

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON

AUGUST 20, 2019

REVISED MINUTES

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and a regular meeting on Tuesday, August 20, 2019 at the John Weichsel Municipal Center Assembly Room, 196 North Main Street, Southington, CT. Michael DeSanto, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

The following Commissioners were in attendance:

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

(*Arrived at 7:06 where noted in the Minutes.)

Alternates: Peter Santago. Stuart Savelkoul & Val Guarino

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

Absent: Dagmara Scalise & Robert Hammersley, Commissioners
Joe Coviello, Alternate

The Chair seated Mr. Santago for Mr. Hammersley and Mr. Savelkoul for Ms. Scalise for this evenings meeting. Mr. Morelli will be arriving late and until he arrives, I will seat Mr. Guarino for him.

A quorum was determined.

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

MICHAEL DELSANTO, Chair, presiding:

Approval of Minutes

A. Regular meeting of July 16, 2019

Ms. Locks moved the motion for approval. Mr. Guarino seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Ms. Clock abstaining.

Public Hearing

(Minutes are prepared summary style. You may refer to the video on line to hear the full presentation on each item.)

Mr. Phillips read the legal notice into the record.

A. Nutmeg Companies, Inc., special permit application for the construction of a truck wash facility, property located at 1300 South Main Street, owned by ZPGroup, LLC, in B zone (SPU #623)

Passed until later in the agenda.

B. Pearl Loika-Garbiel, special permit application for a dog grooming salon with no boarding, property located at 550 North Main Street, owned by King Shamrock, LLC, in a B zone (SPU #624)

Pearl Garbiel, 178 (Inaudible) Street in Middletown with the business address of 550 North Main Street, applicant, explained she wanted to open up a dog grooming salon. This is a brand-new business. Just doing dogs and cats. No boarding, no daycare. Hours: 6:30 am to 6:00 pm, Tuesday thru Saturday – closed Sunday and Monday.

Mr. Phillips reminded the commission about the stipulation of soundproofing in accordance with the regulations. And, keeping noise to a minimum.

No work to be done outside the facility, all operations inside.

(Those speaking in favor of the application.)

1. Christy Labella, 73 Wells Drive North, Newington, CT spoke in favor indicating she had known the applicant for over 22 years and she had been dog grooming for 13 or 14 of those years. She's very experienced and has been training with professionals who have done show dogs and she has groomed my pets. She's good at what she does.

(Those speaking against the application.)

None.

The Chair closed this public hearing item.

C. New Hope Clinic, special permit application to add grooming services at an existing veterinary clinic, property located at 214 Canal Street, owned by Cusano Realty, in a I-2 zone (SPU #625)

The Chair announced at the beginning of the meeting that this item has been withdrawn.

Passed Item:

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to video on line to hear the full 80-minute presentation with full commentary by staff, commissioners and residents.)

A. Nutmeg Companies, Inc., special permit application for the construction of a truck wash facility, property located at 1300 South Main Street, owned by ZPGroup, LLC, in B zone (SPU #623)

Stephen Giudice, Harry Cole & Son, 876 South Main Street, presented on behalf of the applicant. He noted with Bob Godiksen from Nutmeg Companies, LLC and David Ford who is the owner of the property. We are here tonight for property located at 1300 South Main Street.

This known as Assessor's Map 41, Parcel 35. Its zoned B for Business. It's 4.09 acres. The property is relatively flat. It does slope slightly from the east to west and north to south. There is a wetland area to the rear of the property. The commuter lot is north and the bowling alley is to our south. Industrial property to the west. It encompasses the pavement in front of the bowling alley and the curb cut. It is vacant. Mostly wooded. It was cleared approximately 7 to 8 years ago but it's overgrown since that time. A good chunk of the property does lie within the 100-year flood zone.

He gave this history of this property's use and applications that were approved but never came to fruition.

We've looked at this property for many different owners from a drive thru coffee shop, dance studio, industrial condos, all different types of uses for this property but none of them came before the commission.

We are proposing tonight per Section 4-03.2B, a truck wash facility. (Showed site plan on the screen.)

With this proposal, our building is pretty much in a similar location to the previous buildings. Our detention is in a similar position as the previous application.

This application tonight is for 16,386 sf truck wash facility. The proposed building is 100 x 200 with a small office to the rear. Access will utilize the existing curb cut which is owned by the applicant. Vehicle circulation will run through the existing curb cut into the property, around and thru two bays: one is self-wash and the other will be fully automated. Then the vehicles will leave through the existing curb cut.

Parking area is proposed (indicating) for visitors and employees. The proposed building is served by public water and sewer. The sewer runs in front of the property that we would tie into and a water main exists here (indicating).

We have some floodplain activity on this site. There is a floodplain line here (indicating). It represents the 100-year flood elevation in its current state. Our proposal, per regulations, building I to be one foot above the flood zone. So, this building is proposed one foot above the flood zone and then the flood zone limits would be modified to go around the perimeter of the building and tie back into existing flood zone limits.

To compensate for this, we've modified the elevation of this area here (indicating) and we've also provided excavation to this area (indicating) for flood plain mitigation and for ZIRO mitigation. We are filling 120 cy of floodplain and our compensation is 600 cy, with 540 cy of that being or ZIRO.

The detention area was pointed out (indicating). Grass land swales are proposed and infiltration trenches along the perimeter of the parking areas to handle stormwater and reduce the impact to redevelopment rates for runoff.

We have landscaping proposed around the front and side of the building and along the --- request by the conservation commission to provide additional plantings along the side of the bowling alley building. We've incorporated appropriate landscaping plan with our set and we have a detailed erosion and sedimentation control and narrative for the development of this property to prevent erosion from any of the abutting wetland areas or into the abutting properties.

We received wetland approval at the last meeting. They felt this was an improvement over the previous approved plan and they did approve our request.

The site will have full cut off light fixtures mounted on the building. No pole lights throughout the parking lot are proposed.

Three storage tanks located in this grassy area (indicating) will be used to cycle water and collect oils and reuse what we can. These facilities reuse 80 to 90 percent of the water. Those tanks are pumped out as necessary.

A self-serve line and a full-service line.

Per regulation, this application requires a special permit and that's the purpose of this meeting. We did submit the appropriate paperwork and we notified abutting property owners. We have some considerations as we go through the process:

- Nature of the proposed use in its location will not have any detrimental effects on public health, safety, welfare, property values. It is our position this fits in with this area very well. Note the bowling alley, parking lot, bus terminal to the south and the highway access. A lot of vehicles using this will utilize the highway.

- Uses, buildings and structures are in harmony with the character of the surrounding properties. Our building is very similar to the building next door. (Showed a view on the screen.) It is a long metal building with masonry around the perimeter up to the water line (approximately) where we change the texture.

- Hours of operation are proposed at 6:00 am to 11:00 pm.

- Consider the suitability of the structure for the use. We believe this structure is suitable. It's specifically designed for this use. Seven days a week.

- Adequate street for use. South Main Street is a state highway and is more than adequate to handle the volume we're expecting. We've done an analysis on truck traffic for this use and we're estimating 42 trips per day. Peak hours would be 7 trips per peak hour. Peak hours don't generally fall within vehicle peak hours. Trucks will be traveling after general peak hours.

- That the lot, proposed buildings and structures are situated and are of sufficient size and adequate dimension to permit the normal operation of the use. We did our turning movements on this site to be sure the trucks can get in/out and can operate on the site. The building is specifically built for the use. We believe we meet that requirement.

- Adequate landscaping is a requirement and we've incorporated landscaping through the site, especially around the front of the property.

- Neighborhood compatibility. There is a residential home across the street from us (indicating). We have a lot of industrial uses, business uses, the bus terminal to the south and parking lot to the north. We view the site as compatible with the neighborhood for this proposal.

- The proposed use and building structures are designed and maintained in such a manner as not to impose unacceptable risk to aquifers or public water. Through our drainage design and our public sewers, we won't have any negative impact to the water supplies.

- Environmental protection and conservation is another concern. Again, through the stormwater management system are DEEP requirements for the permitting of this site. The wetland requirements, we believe we are in compliance with protecting the environment and concern of the areas.

- Adequate public utilities. There are public sewers and public water that service this property.

We have and adequate parking area and access.

Overall, we think that the application meets or exceeds the requirements of the zoning regulations. We've gone back and forth with staff. We have received a few small engineering comments this afternoon, relatively minor in nature and we don't see any issue addressing from our end.

This concludes our presentation and I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Giudice added there are no sidewalks here. There is a small section of frontage (indicating) and the rest of it is our pavement access. We would request a sidewalk waiver for that approximately 75 feet. Again, it is at the commission's discretion.

Mr. Guarino asked about the 40-some odd trucks a day. Is that based on the traffic study? Mr. Giudice explained they did an analysis of a similar facility to this in Milford which is owned by the municipality.

Discussion.

The highway access is only eastbound. Any trucks going westbound have to go down the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike pointed out Mr. Guarino. There is state road access to the highways added Mr. Giudice.

Discussion.

Mr. Guarino noted the plantings are getting better. But the spyaria (sp) you have to get rid of. Discussion.

Ms. Clock asked what the largest size truck is that will go through. Mr. Giudice responded a typical tractor trailer anywhere from 65 to 75 feet.

Discussion.

Robert Godiksen with Nutmeg Companies explained they'd be looking to do town trucks, school buses, tractor trailers and oil trucks, et cetera.

Discussion.

Discussion about the market the applicant is looking for with this application.

Mr. Grappone noted as a point of clarification, DEEP does discourage washing on lots. They encourage oil/water separators and a closed facility with recycled water as proposed. There is a general permit that even discourages residential washing on your own property. This is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Godiksen pointed out trench drains down both lanes that go into the recycling facility.

The municipal Norwich facility was described by Mr. Godiksen. He noted this one would be a privately-owned public facility.

Mr. Santago discussed the traffic impact of 42 tractor trailers a day with a house across the street and the Alzheimer's Center to the north. Outside of the noise and traffic generated by these things, how large is your facility? Mr. Godiksen said it is a fully insulated facility. It is 80' by 200' approximately. Aside from driving in and driving out, it's not loud at all. Mr. Santago pointed out this is increasing traffic from what is there today.

Discussion.

Mr. Giudice said 42 a day is not a huge number when you look at the traffic that is on Route 10.

(Those speaking in favor of this application)

Lou Perillo, Economic Director for the Town of Southington. This is a challenging site. Many have looked at it with a few approvals. It is large enough to accommodate this unique use on a difficult site. We understand the neighborhood concerns and we are not minimizing them. No matter where you put a truck wash in our town, you'll be affecting some residences.

This site was selected because of its proximity to the highway. It's adjacent to a bowling alley. There are residences nearby. There is a towing facility, the bus depot also adjacent.

It's a tough site, a tough call. Comments are well founded. Traffic count on this street is approximately 10,000 cars a day. The state has a truck wash in town but they won't let the town use it. Our town will probably build a truck wash for the highway department. The DEEP wants reclamation and what not for the sites.

Given the constraints of where to put a truck wash in town, this is one of the sites we deem appropriate. It's not an easy application. But looking at where it is located and it shares the driveway entrance with the bowling alley . . .

Hypothetic situations (Stop & Shop) about truck traffic in the past were discussed.

Traffic patterns were discussed.

I understand the feelings of the public, but this has the potential to bring in some decent revenue to the town. If the town can use the facility, perhaps we can save money on one end and get revenue on the other. It is my job to bring applications forward and it is your call.

In response to a query by Commissioner Savelkoul, the upside to the town economically is that it brings a venue into town that is unique. It is an opportunity to bring some business in. There is a safety aspect to having the trucks/cars cleaned. The bus depot to the east across the street, if they could use it. It's an opportunity. They chose to come to Southington and my job is to facilitate that request and we are here before you.

We think it is a decent use for the site. It's a very difficult site. They're building a 16,000-sf structure at a cost of about \$3 million. Bringing that in to the town, it's something that all taxpayers should have the right to see.

If I could pick a location in town not near a residence, I surely would. But I can't find one.

That's the task before you.

(Those speaking against the application.)

The following three speakers spoke against the application

1. Ron Albrycht, 207 Canal Street
2. Emily Fortier, 15 Burritt Street
3. Mr. Suhar, Old Turnpike Road.

Noting concerns with:

Traffic coming off the highway at Sliders, hitting the pole and wall at the end of Canal Street, getting under the bridge to get to Canal Street, diesel smell, sewers can't handle the water, Alzheimer's Center across the street, wetlands and the river backing up, chemicals getting into the river which goes to the ocean, dilution of the chemicals, possible traffic routes through Plantsville.

Residential lots in the area, truck volume, lack of formal truck study, lateness of 11:00 pm, lack of noise ordinance which would apply to jake brakes, speed of traffic on Burritt Street, speed and noise is a major concern and problem, walking trail and children nearby. No statement of water use. This is a more objectionable use than what it is zoned for. Preservation of trees over 4-inches in diameter, i.e.: big willow tree on the corner. Consider operating hours and maybe a noise ordinance for that area at a minimum in this residential area.

Pretty big building will stand out like a sore thumb. Clearcutting of the land, unreasonable loud disturbing noises from the trucks, diesel engines, big motors. Sixty-five feet long trucks going in there. Turning radius on Route 10 – they won't make it. Engine brake noise, jake brake noise, clutch brake noise disruptive to the neighborhood. Public health, comfort, safety, welfare and peace of quiet will be overwhelming in the area. Truck stop with idling trucks. Rest area open with exhaust blowing. Discussed cleaning out reef units with chemicals involved.

Problem with the uniformity of this in town. Are there employees to wash the trucks? Pollution from the diesel generator running the pressure washer.

Discussion and confirmation that notification was sent to abutters within 500 feet.

Traffic patterns for the trucks coming off 691 and don't take the correct left. Maybe no signage so trucks wandering around looking for it. Other areas for the truck wash were suggested: Where Pilot wanted to put a Truck Stop which would eliminate controversy at the truck stop now with congestion getting in and out and snow in the wintertime. Underground tanks maintenance.

(Rebuttal)

Mr. Giudice answered questions that were asked. Height of the building is 30 feet.

Mr. Godikson explained the process of cleaning the trucks with both the hand held and automated side. The tanks will be pumped once a month as they get full and they are taken to a facility that they have to confirm they've taken them where they have to go.

Three one thousand-gallon tanks underground.

We have one automated side and probably some sort of a crew to help and we have one hand held side and we haven't decided how many people they will have as staff. Most want to wash their own tucks.

Electric generator takes care of the water from the pressure washers.

No highway signs indicating Truck Wash over here.

Town water and town sewer.

Discussion of the Norwich facility, it's use, with no problems.

Queueing on site was discussed. Scheduling of use on the site was discussed.

We are more than willing to stipulate the end time to be 9:00 pm. We want to work with and not fight with the town.

Discussion of the cleaning process on the drive thru automated side.

On the hand held side, you can clean it how you want with electric pressure washers that don't make any noise.

Idling and queue was discussed.

Average time for a wash is under five minutes.

Clarification of the 42-truck estimate.

Turning radius for the trucks was discussed.

This has Inland Wetlands Commission approval.

Flooding of the parking lot was discussed.

Discussion of beefing up the plantings at the exit to shield any lights from the trucks as they come out of there. So, it doesn't hit the road or any building across the street. Mr. Giudice confirmed they would do that.

Discussion.

Modification of hours of operation from 6:00 am to 9:00pm is reasonable.

Discussion of a lot of other activity in this area with diesel engines, i.e. buses in the area. New Penn has a lot of trucks coming in and out of that area. We are hoping to capture some of that with this use. I don't think we are going to be pulling hundreds of trucks off the road, explained Mr. Giudice.

Suggested signage was discussed.

Mr. Giudice discussed the following:

Distance to the Alzheimer Center and Mulberry Gardens, the residential home across the street, Canal Street and Burritt Street homes which are in proximity. Our building is considerable in size and shape and will provide buffering to the neighbors to the south. And, I don't think we are going to have a detrimental affect on those property owners.

Discussion.

The pole and all at the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike is a problem. I don't know how we can help or fix that.

Discussion.

The water department is reviewing the application and we did receive comments from them. No concerns about the amount of water we are using.

We do need to get DEEP approval and one of their requirements is the recycling of water.

Discussion.

The clear-cut was done in about 2007-08. It's just overgrown since that time.

The tanks will be maintained by a vendor that will come in and take the sediment, oils and reused soaps and detergents and discharge of that in an appropriate manner. The vendor is monitored by the DEEP and their standards.

We are not anticipating tons of trucks queueing up in there. If we have a backup, there is room in the parking lot to have the trucks queue back to back or front to side. This is not a Truck Stop by any means.

The Chair left the public hearing open in order for further information to come in, if need be, and allows people to visit the site.

Continued to September 3rd, 2019.

Business Meeting

A. Nutmeg Companies, Inc., special permit application for the construction of a truck wash facility, property located at 1300 South Main Street, owned by ZPGroup, LLC, in B zone (SPU #623)

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

B. Nutmeg Companies, Inc., site plan application for the construction of a truck wash facility, property located at 1300 South Main Street, owned by ZP Group, LLC in a B zone (SPUR#1788)

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

C. Nutmeg Companies, Inc., floodplain filling application for the construction of a truck wash facility, property located at 1300 South Main Street, owned by ZP Group, LLC in a B zone (FF #264)

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

D. Pearl Loika-Garbiel, special permit application for a dog grooming salon with no boarding, property located at 550 North Main Street, owned by King Shamrock, LLC, in a B zone (SPU #624)

Mr. Phillips indicated this is ready for action with one comment by engineering. There are some catch basins that need to be cleaned out. These are property owner type of activities and this is a tenant applying for this. But if we can get that work done with a stipulation that the tenant speaks with the landlord to make sure the issue is addressed before we issue the CO.

Mr. Chaplinsky brought another tenant/property owner issue which is that this is in a B zone and it requires cross easements. On this property it seems appropriate to have them to the south to the auto repair shop next door. It is just the easement on the map and no connection is required at this time.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips suggested as stipulations that the applicant work with the property owner and the planning department to address those two issues: cleaning out the catch basins and cross easements.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with staff's suggested stipulations. He noted they should find an appropriate location to the south for the easement and have it added to the drawings. And, clean the catch basins. Mr. Grappone added the applicant work with the owner for an accessible space. Mr. Savelkoul seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.¹

E. Pearl Loika-Garbiel, site plan application for a dog grooming salon with no boarding, property located at 550 North Main Street, owned by King Shamrock, LLC, in a B zone (SPR #1789)

Ready for action as we just covered all issues under the special permit application. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve and Mr. Savelkoul seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

F. New Hope Clinic, special permit application to add grooming services at an existing veterinary clinic, property located at 214 Canal Street, owned by Cusano Realty, in a I-2 zone (SPU #625)

Item withdrawn.

G. Target Corporation, site plan application for staging area for approximately 50 storage containers to be used for interior and exterior improvements; and the installation of 12' solar powered internally illuminated drive up beacons near the entrance of the store for proposed drive up service 600 Executive Boulevard, in a B zone (SPR #1790)

Kevin Van Heiss, with Kimly Horn & Associates, engineers for Target Corporation presented the application.

We are here to discuss two things:

1. Temporary storage we are asking for permission to use while we do interior and some minor exterior renovations; and
2. Implementation of a drive-up program which requires minor restriping to the parking lot and installation of a solar powered beacon.

The staging area is part of the ongoing modernization program that is happening throughout the country and most of that work is done on the interior. Some is done on the exterior. In this case, the building will be painted, the existing sign that says: TARGET, will be removed and just the Bullseye will remain. And, an Order Pick Up sign will be placed.

It is not planned to be done during our busy season which is now until December. It's planned for March to June of 2020.

We have the required parking needed even with the reduction of the spaces for the temporary staging area.

The traffic flow as discussed noting the temporary storage containers primarily for the use of the contractor for his staging and equipment. Explained it is not for product to be sold but for construction items.

Discussion.

The drive-up program at Target was explained. If there is a beacon option, you can pull into the spaces noted and an employee will come and deliver the packages to your vehicle. We will repurpose six existing spaces into four. Two for the store employees for loading purposes.

Explained.

The beacon was explained. It is internally illuminated. The purpose is for you to see it and it is not casting light to light an area. The height 12' tall is so that in the event of a large truck or SUV parked adjacent to it, you can still see it. This signals this store has the technology in it. It is solar powered and only one beacon is proposed.

Discussion.

Mr. Phillips brought up the issue of a bond.

Mr. Chaplinsky said the bonding required was for temporary storage of retail material. This is construction material. It seems unlikely any company will want to keep storage containers in their parking for a long time. Mr. Phillips said he had no recommendation for a bond and you don't have to require a bond. Simply approving this within a timeframe to be removed by September 1, 2020.

Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve with the removal of the containers by September 1, 2020. Mr. Morelli seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

H. Release of \$25,200 public improvement bond, Connecticut Self-Storage, 1588 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike (SPR #1742.1) tabled from July 16

Mr. Phillips said this is ready for action as the signage issue has been resolved. Mr. Chaplinsky made a motion to approve which Ms. Clock seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

I. Wonx Road Partnership, LLC, request for 5-year extension for Hunter's Lane (S #1303)

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

J. GHIO Family Partnership, request for 5-year extension of site plan approval, 2004 West Street (SPR #1673)

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

K. Release of \$6,700 E & S bond, Underground Builders, Mastrianni Place (SPR #1353)

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

Administrative Items

A. Open Space and Land Acquisition Report

Mr. Chaplinsky advised the meeting was cancelled.

B. RCP Liaison Report

Mr. Hammersley not present, however, Mr. Phillips advised there was no meeting.

C. Heritage Committee Update

Ms. Clock advised there was no August meeting.

Items for Schedule for Public Hearing

A. Jason and Maria DeGumbia, special permit application for parent/grandparent apartment, property located at 537 Pleasant Street, in an R-20/25 zone (SPU #626) September 3 Schedule for September 3rd.

Receipt of New Applications

Mr. Phillips reviewed the new applications along with the public hearing item: 2-lot subdivision at 125 Jude Lane.

Other Items to Discuss

Mr. Chaplinsky advised he and Rob spoke before the meeting they have a report they have been working on looking at cross easement on West Street and Queen Street. There might be 25 items. The next step is to go through and note which cross easements would be appropriate in which areas. Staff will go through and prioritize them. Then they'll create a list and we can share that with the commission. Mr. Phillips also wanted to see if engineering could add, maybe beautify, some maps and make them digital. Also, staff has been working on reaching out to higher priority item and beginning a dialogue to get cross easements on the record; namely, Aldi's. Mr. Chaplinsky added it is positive progress.

It was noted that the town and Bertucci's are working together to try to come up with a plan to do what we need to do with the new tenant and try to bring forth a zoning permit and to prepare for the eventual widening of a lane extension off Spring Street. That is Phase 2 and we need funding. Not this year but long term. Something is going to happen there.

Mr. Phillips said there is very good news concerning the West Street Corridor Study. The scoping process has been laid out, generally. The next stage is that the Naugatuck Valley Council of Governments is the lead on this and they'll do an RFQ which may result in some refinement of the scope at that point. They will form a steering committee. The project looks to commence on November 1st of this year. It should take about 18 months to 2 years. Mr. Chaplinsky noted the good news is we will finally start the process. There will be informational meetings with one being in Southington, Plainville and Bristol. The town contribution was minimal.

Adjournment

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

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