

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
TOWN OF SOUTHTON  
OCTOBER 6, 2020

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and regular meeting on Tuesday, October 6, 2020 via WebEx teleconference. Robert Hammersley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:03 pm.

The following participated:

Robert Salka, Jeff Gworek, Susan Locks, James Macchia, Christina Volpe & Peter Santago

Alternates: Theresa Albanese, Joe Coviello & Caleb Cowles

Absent: Stuart Savelkoul

Staff:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development

James Grappone, Ass't Town Engineer

A quorum was determined.

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

A Moment of Silent Reflection was observed by everyone.

ROBERT HAMMERSLEY, Chair, presiding:

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Regular meeting of September 15, 2020

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve the Minutes. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

A. Special Permit Application of Eleni Real Estate, LLC for two buildings on one lot, property located at 1615 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPU #639), continued from September 15

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates, representing the applicant at 1615 West Street for a special permit use for two buildings on one site, stated on behalf of his client, he is officially requesting an extension of the public hearing for 65 days total as allowed by the regulations.

I'll answer any questions.

Mr. Phillips advised that would be extended all the way out to the December 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

(Those wishing to speak in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those wishing to speak in opposition to the application)

No response.

Without objection, the Chair left the hearing open per the request of the applicant.

(MINUTES ARE PREPARED SUMMARY STYLE AND YOU MAY REFER TO THE ON LINE POSTING TO HEAR THE FULL 42-MINUTE DISCUSSION.)

B. Robert Agro, Special Permit application to build a garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 30 Blueberry Lane, in an R-20/25 zone, parcel size .59 acres (SPU #640)

The Chair asked the applicant to explain his application. Mr. Agro said his wife's SUV fits in the garage but he cannot get his truck in the garage because the trucks are bigger than they used to be. It I a double door garage instead of separate doors. So, I am looking to build a garage to put my truck in and work on my lawn equipment and snow equipment inside whenever I want to take care of them. I have a shed, but I can't tune them up, do an oil change or change the blades. I'm looking to have extra room. To pull my truck in, mainly.

Presently, I have one garage with the big door and you can't fit an SUV and a truck in that garage. Plus, you can't close the door. I want to put a two-car garage, oversized, to drive my truck in.

Commissioners questions:

Mr. Santago asked with regards to the garage, is it simply for private use or are you going to operate a business out of that, as well? Mr. Agro said no business. My own personal use. I used to have a Camaro and I may buy another one to try to fix it up. So, I'll have extra space for another desire. I'm not sure.

Mr. Santago continued he went by the other day and it is a pretty small lot. A garage add-on back there, there is not much more room on that lot. I think if something was to be built on that lot, you could probably see it from Meriden Avenue on the back, let alone Blueberry. I understand some consternation with it.

In terms of the construction of the garage, all we have is kind of rudimentary drawing of it, your house is brick, correct? Mr. Agro said yes. So, is the garage going to brick, as well? What're you planning on doing in regards to what you are putting there? Mr. Agro said he may end up having it brick depending on the cost. Right now, I was going to have it sided. I can't see the house from Meriden Avenue when I come by. Mr. Santago said he could see it when he drove by.

That is a pretty big garage on a pretty small lot observed Mr. Santago. It is concerning in regards to the rest of the neighborhood which has some pretty good density. To put another structure like that there, I don't know, it is pretty tight over there. I can understand it not being in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood.

Mr. Agro said you can come down the driveway and walk to the back of the lot, it is a long walk. I mean, 26' off the garage I have.

Ms. Locks said her questions had been asked/answered.

Mr. Gworek had the following questions:

- The planning department said all detached garages should be constructed with the same exterior building materials. I take that as they need to be, they must be. Mr. Phillips responded the interpretation of matching the principle structure is in the wheelhouse of the PZC. We do our best as staff to make sure it is of similar nature, but at the end of the day, the buck stops with the PZC on what you believe is consistent with being similar to the principle structure.

Mr. Gworek noted it is all brick, a very nice-looking house and I think it would look weird to have a vinyl sided or wood sided or any kind of siding detached structure go up next to a beautiful brick house. That's a concern of mine.

- Also, I read through the letter submitted by the neighbor with concerns about his fence and your driveway being up against the fence and trailers being moved in/out. If you get the detached garage, it is going to be situated pretty close to the house, do you plan on moving trailers in/out further back in your driveway? Are there concerns about hitting the fence again? Can you describe what is going on back there?

Mr. Agro said one time he was backing in and he actually hit his fence and I said I would repair it. He said not to worry as it has been hit before by the previous owner. I haven't hit in almost 2 years since I've been there. It is not going to be any further back --- his house goes way further back on the lot than the garage is going to be off of the other garage. It is not going to extend further than his house.

- Also, the shed in the back is 20 by 12 foot. When was that put in? Mr. Agro said two or three months ago. It's in the proper location. I submitted to zoning and it is off the back fence and the side fences in the middle of the yard. I store by stuff in there so it is not in the garage. Rakes and yard equipment in there.

- How close is the detached garage going to be to the house? Mr. Agro said probably 33 feet from it. A little bit of a walkway between them.

- If any, will it affect current windows and doors on the current garage? Mr. Agro responded there is a window and a door in the back going out to the patio. The window would be looking out at the new garage.

- What is the height of the proposed detached garage? Mr. Agro said he didn't have the information with him. It's at the shop. It is not going to be higher than the house. The peak should be with the peak of the other house. This property is too nice to devalue it by putting something that is sloppy. My yard is mint all the time.

- You submitted for a 26 by 26-foot garage, detached. It goes over the allowed 1,092 for a three-car garage. Can you make do with a smaller one, 22 by 22, which would fit you within the regulation? That would get you under the size regulation. Mr. Agro is concerned about the truck and the garage. They're so long. I don't want to be squeezed between the wall. I want to put a work bench to change the oil, air filters in the car when I need to. I can't do it in the other garage it is so tight.

- Are the overhead doors 9 by 7 feet? Mr. Agro said he submitted the plan and he doesn't have it in front of him. Mr. Gworek mentioned the width of the door being wide enough to fit the truck in. Mr. Agro said he hoped so.

Mr. Macchio had no questions.

Mr. Cowles brought up one point mentioned in the letter of opposition about the applicant's existing business and some carry over that might happen between the business and the home. I'm concerned about when the applicant wants to retire from his retail space, a lot of that work might be done in the huge shed and a pretty big garage we are potentially permit. Can we get some assurances about those concern? Mr. Agro responded he is retiring and he has health issues. If I decide to work, I am going to stay there at his work and he is not going to bring the work home. I'm trying to sell the business. It will be left there, not here.

Mr. Coviello had no additional questions.

Ms. Volpe echoed concerns over the make up of the building. With a beautiful brick house, I would hate to see mixed materials on the parcel. That would probably at some point diminish its value when people looking at it would see the mixed materials like that.

I question if we might be able to work with the size to get it within the regulations and if the applicant would be willing to work with us on that I would feel more comfortable approving this. Mr. Agro said he could go 24 by 26. The 22 is not going to give me enough room to put a truck in there. The 26-foot-deep is the main thing I need. Explained he would never do anything to devalue his property.

Ms. Volpe just clarified seeing the brick and then a timber or vinyl structure, she worried about how it would look, since it has been mentioned you can see it from Meriden Avenue. I just wanted to bring that to everyone's attention.

Ms. Albanese had no questions.

Mr. Salka noted in looking at the layout on the drawing we have, my question would be --- I drove out there today and looking at the property from Blueberry Lane, the shed in the back, it doesn't seem to be positioned the way that the shed is actually positioned on the property itself. I'm concerned about not having all the dimensions of where this is going to go, showing the house and the distance from the house to the garage. Where is the driveway going to go? When you look at the property on the left-hand side, the property line, the letter of opposition noted it slopes down toward the property on the left. The water runs off the driveway into their property. I think we need more information such as dimensions, where the driveway is going to go and properly place that shed on the property. The shed is truly straight away from the back of the house and he has it tilted on the drawing. What are the dimensions and is it positioned properly?

Mr. Agro confirmed the shed is properly placed. I put it straight in. The driveway is going to go straight from where it is and the garage is going to the right of it. The garage is not going to be an infringement on the gentleman next door and worrying about his property. The driveway is going to go straight back. Not anywhere near his property.

Mr. Salka restated he didn't think there was enough information here. It might be brick; it might not be. I don't see where the driveway is going to go. I hear what the applicant is saying. I would like to see more detail on this layout before I would approve this size on this property.

Discussion.

The Chair clarified the commission is asking for more detail than what we have right now which appears to be a hand drawn rendering. Maybe it can include remeasuring the sizes and get some distances more firm than on the drawing we have. Mr. Agro said he would redraw it the way you want.

Discussion.

Mr. Agro said he would redraw it extending the driveway back 30 feet, the 3 feet in between the garage and the new one, and the 26 from the new driveway back to the right side. The left side is not hindered. The Chair said any approval on the application goes with the property. Regardless of what you say to us here, when you sell the property, we have to make sure it is done in a manner considerate with the other abutting property owners and citizens in town.

Discussion.

Mr. Agro explained what he is going to put up here is going to be an asset to the property and not a deterrent.

Discussion.

(Those wishing to speak in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those wishing to speak in opposition to the application)

Eric Gherkin, 23 Blueberry Lane, next door neighbor spoke in opposition. Also, a letter was submitted on file in opposition. There are drainage issues which he explained. One thing concerning to me is the additional driveway to be put in which causes more drainage.

Discussion on the drainage issues he is facing. Ponding and streaming were discussed. No washaway. Grass is well established and maintained.

Besides the lamp posts and things in the street, it is a very tight area. And, the size of the garage, it is a big structure for the back yard.

Mr. Gworek asked the applicant:

- Did you put any thought into actually having attaching the garage to the house and meeting the current roofline and doing it all in brick? Mr. Agro said tying the existing roof into a new

roof is kind of expensive. Making it one structure. I looked into that but separating it two or three feet is no problem. You don't have to cut into it, which really is an expense.

I've been here 2.5 years and nobody has ever said anything about water. I would make the water taper so it goes down my driveway and not towards is property. I had no idea about the water.

The Chair explained additional information is being requested, so we will leave the public hearing open. The next meeting is on October 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Santago encouraged the applicant to speak to the neighbors to resolve neighborly things before coming to us. It would be good if Mr. Agro could have conversations with his neighbors and explain what he wanted to do. He just discovered about the water. When he comes back, that perhaps would enter into whatever proposal he is going to come before us with and he could more fully explain what his happening. I encourage him to speak with his neighbors and report back on that next time.

Discussion.

Mr. Salka asked the applicant, if he has any questions about what is being requested, to speak with Rob Phillips so when he comes back, he has everything he needs and doesn't waste his time.

Discussion.

On the drawing: extension of the driveway, size and placement of the garage, the structures including the shed. Show where the house is in relationship to shed. We can look at it and see how it all fits and exactly what we're talking about.

Public hearing continued to October 20<sup>th</sup>.

## BUSINESS MEETING

A. Special Permit Application of Eleni Real Estate, LLC for two buildings on one lot, property located at 1615 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPU #639), continued from September 15

AND

B. Eleni Real Estate, LLC, site plan modification application for a two-story office/retail building, property located at 1615 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPR#1802), tabled from September 15

Mr. Salka made a motion to table Items A & B. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Discussion about approving the 65-day extension requested.

Mr. Salka modified his motion to include the 65-day extension on SPU #639 and SPR #1802. Mr. Santago seconded the revised motion. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

65-day extension granted to Items A & B under the Business Meeting.

C. Application of Briarwood Real Estate Limited Partnership to change the zoning district from R-40 to Age Restricted Cluster Housing Zone (ARCHZ), property located at 2279 Mount Vernon Road, parcel size 32.75 acres (ZC #567), tabled from September 15

Mr. Salka made a motion to get it out of the table to have discussion and vote on it. I'll make a motion to we approve ZC#567 with an effective date of October 20, 2020.

Clarification of the motion: Mr. Salka restated his motion: Motion to approve ZC 567 with an effective date of October 20,2020.

Mr. Gworek asked why the delayed effective date. Mr. Salka said it was a recommendation of the planning department so we can set a time line when it would actually become effective. Because of the paperwork, et cetera, it'll take that time to get it in place. That's why October 20<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Phillips said the effective date has to be after the publication of the notice, the Notice of Decision. Typically, it is recommended 15 days after that. At the last one, because of the 2020 digital stuff, we didn't have an effective date. We just called it effective upon publication. Ideally, you should have an effective date after the publication of the notice.

Mr. Gworek seconded the motion by Mr. Salka.

Discussion:

Mr. Santago stated Mr. Terwilliger has been upfront with us. He came and worked with the town to try to get a school there and that didn't work. He wanted to put businesses there and with opposition from the public he said he wouldn't do it. I appreciate him saying he is not putting 28 houses there but he would rather do this ARCHZ thing with green space and the like. Then he said he could also do something with even greater density which shouldn't play into what we are talking about because we have to rule on things as they are versus would could be or what we would want. That's a struggle.

This is just the zone change. Last time, we had some issue with the site plan and the density and some of those things. That's part of the next discussion if the zone change is approved.

I'd feel better with sewers and not septic. I'm always concerned about health and the kind of septic systems we have there. It is what it is.

I like to have the green space aspect which we wouldn't get with anything else. I think this has the potential to be a really, really good-looking development if done correctly. The folks at North Ridge talked about the amenities they wanted to have. That would be a site plan discussion.

I think some of the concerns are more site plan related versus the zone change. I don't want that to influence this particular discussion. That can happen when we do get to a site plan application.

Mr. Gworek echoed those sentiments, most of my issues would come up with the site plan, especially the green space. There was discussion about having more active green space, walking trails, et cetera. Activities for those in that community would be nice. More site plan review related.

I think the 28 single houses might just be as disastrous. It might be an unused lot for a long time to find that developer to do that.

Tough call, but I think this fits the need for the area and for Southington. I am in favor of this as proposed.

Ms. Locks felt the same way. More concerned about the site plan for the green space, et cetera. I'm okay with the zone change.

Mr. Macchio echoed the comments. No problem with the zone change. My concerns would be in the site plan and mainly with the green space. Having the sewers looked at. I'm good with making the zone change right now.

Ms. Albanese echoed fellow commissioners' comments. I want to take a good hard look at the site plan for concerns brought up during the public hearing. What's presented to us so far, seems to be the best fit at this point. I am in favor of the zone change, as well.

Mr. Cowles noted something has to happen on this property. My comment is towards the zone change and not what comes after that. Reflecting on the letter sent by the health department for the septic systems analysis indicating there was no soil testing. It is age restricted, but it is also cluster housing. We are looking at increased density without even knowing if that density can be satisfied by the septic systems for the units. That's my big concern. I don't know if it will work because of what the health department's concerns are. Lack of data for the soil analysis is an issue. If you said we did perc testing, we know the soils will be able to maintain the density, then it would be a good idea. I don't know if it necessarily works.

Mr. Coviello didn't know if there was a perfect option for this land. Of the things presented, this certainly seems the most feasible and I would support the zone change. Septic is something we should take a hard look at. Is that a site plan issue or should it be considered here? Once we make the change to greater density, it's pretty much a done deal. I suspect we would align that to some regulation once this is ready to be built.

Mr. Phillips said because this is one single site and there are going to be multiple septic systems on this site, it's considered a community septic system which is under the jurisdiction of either the Department of Public Health or the State DEEP depending on the threshold of total flow. Either way, it's not something subject to the local Plainville-Southington Health Department.

Ms. Volpe echoed what everyone was saying. She is concerned about the site plan. Talking about the zone change for this area, when we think of age restricted cluster housing, we know the kind of cohort that is going to be going there. I do wonder if this area is appropriate for that understanding about how removed it is from grocery stores, hospitals, convenience stores. Explained the distance involved for this cohort.

I want to echo public concerns regarding the neighborhood feel and character of this area of town and some of their skepticism in how this development would conform to the character of their community going on there. We've talked about density, but I want to remind you that this is a cluster housing zone. There is going to be density regardless. Hopefully, there will be more of an emphasis on open and green space as cluster housing was conceptualized to preserve and accentuate natural resources.

When we discuss the age restricted cluster housing, is it going to fit and benefit the lives of those that are going to live there? To do the zone change, it allows for cluster housing in this area for elderly people who may not be able to access their resources in a timely manner and who may not conform with the neighborhood. Further, part of the ARCHZ for our benefit in town, is per our regulations, says this needs to conform to natural spaces. We heard from the Forestville Fishing Club last time they have this incredible space back there.

I am not in disagreement that something needs to happen with this land. I am not in disagreement with cluster housing on this parcel. But I am just concerned we are not conforming to the purpose of the zone change if we are not putting more of an emphasis on the natural landscape there.  
Discussion.

While we may not know what to do with this space, is it is not reason enough to approve any change to a space just because.

Age restricted cluster housing really should be to the benefit sustainably for years to come. There is not a grocery store or hospital near there. I wonder if we're not segregating an aged community on Mount Vernon Road. Where are the activities? It's going to be very much in this area where they can't walk to other places, be near other people and that is the point of this zone per the regulations and the POCD.

Just because this is our only option, does that mean that we approve it?

Mr. Salka echoed other comments by the commissioners. But my concern is what happens to that property? It is not going to sit here vacant. Something is going to happen. The 28 houses are not probably a viable option as stated by the applicant. I believe it does fit in with the POCD. I think it is a valid option for us to approve this application.

The Chair added in deciding the appropriate use for this parcel, something is going to happen there. I think this provides clarity to it and this is an option that is consistent with the POCD which calls for additional housing for an aging population. When this zone was developed, part of the logic behind it and the hope behind it is achieved by this application and that is to provide for greater density and the trade off being (1) increase the number of affordable units you have for this population which is a requirement (10%) within the regulations and (2) additional open space. We get that here as well.

Layout is a site plan discussion we'll have later on if this is approved. This is the best we can hope for. The use as a college just isn't there. With that, this is the best use, it's consistent with the regulation and the POCD. For those reasons I'm supportive of it.

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

D. Robert Agro, Special Permit application to build a garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 30 Blueberry Lane, in an R-20/25 zone, parcel size .59 acres (SPU #640)

Mr. Salka made a motion to table SPU #640. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

E. Ingriselli Carpentry, LLC, site plan modification application to construct 32 x 24 garage, property located at 211 North Main Street (Dellavecchia Funeral Home), property owned by SCI Funeral Services of Florida, LLC, located in an RO zone, parcel size .63 acres (SPR #1803).

The applicant's representative, Ron Ingriselli, was unable to get on the meeting at this time.

(Pause, pause)

Mr. Phillips gave a brief overview. He shared the screen with the site plan proposal. The proposed garage in this location (indicating). There was a single-family home over here which they tore down. The proposal is put in an attached garage to the existing building, presumably to store the limo/hearses and create an employee parking area on this side over here (indicating). It has access to the existing parking on this side (indicating). It looks like they're going to continue to utilize the existing driveway here on to North Main Street.

Discussion on whether or not Mr. Phillips could answer commissioners' questions on this application. Mr. Phillips said if the applicant is not able to answer, he can't speak for them.

(Waiting for Mr. Ingriselli to get on the meeting.)

The Chair asked for a motion to move out of the Agenda while Mr. Ingriselli figures it out.

Mr. Salka made a motion to move Items F & G forward in front of Item E. Ms. Volpe seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

F. Release of \$3,700 E & S bond, 336 Savage Street (S#1304)

Mr. Grappone indicated it was ready for action. These are frontage lots developed by Mr. Denorfia and all lots have been built upon.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve S #1304. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

G. Release of \$5,000 E & S bond, 474 North Main Street (SPR #1746)

Mr. Grappone indicated it was ready for action. This is the Modern Formal site. They did an excellent job in renovating the site. It is complete and ready for action.

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Returning to Item 8-E. Ingriselli Carpentry, LLC, site plan modification application to construct 32 x 24 garage, property located at 211 North Main Street (Dellavecchia Funeral Home), property owned by SCI Funeral Services of Florida, LLC, located in an RO zone, parcel size .63 acres (SPR #1803).

(Pause, pause)

Ron Ingriselli represented the applicant. The plan is to build a three-car garage on the side of the building there mainly to access the entrance into the building where they bring the bodies in. Where they'll have a little bit more privacy. They want to keep the hearse there and a couple of other vehicles. The garage is attached to the current structure.

Commissioners questions:

- Ms. Locks asked about the driveway going out to the main road. How will the cars be circling in and out of there? Mr. Ingriselli said the driveway from North Main Street is going to be for employees, only. Everybody else will use Hobart Street.

- Mr. Gworek said that was his question.

- Mr. Macchio had no questions.

- Mr. Cowles asked if there was going to be any new walls or curbing along the driveway that goes into the employee parking area and is there going to be signage that indicates it is parking for employees only in that area? And, you are going to be able to drive from the main parking area into that lot from east to west? You'll be able to pass through the main parking area to the employee space down Route 10? Mr. Ingriselli said it is possible. There will be signage: For Employees, Only. And, there is a parking lot there now for employees.

- Mr. Coviello had nothing to ask.

- Ms. Volpe had no questions further.

- Ms. Albanese noted everything is being built on existing improved area. My question is, will there be any bedrock removal or any kind of earth movement? Mr. Ingriselli said only where the garage is going, where the foundation is going. We're hoping there is no bedrock in that location.

Discussion.

- Mr. Santago asked about the big boulder that's there. You are going to put the garage right after that? You're keeping the big boulder there? Mr. Ingriselli said a long time ago when they did work there, they asked about removing that and I was told if they tried to remove that, they might upset the whole building, by blasting it. It has to stay. We are away from it so we won't be dealing with it. The garage has three bays. The first garage will go right into where the door is now.

- Mr. Salka had no additional questions.

- The Chair was all set.

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve and Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

## ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

### \* Discussion – Regulation Review Committee

Mr. Santiago advised the committee met yesterday and Rob has a start to add a little more clarity to the regulations. He has put together a table starting with residential zoning so the regulations are easier to read. Mr. Phillips showed what the current regulations are. Section 3, residential zone requirements with a long listing of different zones and a lot of language. The way this is designed is that everything builds off of R-80 and R-40. As you move to denser zones, you refer back to previous zones that are less dense. You are constantly flipping pages. The public can't follow this and we get questions all the time. Cumbersome.

My thought was to do this: Create a table where we start with R-80 and R-40 and we have the same exact language in the entire regulations. There is a lot of language within the uses of the regulations. We highlight exactly what the use is, so it is easy find when looking through the regulations. Then you can see the rest of the requirements.

Not only that, but you actually create a pathway of zoning permit, site plan review, special permit and special exception pathway that is very easy to follow. You find your use and then you can see the process you need to go through.

R-20/25 builds upon or refers back to every use that is allowable either by site plan, zoning permit or special permit and it builds on another use. Each section we go through all the way down to R-12, same thing.

Then we go to residential office zone and it builds upon the previous zone where other uses were allowed.

There are specific zones that are pretty technical, such as the open space residential design for subdivisions, age restricted cluster housing zoning regulations and those obviously are so specific they really don't constitute an opportunity to put them in the table.

This might be useful for the residential section. My thought was we could take this and repeal what we have already and replace it with the table. We want to see if you guys support this.

The Chair asked when you said repeal what we have right now and replace it with a table format? Mr. Phillips responded that all it does is it takes the exact same language for the uses and it just replaces it in a table doing away with some of the qualifying language that really is unnecessary.

Ms. Volpe asked for a sample to be sent to us so we can how comfortable it is to scroll the word document and read it, et cetera. Mr. Phillips said he would send out the existing and the proposed table for your review for that section for the next meeting.

Mr. Santiago said we should look at it, go side to side. Before we start reviewing what the regulations say, is the language okay, is to try to get to the foundation stuff first which is is it easy to read? Is there duplication? Is it consistent? That kind of thing. Making it a little more clear. We don't expect a vote on it this evening, you have to take a look at it. Do we want a format change in terms of presentation, only? No words are being changed. It's just how the words are presented in a more

definable way. If you can incorporate what you need to do as part of that, that's kind the idea there to simplify matters a little bit. A lot of towns do it that way.

The Chair said we should look at this and do a side by side comparison to see how this compares to what we have on the books.

Mr. Santago said we also talked about – last time we had the big sheet of every change to the regulations since the 60's. And, we talked to Rob about making that a little more sortable. To do that with both date and regulation, we gave Rob some ideas to do that. Hopefully, when that is done it can perhaps be an index within the regulations that can be sorted and referenced, as well.

When we get together next time, we are going to be looking at definitions and that section to see if the definitions make sense and if what's there again is consistent. Going step by step to get the foundational stuff done first before delving into things.

We had some ideas about somethings in addition to looking at regs that he suggested we may want to look at. Rob said FEMA has some new requirements for their floodplain management regulations that they hold authority no matter what, but we really align our regulations with their most recent update. That's boilerplate and should be done sooner than later.

Window signs: The discussion around here was to maybe have an exception or allowance for certain percentage of window signage up to maybe 25%. Some of the cities and municipalities that have more commercial type development do have to allow certain window signage percentages. It is something we don't have right now. We are constantly dealing with enforcement issues with window signage. The thought is maybe to consider a percentage (15, 20 or 25 percent).

As far as small farms sustainable regulations, we do have a couple of existing micro farms and they're providing some of the farm to table produce that some of you may have eaten at local restaurants. Unfortunately, our regs only allow an established farm to be 3 acres or more and it presents a potential problem and I think that through the sustainable regulations the Capital Regional Council of Governments has put together before in a report there is definitely some opportunity here to be more farm friendly in Southington. Allow situations where you are doing farm produce on smaller lots. Our regulations are permissive by nature. If we don't allow something specifically, literally it is prohibited. We need to be able to put regulations in place to allow for things that we want to promote and that's what this small farm thing would be.

Access management modifications. The way our easement language for site plans between adjacent properties reads is a little bit funky. It probably needs an improvement. We talked about working with local consultants and trying to make sure we can put something together that is actually feasible, prudent and actually works.

Those are the four low hanging fruit at this time as far as regulation modification that should be considered.

Mr. Santago said begin the framework and then start to get into other things.

Ms. Locks had nothing further to add. The work that Rob has done and some of our suggestions will make it a lot easier for new commission members, especially. We're trying to make it more straight

forward and easier to find. The new things coming to the plate, I think we need to get right on it. We need to take care of them as soon as we can.

The Chair said this is ambitious with some good things. I'm excited to see what it yields and to look at the spread sheet.

Mr. Santago said this is just to share information and give an update as to where we are.

Mr. Phillips will send the samples to the commissioners for review. Comments can be shared with Rob and Peter or Sue to let them know your thoughts. We'll circle back in a couple of meetings and proceed.

#### ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

\* Robert Eldridge, Home Occupation application for Cottage Food Industry Operator License, property located at 49 Parkview Road, owned by Paula M. Hatje, in an R-12 zone (HO #76), October 20

\* Lovley Development, Inc., Special Permit Application for proposed 15 units age restricted development, property located at 45 Pacer Lane, owned by Dennis Crispino, in an ARCHZ zone, parcel size 5.75 acres (SPU 3641) October 20

Mr. Phillips briefly summarized the items for public hearing. Cottage Food Industry is not regulated by the health department although it falls under the home occupation regulations. That's why it is before you.

Pacer Lane, you did the zone change and now they're following up with a special permit and site plan.

#### RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

\* Lovley Development Inc., site plan application for proposed 15 units age restricted development, property located at 45 Pacer Lane, owned by Dennis Crispino, in an ARCHZ zone, parcel size 5.75 acres (SPR #1804)

\* Sign Pro, Inc., site plan application to construct an industrial building and associated parking area, property located at 161 Canal Street, owned by Pro Realty, LLC, in an I-2 zone, parcel size 1.09 acres (SPR #1805)

ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 o'clock, p.m.)