564 Mount Vernon Road, in an R-20/25 and R-80 zones (SPU #619)

Ms. Clock recused herself from this item. The Chair seated Mr. Coviello for this application in her stead.

David Pepin, 1564 Mt. Vernon Road, applicant, explained his project. He wanted to add on three spaces to a back garage. For storage space. I currently have two garages. The addition is 24 by 30 feet. It will be three additional bays with one door.

Strictly for storage space. Nothing that will require a driveway. I am approximately 200' from my house.

Mr. Phillips said anytime we space that could either no or the in future accommodate a motor vehicle or reasonably situated to do so, we'll consider it a garage per the regulations. They have an existing 1384 and the proposed is 720, so they are over the 1,092 thresholds by about 2,000 sf. There is an affidavit on file it is not to be used for business use. Otherwise, staff has no issues.

Mr. Chaplinsky noted the drawing says existing tool shed/garage. And, then the proposed storage says: storage. But we are going to treat these as garages. The reason I ask is because you are only allowed one accessory shed, so for the record, this is not an accessory shed. In the future if he wants to come back and put a storage shed on site, he can. Mr. Phillips agreed. He stated if you can access the structure by a garage door, you can reasonably fit vehicles in there --- we don't know. He may store a bunch of vehicles.

(Those speaking tonight in favor of the application)

None.

(Those speaking tonight against the application)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

B. Town of Southington, Amendment to Section 13 (signs) of the Zoning Regulations, (ZA #599).

The Chair reseated Ms. Clock.

Rob Phillips, Director of Planning, presented the application. He summarized the PZC's subcommittee was looking at detached signing, the current regulations, and assessing whether some of those regulations needed some modification in some way.

They reported back to you what I am presenting tonight. (Please refer to the video on line to hear the full presentation and see the screen presentation as these Minutes are prepared summary style.)

Suggested modifications:

Detached Signage, Section D has proposed language. With regard to attached signs are established with intent to balance the need, to protect the public safety and welfare, the need for a well maintained and attractive community and the need for adequate identification, communication & advertising.

Section 1: Detached Sign Per Lot: suggested changes are to add: or composite wood as materials to be used.

And, to remove: They are encouraged to actually require them instead of encourage them and I also include stone and brick.

The height of the detached sign shall not exceed 15' as opposed to 24'.

That is inclusive of the base.

And, language that the detached sign shall in no case be more than 20' from the property or the street line but at least less than 10' from the property or from the street line.

On a corner lot, they may have more than one detached sign on each street providing legal access to the lot. Suggested addition: Such sign shall be no greater than 10' in height and a combined area of no greater than 100 sf in total if more than one detached sign is utilized on the entire property.

That replaces language that stated signs shall be subject to the provisions contained within Section 13-08.B-1 except that the area of each sign shall not exceed 100 sf. It's a clarification there.

Suggested removal of the business center: Each sign shall not exceed 100 sf. Remove the language: nor display more than the name and the location of the business center.

The Chair asked if the discussion didn't indicate that we wanted to change the 15'? You see in Subsection 3? Fifteen is in red. I thought we had said 15 may be a little low. You said it wouldn't be an issue because we're not more restrictive, we are doing less restrictive. So, it could be anywhere between 15 and 24. That's okay? Mr. Phillips said you could do that because you are moving closer to what is currently allowed. The Chair felt the 24 was too high but the 15 was low. Ms. Scalise did not recall the PZC agreeing to a number. Do we have to? Mr. Phillips explained this is a proposal and if you want to change it, you would modify the proposal and you could do so if it's less restrictive.

Discussion.

Prohibited signs, we suggested adding: Number 9, which is pylon and monopole signs. Those would be prohibited structures to mount the sign on for detached signage if this is effective.

There is a section basically establishing a policy which enhances or at least incentivizes potential enhancement of existing detached signs that are not necessarily in conformance with what we're trying to do with these regulations here. Essentially, that is allowing for a marginal increase in the sign area and height if you enhance the signage base or the outside of the sign. It's not applicable to a cabinet sign that is fully lit as that is one of the signage options that we've really been trying to get away from. It has been quite successful with new signage changes when we have tenant changes.

That covers all of it.

We won't be able to vote tonight and we need to leave the public hearing open as we have not heard back yet from one of the three agencies that we sent it to for referral.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones, had some questions on detached signs.

Paragraph D, it says: It shall in no case be more than 20' from the property or the street line. What is the logic of that, why not 25 or 30?

Item 2, the next page: Corner lot shall have the two signs, could have two signs, 10' high. The question is why so low for the corner lot? Why not the same size as the others?

Item 3, this is geared to the West Street B zone scenario: In a business center developed on a tract of land three acres or more, initially held in single ownership or control, one sign might be erected along each ROW which provides legal access to the property. Does it mean this is not a public road? A ROW to some kind of rear lot?

Mr. Phillips said the definition of a sign in the regulations is supposed to be visible from a public street ROW. So, if it's not visible, it wouldn't necessarily be a sign, by definition.

Mr. Bovino continued: Each sign shall be set back entirely within the property lines and outside of the ROW or at least 10' from the street line when the property line is less than 10'. So, it goes from ROW to property lines. That's confusing. Street line is normally associated with a public road. If it's intended to be the West Street scenario where you have interior properties, so this should be looked at a little bit.

In terms of the last portion 15-11, Mr. Bovino said enhancing or allowing the applicants to be creative, I'm wondering, creative is a very wide range of things.

He submitted his notes to Mr. Phillips.

(Those speaking against the application this evening.)

None.

Mr. Phillips said he would like time to digest the queries. The first one, 20' from the property line, Mr. Hammersley noted that is referenced in Section 13-D.1 where we put a contained area there between 10' and 20'. The sense of the subcommittee was that we wanted to have overall consistency in the setbacks on the sign so they are not jogging all over the place and potentially being a distraction. We put it at 20' to allow for sight variances where there might be hills or buffers that might prohibit it from being at a certain height. We wanted to give flexibility to move it within a 10' area.

As to corner lots, Mr. Hammersley explained the consensus was that we were trying to make sure that on a corner lot, if they were going to put two signs up, they had to lower them so they didn't have an added advantage, if you will.

Mr. Hammersley said in the third item, the use of the word creativity is probably a subjective word. The Chair said it was for years it was the internally illuminated box signs because they were cheap and economical for businesses to use. That's okay. But the technology has come to a point now where they can still be economical with a nice-looking sign. Externally illuminated, back lit.

Discussion.

Mr. Hammersley said the point was to encourage businesses currently with signage to come into compliance with this and give them incentive to do that rather than waiting for a change in use.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips said he didn't think it would be a town wide change of signage overnight. Some may be interested.

The Chair said if you have questions between now and the next meeting you can contact staff.

The Chair left the public hearing open.

C. Mark Lovley, application for Zone Boundary Change from R-20/25 and R-40 to Age Restricted Cluster Housing Zone (ARCHZ), property located at 792 South End Road (ZC #561

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to the video on line to hear the full 33-minute public hearing.)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates represented the applicant. The property in question is shown here on the screen and is located at 792 South End Road. Bounded on the north by a vet's office, a gas station here, and Route 322. To the east we have a church and to the south we have Town of Southington Open Space. To the west we have residential homes and South End Road.

The request is to change the zone to ARCHZ. The current zone is R-20/25 and R-40. The purpose is to increase the type of development of available housing as contemplated in Section 3-09.2 of the ARCHZ regulation which was recently approved.

The property meets Section 3-09.6 which is the site requirements, the last page of the regulations. The land area is 5.98 acres. It has more than 75' frontage on South End Road and it is served by public water and sewer.

Section 3-9.22, Item A & B, requires the submission of an existing condition plan and a conceptual site plan. We've provided the plans and I have additional copies for the record.

The proposed plan has more than 20% minimum required open space/green area. We were able with this layout to provide 41% of open space which basically wraps around the property and connects with the Town of Southington open space.

We've provided architectural plans. We have copies here tonight I'll pass around.

(Pause)

Also, for the record, he submitted the receipts for the mailing which was done to notify the owners within 500'.

The packet you have has: area map which is showing the property owners affected by this proposal within 500'.

The second sheet is the property map which is an existing conditions map and it shows the land as it is today. There is an existing structure on the property.

Explained.

The next sheet is the rendering one of the types of homes that we have proposed for this community. They will be ranch style homes.

Section 8 of the regulation requires we notify property owners as discussed, within 500'. That was done and the receipt is in the records as proof of notification.

The ARCHZ allows 5 units per acre for a total of 25 units and we are proposing 15 units. It shows you can make something happen with a piece of property without maximizing and provide some open space. More than required. In this case it is 5.88 acres and we have 2.3 acres of open space.

We believe this property is a good fit for the zone change request to ARCHZ.

We ask you to consider approving this request. Any questions?

In response to a question by Mr. Chaplinsky about the conventional layout, six lots were approved with no open space. Public road.

This one is a private road. The front of this will have landscaping and along the south side. Trees planted and a white vinyl fence installed along this property line (indicating). And, the buffer, obviously around the homes and the open space will be left as open space.

Minutes are prepared summary style, and you may refer to the video on line to hear the full commentary.

(Those speaking in favor of this application.)

(1) Tom Curtis, 821 South End Road. He questioned the terminology of open space because he felt this proposal is not open space. It is greenspace for the community, but it is not part of the open space preserve.

The concept of the zone change is okay. There is a need for this. I think the density on your allowances is way too high. I think for this, to keep the greenspace available here, the density is still high on this proposal.

The bottom of the development, along the back line, the two homes, mine and my son's, they had proposed to move that concept further north so it would lessen the greenspace along Meriden Waterbury Road and open an area against the back line. That would preserve an area of an old barn foundation and the site of a stop on the underground railroad back in the 1850's.

I expect this concept would change. I am in favor of the concept, but I think the density is too high.

(Those speaking against the application.)

(1) Jack Eaton, 44 Hacienda Circle, Plantsville. I'm not in favor of it as it stands right there for a couple of reasons. Senior housing should be affordable for seniors and the house size should be smaller.

Discussion.

The other part is should we be taking this cluster zoning and putting it in place to build larger houses to get more houses in that same property? It's going to populate the area more. Noise level is going to be higher which is already an issue there.

Discussion.

The other problem is are we turning around and allowing cluster zoning for senior development, if that is true, what is the price?

Discussion.

He spoke of development rights as cutting back on the services for the town. Here, you are increasing it.

Spoke of development on Route 322 already: Hillside, condominiums.

You are not cutting back on construction in the town, at all.

Discussion.

Should we really be putting all these new houses in cluster zones? Should we maybe be controlling our growth or expansion?

Discussion.

When they sent the documentation out, we got it on Friday with a meeting on Tuesday. Not much time for researching it. It wasn't mailed out when it should have been.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips clarified the notification requirements.

(2) Maria Toppe, 828 South End Road. With my husband, Tom.

We are opposed to this. It's way too many houses. And, it looks to me they're going to come out on to South End Road where the vet is, McDonald's is, Vinny's Pizza is. That's already backed up now.

I think the concept is great for senior housing but there is senior housing up the road and down the road. A lot in the area already. I don't think they need as many houses as they want to put in.

(3) Speaker questioned the water runoff. Are they going to tie into the street? Discussion.

Mr. Grappone said the previous application had underground storage. The applicant would have to hold predevelopment versus post development storage up to the 25-year storm event.

Discussion.

The Speaker said his property floods now.

Tom Curtis spoke about the drainage problem this speaker has. He noted an easement that goes down to outflow into the river. It's from the storm drains they put in on South End Road.

Mr. Phillips said he has a correspondence which he sent to the commission previously from Beverly (Inaudible) 69721 South End Road, Plantsville, CT which said: I vote no.

Also, Mr. Eaton's letter, but he was here tonight.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Bovino said the hearing tonight is about zone change. The runoff, the drainage system is mandated by regulation to be designed in such a way that the increase in runoff will be zero or less. We're not going to increase flow on anybody's property. We will have underground storage and be tying into the town system. That was previously approved at other times when the subdivision was built across the street.

Discussion.

As to noise, we are on the south side of Rte 322 and we will keep the existing tree line to buffer any noise. These will be senior houses. Not as much activity as the typical home. We have buffer all around. Not a public road, a private road.

We will move the development slightly to the north as Mr. Curtis has requested. Explained.

The density is three units per acre and not five per acre.

An affordability plan will be prepared and we will have three affordable units in this development. The homes sizes are between 1440 sf to 1600 sf.

It is for senior housing.

As to the mailing, registered mail does not get delivered unless you are there to sign.

Discussion.

The open space, we got word that the open space committee was interested in having this as open space. In addition, we have greenspace in the center and other areas of the property. The open space is here (indicating). It is connected to the existing open space and we understand the town would like to have that.

Mr. Santago clarified: The movement would be to address and not disturb the historical nature of things, is that correct? Mr. Bovino said it has been accomplished. The structure is right in this corner (indicating). We do not intend to touch that at all.

Mark Lovely, Lovely Development, 710 Main Street, Suite 11, Plantsville. We will have a homeowner's association that'll take care of the properties. There will be a condo fee to take care of roadway, landscaping. As far as noise, the landscaping will all happen on the same day. Garbage pickup all on the same day from one company.

We'll have an association. If you want to review the condo docs, it will be filed on the land records.

Ms. Scalise asked about the parcel being connected to the other parcel of open space. Mr. Lovely explained one of the commissioners on the open space committee asked me if I would be willing to give the open space to the open space committee because it does abut existing open space and it does have that historic feature. That was our idea to slide the development up a little bit to be able to get a path or something from the development back into the open space, carry the open space around to the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike so those trees always stay there.

Here I can see why they want the open space as it abuts existing open space already there and benefit from it later.

Discussion.

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

BUSINESS MEETING

A. David Pepin, special permit application for garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 1564 Mount Vernon Road, in an R-20/25 and R-80 zones (SPU #619)

Ms. Clock recused herself from this item and Mr. Coviello was seated in her stead.

This is ready for action. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Hammersley seconded.

Mr. Chaplinsky said he liked the proposal and was glad to see people continuing to use the updated regulations for more garage spaces and using their property as they want to. Good luck!

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. Town of Southington, Amendment to Section 13 (signs) of the Zoning Regulations, (ZA #599).

The Chair reseated Ms. Clock at this time.

Motion to table by Mr. Chaplinsky. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. Mark Lovley, application for Zone Boundary Change from R-20/25 and R=40 to Age Restricted Cluster Housing Zone (ARCHZ), property located at 792 South End Road (ZC #561)

This is ready for action. If you do approve, you have to set an effective date and Mr. Phillips recommended 15 days after the approval date.

Ms. Clock made a motion to approve. Mr. Hammersley seconded.

Ms. Clock commented this is a highly sensitive and historic piece of land. If there is any piece of land, she could think of that this zone would be appropriate, it would be this. It provides for the most open space which is obviously abutting town open space. It is private which I think will lend to the community surrounding as well as providing for less town maintenance, et cetera. And, she thanked the developer and engineer for recognizing the sensitivity of the land because, especially as Mr. Curtis pointed out, the historical, the building, underground railroad being on that plan, it is so important that once you tear something like that down, you can never get it back. It is priceless.

Mr. Chaplinsky echoed those comments, as well. As this goes forward, if there are things we can do to preserve and enhance and allow for information or viewing of that area, maybe to let people know it is there and it was preserved as part of a project like this I think would be a really nice thing to do. If you could consider that in the site plan, consider that along with some of the things Mr. Curtis said.

I want to insure we are also talking about runoff, I think if you get with the neighbors to ensure the system is engineered so maybe less runoff comes off or at a slower rate so it doesn't negatively impact there.

I like the idea of maximizing the open space Mr. Chaplinsky continued. Maybe it should be open space with the historical nature. We should discuss it given the fact there is a landmark there as to whether we want that as open space for its historical nature.

He pointed out he liked the private road versus public road. Less money for taxpayers.

Age restricted is less burden on the community with education.

He felt it was a win/win/win over the last approval here for a traditional subdivision. He supported the motion.

Ms. Scalise noted she didn't support the zone change overall. The idea of an age restricted housing cluster zone, however, I've heard from the neighbors and they don't seem to have an issue. She said if we are going to be looking at opportunities for these types of parcels, we need to be cognizant of what the rest of the environment is like --- I am not hearing anything that would make me continue to not support it.

The Chair commented this board is constantly striving to maximize open space. We've tried to maximize open space without a lot of support from the public. He has a hard time when folks come up and question why we are not working harder at it.

Discussion.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Susco Building Group, LLC, floodplain filling application to regrade site for anew building, parking and storage area, property located at 49 Birch Street in an I-2 zone. FF #260.

AND

E. Susco Building Group, LLC, site plan application to construct a 3,000-sf building, parking lot area and outside storage area, property located at 49 Birch Street, in an I-2 zone (SPR #1773), tabled from March 5

Stephen Giudice with the office of Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street in Plantsville represented the applicant for both Items D & E.

This property is at 49 Birch Street in an I-2 zone. I did present this previously. We did revise our plant list and street trees. We've made some minor modifications to the site based on a site walk with the conservation commission. They did grant us a favorable FF recommendation and a permit for this application.

We've submitted revised plans based on comments from Mr. Grappone and I believe we've addressed his comments, as well.

At the present moment, the application is ready.

Mr. Phillips added the applicant is requesting a sidewalk waiver.

Mr. Giudice said as part of your regulations, you are permitted to sidewalk waivers especially in industrial zones. One of your criteria is the amount of development and the number of sidewalks in the area. Birch Street has absolutely no sidewalks. Nor any on Queen Street which is across the railroad tracks from us. The applicant is requesting a waiver of sidewalks.

We have issues with wetland impact if we were to construct a sidewalk (indicated on the screen).

Mr. Phillips stated that you need to have a 2/3 majority vote to approve a waiver. Otherwise, staff has no other concerns on the application.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve the floodplain filling application. Mr. Hammersley seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve the sidewalk waiver. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

The site plan application is ready for action. Mr. Hammersley made a motion to approve which Mr. Chaplinsky seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. John J. Roncaioli, floodplain filling application for a proposed addition to a house, 62 Echo Valley Road, in an R-20/25 zone (FF #259) tabled from March 5

Mr. Phillips said they are looking at revising the plan and we're waiting to hear back. There is no timeline on these FF applications. Staff recommends a table.

Motion to table by Mr. Chaplinsky with a second by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

G. GLS, LLC site plan application to construct retail building, property located at 2110 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike in a B zone (SPR #1775).

George Andrews, Professional Engineer, with Louriero Engineering Associates in Plainville, CT presented. He gave a summary on the background of the site and talk a little bit about the proposed improvements and close with some of the stormwater management and soil erosion sedimentation controls that we are proposing for the site development.

(The Minutes are prepared summary style and you may refer to the video on line to hear the full presentation.)

This is at the intersection of I-84 and 691. (Indicated on the screen) We have frontage on Rte 322. He provided an aerial view of the site to see what it looked like in 2011 and I wanted to define that the entirety of the site was at one time paved. (Indicated on the screen)

He noted the canopy, convenience area, pumps underneath the canopy and where the former underground storage tanks were located (subsequently removed).

It's assessor's map 19, parcel number 4. It is 2110 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. It is encompassed essentially by wetlands. Our wetland scientist has flagged them and we did survey them to define the limits. It encompasses three sides of the site.

Discussed.

He noted there are no sidewalks associated with the existing bridge (indicated).

The lot is identified on FEMA Flood Mapping as AE zone. It does have elevations.

Discussed.

A high intensity topo survey was done identifying that the majority of the site is above elevation 139. So, we were able to design the majority of the improvements above elevation 139 which is out of the FEMA Flood zone.

We have prepared a LOMA (Letter of Map Amendment) and submitted that to FEMA and we're awaiting their response. That would adopt the new delineation of the floodplain on this parcel.

Utilities are available within the street: water, sewer, power, communications. Explained.

We did advance a couple of soil borings and site is udorthent soil which is a filled site. You would expect that based on the elevations. Explained the soils on site.

As to variances, we have the rear yard setback reduced to 6'. The front yard setback has been reduced to 18'. The 18' feet is a match to the canopy.

He then showed and discussed the site plan proposed. Two story building about 4755 sf. Located toward the back of the parcel (indicating). Total building square footage would be about 9510 sf. First story will be full retail (package store and convenience store). Two separate entries. Second floor will be office and storage space.

We are proposing underground storage tanks (indicated) as far away from Judd Brook as possible. The previous storage tank locations were indicated. They've both been removed.

We have parking across the front of the building. We're proposing 26 spaces including fueling stations under the canopy at the pumps.

We just submitted a set of revised plans today. That included an updated landscape plan. He noted the two access points (two way) with an island in the center which is enhanced from the original. He explained proposed landscaping enhancement.

We are not proposing clearing the site, but are going to try to maintain all of the existing trees not within the paved surface of the site.

Storm water management, grading, drainage and soil erosion control were explained. ZIRO has been achieved for the 10- and 25-year storm events.

The photometric plan was explained and discussed in detail.

Planning Department comments have been responded to today (23 comments) and we updated the plans to accommodate. We provided a letter document with responses, as well.

Mr. Andrews went back to the site plan. Scott Hesketh is here to talk to you about traffic and his assessment of the site. I did want to identify one quick item Louriero performed on this. We did a radius analysis essentially and evaluated the ability for a WB-53 truck (delivery truck for this fueling station). We be sure it could come in from the tight lane travelling east on 322 and if they are to turn in, make the turn, park here, unload with fuel and actually turn out and exit on to 322 in the same lane. We ran through that analysis and included a sketch on our site plan.

That concludes my work and I'd like to open the floor for Scott Hesketh.

Attorney James Ziogas brought up the sidewalk waiver. There are none in the area whatsoever so we are asking you to consider that waiver.

Secondly, regarding the sign modifications to the regulations discussed earlier in the evening and whether or not they are applicable to this application. More importantly, there is about a 24' buffer between the paved area of the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike to our property line and if our setback was another 20' from there, our sign would be 4' from the street which would be very difficult to see given the tree canopy. Explained it would be almost 40' from the travel portion of the road.

Discussion.

The Chair advised him to contact staff before the next meeting. Mr. Phillips said the new signage regulations would not be applicable to this application because it was in before they are effective. Under the proposed regulations, you could be as close as 10' behind the property line, so it would be 34' instead of 44'. There are situations like this and you may have to look at a variance because of the lot which is different than everywhere else.

Scott Hesketh, licensed engineer in the State of Connecticut with the firm of F.A. Hesketh & Associates. Our office is in East Granby, CT. We have submitted a traffic report in support of this application. (On file in the planning office for review.)

He reviewed the traffic report briefly but thoroughly. (Please refer to the video to hear the full presentation.)

Commissioners then asked questions, offered comments and suggestions to which Mr. Hesketh responded and discussed.

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

H. F & F Concrete, site plan application for 2,555 sf building addition, property located at 110 West Main Street, in an I-2 zone, SPR A#1774

The applicant has requested a table. Motion to table by Mr. Chaplinsky with a second by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

I. Release of \$7,800 E & S Bond, Dollar General, 2091 West Street (SPR #1743)

Ready for action. Motion to approve by Mr. Chaplinsky. Ms. Clock seconded.

Mr. Hammersley advised he was out there the other day and the detached sign looks like it is internally illuminated. If staff could take a look? Staff will investigate.

Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

J. Release of \$36,360 public improvement bond, Dollar General, 1724 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike (SPR #1733)

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

K. Release of \$1,700 Subdivision bond, Magnoli Enterprises, Loper Street (S#1300)

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

L. Release of \$7,200 E & S bond, Magnolia Enterprises, Loper Street (S #1300 and S#1305)

Ready for action. Motion to approve by Mr. Chaplinsky. Second by Mr. Hammersley. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked, on Loper Street, is it possible to have someone look at the connections and the patchwork that's there. It is the worst road in town right now! It is complete potholes. The Chair said the ground has to stop freezing first – mid to late April. Mr. Chaplinsky wanted it on the list now. The Chair asked that public works be contacted about this.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Open Space and Land Acquisition report.

Nothing to report.

8. ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- Rebecca & Brett Graham, special permit application for parent/grandparent apartment, property owned by Fral, LLC, located at 55 Fral Court in an R 20/25 zone (SPU #620), April 2

- JonNic Enterprises, LLC, special permit application for garage in excess of 3 spaces, property owned by Matt and Sue Milosz, located at 86 Lady Slipper Lane in an R-20/25 zone (SPU A#621) April 2

Both can be scheduled.

9. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

The Chair advised there may not be a meeting on April 16th due to a lack of quorum.

Only what is for public hearing.

Mr. Chaplinsky had a request: Can we follow up on the horse farm on Laning Street application? The dirt has to be cleaned up.

Discussion.

Mr. Grappone said it was brought up that there should be a paved surface up to the barn.

The Chair said they have to be a better job as that was a paramount concern of some of the neighbors. Get them in here and have them answer why it is not happening.

Mr. Phillips said he would ask staff but he was pretty sure they have a riprap apron. Mr. Lavallee has mentioned it. We may be on top of it but I'll check again.

Mr. Chaplinsky said for a longer-term discussion, he's like between this commission and staff to proactively talk to businesses on Queen Street and see if we can reach out and ask them to put cross easements on file. There are some real pinch points out there.

The Chic-Fil-A site was discussed.

Maybe some would be willing to do it sooner before an application in order to promote safer traffic and cross traffic between businesses. How do you feel about an initiative like that this year asked Mr. Chaplinsky. Mr. Phillips said he would take it into consideration but Lou Perillo at economic development may be in the best position to do that.

Discussion.

10. ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 o'clock, p.m.)