

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

MAY 7, 2019

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a regular meeting on Tuesday, May 7, 2019 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DeSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

Jennifer Clock	Susan Locks
James Morelli	Dagmara Scalise
Paul Chaplinsky	Michael DeSanto, Chair

Alternates: Joe Coviello, Peter Santago, Stuart Savelkoul\* & Val Guarino

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

Absent: Robert Hammersley, Commissioner

The Chair seated Mr. Coviello for Mr. Hammersley for tonight's meeting. A quorum was determined.

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

(\*Arrived at 7:02 pm where noted in the Minutes.)

**MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:**

MINUTES

A. Regular Meeting of April 2, 2019

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

BUSINESS MEETING

A. Tilcon Connecticut, Inc., request for two year extension of Earth Excavation approval, West Queen Street and Welch Road, in an I-1 zone (EE 24.16)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates, represented the applicant. This property is on Welch Road and West Queen Street. It is an ongoing earth excavation for over 20 years. The truck routes are the same as always coming to Wet Queen Street, to the light and then heading to I-84.

The E & S bonds are in place. The amount of materials to be excavated is 100,000 cys and the proper erosion controls are noted and detailed on the plans.

Any questions? We will be asking for a renewal.

The Chair asked about stipulations of a couple of years ago to get something to the Town Planner? Mr. Bovino said to answer that there is a bond that they needed to have and I've just provided evidence of that. As to the spot grades on the map, on Sheet 4-A of the set, it shows all the spot grades of the property. Sheet 3 and 4 refers to 4-A for the details.

Mr. Phillips suggested if you look to approve this extension, we ask that the bond be extended for the full period of the approval. Two years out. It is going to expire in November of this year.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked the status of the activity. Mr. Bovino said it is shut down for the winter but it opens up in the spring and stays active through the summer. No activity on Saturday or Sunday and it is regular hours.

Discussion.

The primary route is from Lake Compounce, take a left on Welch and a quick left to the property. There is a gate.

This is ready for action noted Mr. Phillips. However the regulations require that no more than two acres of unstabilized area shall be exposed at any one time. Mr. Bovino said they were aware of that and are in compliance.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the town staff stipulation that the bond carry through the length of the extension. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

B. JD Solar Solutions, floodplain filling application for installation of solar field, 270- Spring Street, in an I-1 zone (FF #263)

Mr. Bovino represented the applicant. This property is at the corner of Graham Place and Spring Street. It has been in operation for many years. It's I-2 zone. It is 8.5 acres of property. The proposal is to install solar panels on the south side of the property. About a half -acre of grass area where we are going to install a solar panel. The panel rows are separated by 10 to 12 feet of space to allow for maintenance. The existing grass area will remain, not to be removed.

The panels are installed on concrete footings. These footings are not in the ground. They are above grade. This creates a displacement of water during the 100-year storm of about 150 cys. To compensate for that displacement, we are proposing an excavation of a small area on the north side of the parking lot for 170 cys of material which is 20 cys more than what we displaced.

The area will be seeded with a meadow mix.

We received wetlands approval and a favorable floodplain recommendation from the wetlands board. We have addressed staff comments.

Any questions?

This is all industrial on all sides noted Mr. Bovino in response to a question by Mr. Chaplinsky.

This is ready for action.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion a motion to approve. Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.

C. JD Solar Solutions, site plan application for installation of solar panel field, 270 Spring Street, in an I-1 zone (SPR 1776)

Sev Bovino represented the applicant. The same property and same proposal as the one before.

This is ready for action.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. John J. Roncaioli, floodplain filling application for a proposed addition to house, 62 Echo Valley road, in an R-20/25 Zone (FF #259) tabled from April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Phillips reported the applicant requested another table. They are still working with staff on revised plans.

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

E. GLS, LLC, floodplain filling application to construct a retail building & stormwater management facilities, property located at 2110 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in a B zone (FF #261) tabled from April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

George Andrews, from Louriero Engineering Associates out of Plainville, CT represented on behalf of the applicant.

During my previous presentation, I presented a background on the subject parcel located at 2110 Meriden Waterbury Road. I gave a summary of the proposed improvements and talked extensively about the stormwater management erosion and sedimentation control.

Subsequent to that we have made revisions to the plan. As I identified at the last meeting, we had some complications with FEMA. We had a LOMA (sp) application in with them and we were not in alignment with regard to the selected elevations. We were shooting for elevation 139 and they were shooting for 139.6.

Subsequently, we received a notice from FEMA and we adopted the 139.6 and we revised our plans accordingly to facilitate that elevation.

We reduced the building size from 47,055 sf to 33,041 square foot. That pulled it out of the rear floodplain.

We had a variance for a rear yard of 6 feet and we were actually able to bring that to 25 feet.

Those are some of the minor modifications made to the plan at this point.

We received staff comments from the town engineer dated April 1<sup>st</sup>. We responded in writing and presented that package to the town engineer, ass't town engineer and the ass't town planner. We also reviewed the changes to the plan with staff.

We did receive on question from a resident pertaining to a delivery truck and the lane selection we used. I showed it coming in from the west and the resident suggested the majority would be coming in from the east. I call attention to the fact it is a more difficult turn making a right turn in than a left turn in. We are maintaining the layout we have as there is plenty of room to come in from either side.

Secondly, we got a comment from the commission with regard to the lighting. I observed the lighting fixtures referenced and we'll go with the recessed design as included on our plans. You won't get the bright overflow to the roadway.

F. GLS, LLC site plan application to construct a retail building, property located at 2110 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in a B zone (SPR #1775), tabled from April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

The updated site plan shows very, very minimal changes. The building got a little bit smaller. We had 6 foot rear yard setback and we increased that to 25 feet. The building has an interesting configuration. Toward the rear of the building, we have an overhang that comes off of the back of the building and that overhangs the flood area. The flood elevation comes right up to the foundation. We have a 4.3 foot overhang that will house the coolers from the facility.

Beyond that, the general layout, parking and everything else short of the building size is the same as the original design presented a month ago.

Any questions?

James Ziogas, 104 Belleview Avenue, attorney, for the applicant, as well. Last time we were here we talked about a sidewalk waiver. We had a discussion. The sidewalks were not being show on the site plan at that time and they have been added. We are requesting a waiver be granted as there are no sidewalks in the area.

There were landscaping questions raised and those have been addressed on the landscaping plan.

If you have questions, George is here, I'm here and our architect Charles Nyberg is also here.

Charging stations on the plan were noted and discussed as being for an electric car.

Mr. Chaplinsky asked where the nearest sidewalk was. To the west of this there are some residential homes with interior sidewalks in the development but they don't come out to the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. What is the reason for the sidewalk waiver besides there being none in the area?

Mr. Andrews responded there are no specific site constraints short of the fact we have a culvert to the east of the subject site. There'd be no travel in that particular direction. There is also a culvert to the west that would complicate matters. There'd be a short section of sidewalk that would have no connectivity, certainly, to the east and west.

E. GLS, LLC, floodplain filling application to construct a retail building & stormwater management facilities, property located at 2110 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in a B zone (FF #261) tabled from April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

As to the floodplain filling, Mr. Phillips indicated it was ready for action.

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

Now, as to letter F: GLS, LLC site plan application to construct a retail building, property located at 2110 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, in a B zone (SPR #1775), tabled from April 2<sup>nd</sup>.

As to the sidewalk waiver, Mr. Chaplinsky asked about the property to the wooded property to the east, is that part of this parcel? It is stated owned.

Mr. Ziogas noted there is a 19 foot gap between the property line and the paved portion of the highway. If we put the sidewalk on our portion it would be a good 15 or 16 feet of grass and it seems sidewalks wouldn't work in that location. Mr. Chaplinsky was concerned there is a residential in the area and a little complex, Winterberry Woods, that has internal sidewalks and it is to the west of this. This is a convenience store and maybe local people will walk to the area.

Discussion.

Mr. Ziogas suggested a caveat for installation of sidewalks when at some point they are introduced into the area and the owner is then responsible to build the sidewalk. In the interim he is not required to build it. The caveat is placed on the land records so there is public notice of it.

Discussion.

The applicant indicated he would be offering that.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to deny the sidewalk waiver request with the caveat on the land records that it would be a deferral and if sidewalks are introduced on neighboring property, the owner will provide sidewalks. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Mr. Phillips advised that signage is not part of the approval. They submitted a rendering, but we don't typically do that. The applicant's representatives understood that.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with staff's comments and also carrying the same language in that it is a deferral for installation until an adjacent sidewalk should be installed to the property. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Maier Properties, LLC, floodplain filling application to construct a new house, driveway & septic system, property located at Parcel C, 221 East Street, in an R-20/25 zone (FF #234.1)

Stephen Giudice, with the office of Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, Plantsville, represented the applicant.

We presented this at the last meeting. This application is for a single lot, floodplain filling. We were proposing to fill this small area (indicating) for a driveway installation. We are compensating with an additional area in the back. We have about 17 cy of disturbance and about 45 cy of compensation. We're more than doubling floodplain storage on the site.

This plan had been approved by wetlands a few years back and we decided to bring it back to life after meeting with staff. They did give us a favorable recommendation for the floodplain filling.

The discussion last time was about the septic system for the adjacent property. It was brought up there was a system that had been previously connected to this house (indicating) and had been disconnected prior to the current property owner. We didn't have information on that at the time.

Since then, we talked with the health department to get information that we needed. As to the septic system, the director of health has been speaking with the property owner for about a year now. Making suggestions and recommendations. There had been a letter to the previous owner about this system and the fact it was not on the property and the recommendation was to abandon.

After effort, the applicant did have conversations with the property owner. We talked about helping her as she's having issues with the septic in the back. We thought disconnection of this is putting too much pressure on that one. We talked about moving the system to the front of the house and working with her to install a septic system in that area. It's not a blank check from the applicant but there is an effort to help her and work with her to install that system while the house is under construction and the system on our property is being installed, as well. Much more cost effective.

Discussion.

Today we talked with staff about providing sewers for both of these two houses.  
Discussion.

We are working in earnest with the homeowner to resolve the issue and we are moving in a positive direction.

Any questions, more than happy to answer them.

Mr. Chaplinsky thanked Mr. Giudice for having the dialogue. That's the important part. I trust you guys will work together to correct things. It is the right thing to do and I trust you will do the right thing.

This is ready for action.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

H. Request for 5 year extension of site plan approval to allow completion of Phase 2, 963 Queen Street (SPR #1563)

This is ready for action.

Mr. Bovino advised this property right before the light at River Street. To the right there is a beautiful office building with a beautiful clock and grass well maintained in the front. This was a two phase project and that was phase one.

Phase two is an attached section which is about 4500 sf of additional office space at the rear of the building. Utilizes the existing parking lot plus additional parking will be provided.

This owned by the Putnam Family. Served by water and sewer. Sidewalks are in.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to grant a 5-year extension.

Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. Open Space and Land Acquisition Report

Meeting was cancelled.

B. RPC Liaison Report

Mr. Hammersley is not here tonight.

Mr. Phillips reported there is a new appendix to the standard section for the construction of subdivision roads. It just updating this graphic and adding a note having to do with the grading plan that hopefully resolve some issues with water drainage over roads that don't quite come in flush to the existing road as far as topography. That was at the recommendation of engineering.

#### ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Nothing to report.

#### RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

All four were on tonight's agenda.

## COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Mr. Chaplinsky had three small items:

- Loper Street is a mess. We've got to either repave it patch it. There is a lot of patch work that needs to be done. There are holes, large connections. I'd like to know where is that on the list? Can we get it done this year?

Both up and down the hill.

- Cross easements and trying to schedule a meeting with economic development: Mr. Phillips spoke to Lou at 2:00 pm and we're coming up with a plan. We need to have some engineering advice on this, as well. We're working on. Important thing would be to identify some of the low hanging fruit in terms of what really needs a connection, if we could prioritize that.

If we have to get deeds, that'll take some time.

- West Street Corridor email overview was given by Mr. Phillips. There is a scoping exercise going on right now between the towns of Bristol, Southington and the State of Connecticut and the Naugatuck Valley and Capital Region of Governments. Engineering looked at the scope as did I and we sent to you previously.

We had a revised scope come in on comments received. I believe at this point in time the state is looking at it now.

The timing could be as early as this summer, over the course of a full year, to line this up and find the consultants.

The Chair wanted to be sure Southington wasn't lost in the shuffle. It sounds like it is Bristol's initiative and let's just throw Southington in. I want to make sure we're on the forefront and we have a voice.

Mr. Phillips advised they are going to create a steering advisory committee with representatives of the towns, the state and citizens. Mr. Chaplinsky expressed interest in being on it.

Mr. Chaplinsky said Bristol brought it forward but at the CCROG level and the state level we've been making aware we've wanted to get involved in something like this should the opportunity come up. I don't think this is totally Bristol. The Chair said he felt like we were piggybacking. Mr. Phillips said it makes sense from a logistical standpoint. The Chair just wanted to be sure we are represented.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 7:46 o'clock, p.m.)