

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
FEBRUARY 2, 2021

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a regular meeting on Tuesday, February 2, 2021 via WebEx teleconference. Robert Hammersley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

The following participated:

Robert Salka, Christina Volpe, Susan Locks & Peter Santago

Alternates: Theresa Albanese & Caleb Cowles

Staff:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development
James Grappone, Ass't Town Engineer

Absent: Commissioners Jeff Gworek & Steven Walowski
Alternates Joe Coviello & Stuart Savelkoul

The Chair seated Alternate Commissioner Caleb Cowles for Jeff Gworek and Alternate for Commissioner Albanese for Steven Walowski.

4. The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by all participants.

5. Moment of Silent Reflection
(Silent, Silent)

6. Approval of Minutes

A. Regular Meeting of January 19, 2021

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

7. Public Hearings

A. Class Act Auto wash, special permit application for proposed car wash, property located at 1656 Meriden Avenue, 291, 307-309 Meriden Waterbury Road, in a B zone (SPU#648)

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to the online posting to hear the full 95-minute presentation.)

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented on behalf of the applicant Class Act Auto wash.

The property is located at 1656 Meriden Waterbury Road at the corner with Route 322. It is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection. The land area is 1.33 acres or 58,070 sf. It is zoned business served by public water and sewer. It is next to an R-20/25 zoned property to the north and west. It has been used over the years for an appliance store, gas station, machine shop & repair shop.

We submitted 7 sets of plans which include the property map showing existing conditions with topography. A 500' radius map with owners listed and a general development plan showing the proposal. We notified property owners within 500' as required and provided proof of mailing to the planning department.

This proposal is for a carwash with two automatic wash tunnels, one for canvas and box trucks and a self-service bay for regular cars.

This use is allowed under Section 4-03.2B of the regulations by special permit per Section 8.00 of the regulations.

Public sidewalks are proposed along the roadway 322 & 120.

The facility access is from Route 322 via a two-lane one-way driveway (indicating). This two opens up to three lanes 100' approximately from 322 edge of pavement.

The distance of the stacking from the edge of 322 to the closest bay is 360' which will allow for a stacking of 43 cars. The distance from the self-serve bay, the closest one to Route 120 is a minimum of 200'.

Landscaping is provided all throughout the site. A combination of plantings, fences and walls are used to provide screening to the residential properties.

A lighting plan was provided showing there is no spillage e past our property lines. All fixtures are LED lights, full cut off and shielded.

There are no mechanicals on the building roof. They are housed inside the building. The building walls are made out of concrete blocks.

The vacuums are located in the southeast corner of the site. The decibel readings show a 64 db at 60' from the vacuums which is the normal noise level of an office with multiple people working and operating a business.

The facility provides plenty of stacking entering, 360' or more. Exiting 200' or more, two lanes exiting.

The traffic report was provided indicating the traffic generation is low for this facility. It will have a minimal impact on the existing level of service in the roadway.

The signal cycle at the intersection is probably one to two minutes based on the time it takes to clear the intersection.

Our cars will have no problem exiting the site. Any delayed backup will be handled within our site, with no impact to the roadway.

Hours of operation: We plan to have 24 hours of operation. However, it is slow after 11:00 and early morning hours. The lights will be dimmed after 11:00. They are dimmed until a car pulls into the bay for service normally. They are not full force.

The building style is a retro classic style. A three-dimensional plan was submitted showing the building elevations and how it is seen from the surrounding areas. (On the screen)

The site was designed for an emergence vehicle turning movements.

We understand the signs proposed on this plan, which we submitted are in conformity with the special permit, the signs will have to have a separate permit.

Views on the screen were described.

There is no equipment on the roof. This is what the site will look like with landscaping on it. We proposed to have a 4' berm landscaped along the front of the building as you look from the intersection of Meriden Avenue and 322. The plans submitted show the shrubbery. This view shows the vacuums and the building primarily looking northwest.

I'll be glad to answer any questions. We believe that this carwash fits the zone and at this location it will be a good use together with the rest of the uses currently taking place at this intersection.

(Questions from the Commissioners)

Mr. Santago has site plan questions we will get to when we get to the site plan. However, this is self-operating. How often will people be there to help people out? Can you explain how the business is going to work, i.e.: if people have a problem and they call, that type of thing.

David Carabetta, 601 Winding Ridge, Southington responded. Our facility operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We have someone on site at busy times and every morning and every evening. The times the attendant is on site is somewhat sporadic unless it is a busy time and then they are there between 8:00 am and 5:00 pm. We do have cameras and we are constantly monitoring the facility from various locations. All of our technology utilized at the carwash gives us the ability to monitor every facet of the facility and program and troubleshoot at alternate locations. The coverage is there for the facility.

Mr. Santago said the concern is during busy times when you may have cars on the Meriden Waterbury Road. That could be a little dicey. What do you do about this in your similar type operation in Meriden? Worried about spillage on to a main road there. Mr. Carabetta answered the Meriden facility operates identical to this facility. When we are that busy, we have multiple personnel on site. Do we have cars past the entrance for the turn into the facility? We anticipated the additional queued cars at this facility and it will be more than sufficient to accommodate busy days and extra busy days.

I'll add to clarify: Our facility is not a tunnel wash. Explained a tunnel wash.

We are not so much a volume facility as we are a destination facility. People that utilize our facility want to wash their car and take their time doing it and have the options available to them to choose. The volume you would expect to see from a tunnel does not compare with what we would do at our facility. We have a number of approximately 12 to 24 cars per hour, maximum usage of our automated portion. Self service is self-explanatory. People take their time. You're only looking at one

car every 10 to 15 minutes for the self-service bays. The volume is considerably less and the anticipated stacking of cars is far more than an hour's worth and is more like two to three hours' worth of queueing. The option of being that backed up would be pretty slim.

Discussion.

In terms of noise, that's different than a conventional carwash, I would think, commented Mr. Santiago. Mr. Carabetta said the function is the same, you are washing your car, but a tunnel is the same all the time. Ours is set up in that some people only want a touchless carwash. We have option. We have a conventional soft scrub option. And, we have the self-serve bays for people that want to wash their own car and take their time. They utilize the products we have which are all biodegradable and non-petroleum. They're the proper chemicals for the car and yet they are biodegradable and non-petroleum. Well controlled from that aspect.

As to the truck concern, we are not a truck wash. We do not have the area for tractor trailers nor are we proposing that. You would see larger vans, small UPS vans, small box trucks, campers. Snowmobile trailers. That's the type of self service wash you would see in our "truck bay". It is an oversized bay for that. It is not a truck wash.

It is a truly a destination to those who want to maintain their own car outside of the tunnel.

Ms. Locks was concerned if there is a lot of business, people coming out on to the Meriden Avenue. That light is always backed up and that person might be sitting there for quite some time. Mr. Carabetta commented you have to look at the overall volume and usage. Depending upon the package chosen for the automatic bays, it takes 3 to 5 minutes per car. We have two automatic bays. Two cars. We're only talking about maybe a car or two every intersection light cycle which we feel should be sufficient. We don't feel there'd be a backup with our volume and flow. We feel less flow than you'd see through the gas station or the Dunkin Donuts.

Discussion.

Ms. Locks brought up when you leave the carwash, the car maintains some water in it and that ends up going on to the roadway. With the incline of the hill, et cetera, I think it might be dangerous at times. Will you place be monitoring that so no accidents happen there? Mr. Carabetta said they do monitor. Safety is one of our daily pet peeves. We salt certain areas on a regular basis. The runoff from the facility, as you approach the exit, any runoff would run back to our site and not out on to the state or town road. There can be some water dripping from cars, but we are confident 95% will run back to our facility. We will salt our area. And, from normal traffic there will be some carryover of the salt on to the roadways.

Ms. Locks talked about noise. If those vacuums are running in the evening, is there a lot of noise coming out of the carwash facility and the vacuum cleaners? There are neighbors that are very concerned. Mr. Carabetta explained we do have all the decibel readings for all the equipment. Dryers and vacuums might be what people might hear. Our dryers are different than other carwashes. You do not exit while you are drying. The car is stationary until dry. We leave the door closed until the car is exiting in the winter months. The dryer is itself is housed in a noise reduced environment. It has its own enclosure to control the noise. The actual decibel readings on the equipment are equivalent to an average intersection. I think it is around 60 decibels at 40 to 60 feet away. The neighbors in the

distance from our neighbors are at a considerable distance so noise should be no worse than anything else in the area.

The same thing with the vacuums. They are probably not even as noisy as a blower but they're far enough away and we feel with our buffer of fencing and shrubbery that it should not exceed requirements from a decibel standpoint.

Mr. Cowles asked about the staffing. If it is fully automated, 24/7, what is the purpose of staff? Mr. Carabetta said staff is constantly monitoring the facility in terms of cleanliness, equipment maintenance, day to day operation. Putting salt down in the area. There is always something for an attendant to do. Garbage pails fill up. Detergents need to be maintained. Those items are covered by the daily attendant. Does he have a lot to do at night? No, not at all. The typical attendant is 8:00 am to 5:00 pm for the most part. When busy, they may be there until 8:00 or 10:00 in the evening. That is really very rare.

Discussion.

The automated equipment is monitored commented Mr. Carabetta, from either our other wash or from our phone. Between the cameras and the functions of the automated washes, they are constantly being monitored. If there is a malfunction, we are notified immediately.

Discussion.

The sound and decibel readings at the property line are concerning to me. The two automated wash bays, those doors are closed, you mentioned, and that is when the blowers do their magic. You did mention only the wintertime. Could those garage door bays be closed for the drying process throughout the year to help reduce some of the sound? Or is it limited to just the winter for a reason? Mr. Carabetta said it is a possibility, however we truly don't want to leave the doors closed unless there is a reason we need to. If we are meeting the decibel limits with the doors open, it just adds to the atmosphere. Winter has its own issues. We don't want to see anything freeze. Explained we want to have the vehicle stay warm. In the summer, unless there is a reason, we prefer not to keep the doors closed.

Is there a decibel limit for this zone? Mr. Phillips said we do not have a noise ordinance for anything other than construction activity during a construction project. Outside of that, there is no enforceable noise ordinance. Mr. Cowles asked if it would then be considered a nuisance across the property line which is in the eye of the beholder. Mr. Phillips said in the special permit stipulations in your regulation, those are the types of things you would be considering.

Ms. Albanese had no questions at this time.

Ms. Volpe asked concerning the use of public or private water. Mr. Carabetta said it is public water, but we are not ruling out the fact that we may put in our own water. We are not opposed to that by any means. If we do employ our own well, we have to figure out a way that works with the town to monitor the flow into the sewer system. We could go either way with the water.

It is exciting to see this will bring some jobs to that area and that is always a positive thing for our town. Regarding this issue with noise, will there be an attendant overnight?

Discussion.

Mr. Carabetta explained based on our experience 70% to 80% of the work is from 8:00 to 5:00. Some flow of vacuum usage in the evening until maybe 8:00 or 9:00, but not a high volume. You really won't see any after that except for the typical mess in the car that needs to be cleaned. It's not common.

You will see one or two people from third shift on their way home from work, washing their car, and it is a great option for them. I haven't seen a lot of activity with multiple people late in the evening.

Ms. Volpe asked if we got any responses to the engineering comments? Mr. Phillips said we didn't get a response to comments, yet. Mr. Grappone said he has spoken to the engineer of record a couple of times but has not received responses to comments, yet.

Mr. Salka asked about the box trucks which have a backup horn when they back up, is there a need in that carwash in the layout when they come in/out, any need for a truck to be backing up under normal circumstances. Mr. Carabetta said no. The facility is designed so they queue accordingly to the appropriate bay. They can choose the bay far ahead of time. When they enter the bay, it is one way in, one way out.

What are the busiest times during the week and on the weekends for the carwash in your experience? You said 8:00 to 5:00, limited at night. During the day, when are your peak periods of time? Mr. Carabetta said it is spread out during the day, but you do see an influx with people going home at the end of the day. Let's say between 3:00 and 5:00.

On a Saturday, it tapers off towards the latter part of the afternoon. On a Sunday, activity starts later in the morning and that'll subside around 3:00 pm.

Mr. Salka said 3:00 to 5:00 during the week is probably the absolute worst time for that intersection on Meriden Avenue. Explained the traffic coming at that time from 691. That's a concern of mine.

Thirdly, as to well or city water, if they decide to go with the well, how does that impact the neighbors who have wells behind their house? How does that impact that water flow to the wells? You'll be using a lot of water. Mr. Phillips said reviewed and regulated by the health department. I don't know if they get into draw down impacts. Is from a contamination separation standpoint, only? Mr. Grappone said the water department would be looking at that. My first thought was draw down. I'm not sure what minerals would be in the well versus city water. Explained.

Mr. Grappone said he would prefer it to be city water. I'm sure the health department would be open for well water.

Mr. Carabetta said it would not be out of the ordinary for us to request a well for our irrigation system for some of the smaller usage equipment. Understand, that is through a state permit and there is a deluge limit we would be required to maintain. Would we do a tremendous drawn down? I tend to doubt it. Upon developing a well, we would know the pros and cons available to us so that we wouldn't pull down on the area.

The Chair asked for discussion on the lighting. Mr. Carabetta said the bays, yard, vacuum areas, entranceways we have some lighting on all the time via timer. Approximately 50% of the lighting stays on. When a customer enters the site, the lighting will increase on the area they've gone to. Explained.

Same thing upon exit. After a certain time period, the lights go back down to the 50% level.

The lights are directed away from the adjoining properties and on to the site. LED lighting, auto shutoff and shielded. No glare to any neighbors or pollution that tends to be a problem in busy areas.

(Those from the public wishing to speak in favor of the application)

None.

(Those from the public wishing to speak in opposition to the application)

The Chair advised we did receive a couple of letters that were in the record and they were circulated to the commissioners, as well.

Doris Fillion, 1644 Meriden Avenue, the most affected by the proposed carwash as it would border me on two sides of my property spoke. She noted the following concerns in addition to a letter she sent with concise reasons for objecting to this business being inserted between the five properties which included hers. She said she had case law that supported the information and it was in the letter circulated.

Objections:

24-hour operation

The driveway runs parallel to her driveway and her property.

She noted 2.9 miles down the Meriden Waterbury Road is a carwash which is very nice and accommodates what people want to do. That makes me sure this is not a suitable location for another carwash especially with the talk about the lights, the noise, et cetera. Noise on two sides of me.

There are a lot of other businesses that could create a lot of jobs. This is an automated situation.

The lighting is on all the time, 50% and go on brighter when people come. The traffic study said 233 people are coming per day.

I have a serious concern about the water, well or city water. The road is a concern as there is an icing problem there. (See objection letter)

My well is in my backyard adjacent to the property and I have case studies where this particular type of operation was not allowed as they do use chemicals and there is the possibility of stuff from leaking vehicles, tainted water that can all go into the ground. Deadly water to me.

He doesn't want to close the doors. He wants a nice open atmosphere. That's what I want for my yard. I spend a lot of time outside, I have company, children. My family has owned that house for 85 years.

The corner traffic is horrific. Do a town traffic study. Some things the applicant mentioned are underplayed.

A ton of accidents with people coming out of the site and turning left.

Large campers. There are large vehicles.

As to the noise, they have no authority of what kind of vehicles come in. They might have a broken muffler or none at all. Giving out a large amount of exhaust. The trucks could be using those braking systems.

Noise, chemicals and traffic are my problems.

Commissioner comments to Ms. Fillion: Mr. Cowles asked about the accidents at Henny Penny. Ms. Fillion said the driveway set up is on a definite angle. She explained they could see the cars coming

around the corner. A dangerous problem with the double lanes.

Discussion.

Ms. Fillion discussed the landscaping. The trees would make another problem as you wouldn't be able to see to the left very well.

She further discussed the difficulty in getting out of her driveway and not just between 3:00 and 5:00 with the traffic. She noted the exhaust problem with the cars running and trying to get out.

People waiting to use the carwash are letting off fumes, exhaust with their vehicles.

This kind of operation is unsuitable and inappropriate for that location.

Mr. Santiago asked about how long she has lived at this location. Ms. Fillion explained her family built it 85 years ago and she has lived there on and off. Her son and grandchildren live there. I've got some relatives living there now with a four-month-old child. It's 85 years in the family. I'm asking you not to interrupt this.

Discussion.

Other issues with other businesses there previously were asked about. Only Ace Appliance was on the corner. The machine shop was way in the back --- very small. No constantly moving traffic. The traffic has increased majorly. Ms. Fillion encouraged smaller businesses without the operation being constantly moving traffic.

A less intrusive, noisy and less exhaust producing, less health endanger, less traffic danger business.

Discussion

The Chair brought up the fact the area is busy with the businesses there. Have there been changes since the businesses started up over the past 20 to 30 years? Ms. Fillion responded regarding the businesses previously there. The small mom & pops. Gas station. Dunkin Donuts. People come and go. Not constantly moving traffic.

Discussion.

Discussion about traffic taking a right hand turn out of the site. You are not going to make a left-hand turn because you don't have time to get out there added Ms. Fillion.

Discussion.

Discussion of traffic back up at the Dunkin Donuts site in the morning peak hours.

Ms. Fillion wanted to make the distinction between a business where you come and get what you want and then go versus a constantly moving traffic situation, constant noise, constant fumes, constant exhaust, constant lighting 24 hours a day. Traffic is worse and to add this would be a nightmare.

Discussion of the other carwash on Route 322 referred to.

Steve (Inaudible) and I own the property that right next door on 321 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. I am not opposed to this. My concerns are for the noise and I feel better about what I heard today. But I didn't like the idea there might be water used from a well. I'm on well water. I'm concerned if a well is tapped it might deplete the water supply. And, as far as the drainage goes, is the property drainage exiting into a sewer or part of the leech field system? Mr. Carabetta said the facility has a very detailed pretreatment system for all the water that goes through the wash cycles. Explained.

(Applicant Response to Comments)

Michael Riccio, 124 Andrews Street, Southington responded collectively to comments made with regard to noise, et cetera.

He discussed the vacuum pumps and carwashes on Queen Street that either abut or across the street from massive residential complexes. I don't think collectively we've gotten very many noise complaints about any of those operations. We don't see the vacuums being mobbed at 10:00, 11:00 or 12:00 midnight to 1:00 am. People are there during the day. It's not an activity we see late at night.

The decibels from the carwash are going to be less than 40 decibels.

As to the traffic, if there are 200+ cars coming in through this property during the day, that's off the 18,000 car a day intersection. Explained it is far less than the amount of cars that travel through Dunkin Donuts between 5:00 and 9:00 in the morning. It is less than a quarter of the amount of cars that travel through the Henny Penny at all hours of the day. The carwash is on the opposite side. Explained the busy times for the carwash are opposite the normal daily traffic flow of that property.

Traffic flow, the issue is minimal.

Noise issues, the Henny Penny has music and videos playing at the gas pumps throughout the day and it doesn't seem to be a noise issue.

He discussed the newness of the corner. No environmental impact.

It is in harmony with the business zone.

He discussed past uses on the property; i.e., gas station with bays and air guns, jacks, lifts, et cetera with a machine shop on the rear of the property. A carwash operating 8:00 to 5:00 is far less intrusive than the two operations that existed there for many, many, many years.

Normand Bolduc, from LRC Group, addressed traffic questions. Specifically, am and pm peak hours were discussed. AM peak is 7:00 to 10:00 am and PM peak is 3:00 to 6:00. Midday Saturday peak is 10:00 to 2:00 pm. Estimated vehicle trips per day were discussed.

(Traffic Report on file in the Town Planners Office for review.)

The Chair asked the applicant why they had not responded to the 33 questions that came from the Town Engineer. Mr. Bolduc responded they are in the process of doing that now. Explained they were just received on Friday and didn't have time enough to answer all of them. Planning comments were addressed.

Discussion.

The Chair said because of the non-response to the comments, he was inclined to keep the public hearing open to get the comments read into the public hearing prior to action.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino had some concluding remarks:

Mr. Bovino explained in regard stacking, we have plenty of stacking. We have the ability to stack about 43 cars. There is a 360' distance on the one-way driveway coming in from the edge of the road to the first bay.

As to the icing problem, our driveway coming out is at a 5% grade. In some areas of the driveway, we have an 8% grade pitching toward our property. Any water on a truck bed or truck roof, will discharge to the ground within our property because of the slope. We are doing the salting and maintenance.

As to the noise level, it was measured at 64 decibels at 100' away from the vacuums. The house next door is 70' from the property line. The vacuums are well above the 100' distance to the house. And, the 64 decibel is very low in terms of volume.

The proposal for the water is public water.

The lighting plan was submitted and it shows a zero spillage to the properties next door. There is full cut off lighting, shields directed down to the ground and the lighting should not be a problem.

Landscaping is proposed all around the property. Fences and walls are added to shield the property.

The traffic study does indicate a level of service C or better at the intersection. And, 20% of the traffic is already on the roadway that comes to our carwash.

Discussing pollution, he explained the drainage on the property. Maintenance on a regular basis.

As to the concern about trees along the roadway, the proposed trees will not be in the sight distance. We are not going to put the trees 10' away from the edge of road but will be planted throughout the property and not in the sight distance area.

I believe those are the major points of concerns. Glad to move forward.

Ms. Fillion responded to comments made by Mr. Riccio. She advised she would be writing another letter for the record to address her further concerns. The Chair advised she would have further opportunities to discuss this project in the future.

Discussion.

David Carabetta, 601 Winding Ridge wanted to try and answer some of the questions by Doris Fillion.

The water quality was answered through my response to the other speaker.

I did want to clarify: I don't want it perceived that I claim we are going to bring a lot of jobs into the area. Frankly, that is not the case. He explained the personnel that would be hired.

In terms of the vehicle pollution, we are on our property, we will post the state requirements in terms of a vehicle running. In Connecticut a vehicle is not allowed to run more than 2 or 3 minutes on a continuous basis. A regulation we post in our signage at the facility.

Discussion.

In terms of trucks and the noisy braking system, those braking systems do not engage unless you are going a certain speed limit. We would never expect a vehicle to go fast enough within our complex to engage that braking system. I don't think that's applicable in this case.

I guess there is confusion between the traffic study and 12 cars per hour. He explained how the math works. There is a definitive amount of time per car depending upon the car that you choose.

Discussion.

When the intersection is busy, is not a busy time for us. That is when people are going to work and they're not going to wash their car. We like to think they'll wash their car on the way home. I don't believe it will be an increase in traffic, we are just drawing off the traffic that is currently there.

I want to add, when you look at the area and look at the fact it was an appliance repair and a gas station, you had a machine shop, and you now have a lawn mower repair and you look at the parcel and the pictures in the complex we've proposed, we think that adds to the value of your property and the surrounding property. It is not a desirable piece right now.

This is the entrance to the gateway of Southington and we think that should look like a classy operation, as Southington is. We think it may in fact enhance the property value. Something to consider. Something to ponder.

The site in Meriden to visit is 1275 East Main Street. Right on the corner of Research Parkway. For anyone who would like to visit and have a tour.

(No pet washing facility or detail shop is proposed for Southington site.)

Mr. Cowles asked for the commission to be provided with the report showing the decibel levels for the equipment so we can review it. Mr. Bovino said that will be provided.

The Chair left the public hearing open until the next meeting on February 16th.

B. Livewell Alliance, Inc., special permit application for expansion of existing campus to include additional structures for semi-independent living, greenhouse and facility center. The expansion will include renovations to the existing structure, property located at 1261 South Main Street, in a B Zone, parcel size 6.5 acres (SPU #645)

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to the online posting to hear the full 70-minute presentation.)

Attorney Lou Martocchio, 191 Main Street, represented on behalf of Livewell Alliance formerly known as the Alzheimer's Resource Center. He gave some background on this nonprofit organization.

Discussion.

The purpose of tonight's application is to allow Livewell the opportunity to evolve with the ever-changing world. The expansion will consist of additions for independent living and more importantly enhancements to the existing building to allow them to remain the leader in this industry and world.

Discussion.

I have a team with me today that are all available on the video to answer your questions. I'd like to have the President and Director of Livewell do a quick presentation of his vision for this project. It's imperative you know the purpose and intent behind it. I had some submitted renderings and drawings of what this look like and I do believe we are going to take a diamond in our community and truly expand upon it locally and nationally.

(Please refer to the video on line to hear the full commentary by Mr. Smith.)

Michael Smith, President and CEO of Livewell presented his background with people living with cognitive impairment and their needs as it relates to this facility in the future.

Mike Doherty from Milone & MacBroom, principal landscape architect for the project. He briefly walked the commission through the site plans at a high level and touched upon some of the site related improvements proposed and how they relate to the overall goal of Livewell.

(Shared screen)

Discussed each slide. Please refer to the video on line to see and hear the presentation along with each slide.

- Existing Aerial of the just over 7.5-acre parcel in the B zone. Wetlands and forested edge were highlighted.

- Overlay of the layout and landscape plan rendering. He highlighted the proposed improvements to the building. Façade treatments and a new building wing were noted. The River Homes were pointed out. The Center for Resilient Living (CRL) was pointed out and discussed. The Central Drive in was pointed out as well as the loop road for visitor and delivery access. Parking was explained and noted it is going from 83 to 111 spaces. Twenty are underneath the River Homes (indicated).

Courtyards were discussed and indicated on the screen. They will provide multigenerational play, yoga spaces, café seating and eating areas. Expansion of the interior programming out into the outside to enjoy the backyard at Livewell. Between the River Homes and the existing/renovated building, this is the Campus Green. Explained is more of a park setting to allow for daily interactions with people coming/going.

Discussion.

The site will amplify and add to the programming. Sidewalks to Route 10 were noted. Plaza spaces and sidewalks for different circuits of walking for mobility and cognitive recollection.

Along the river edge a small Riverwalk or trail was noted and explained.

Dustin Julius, architectural designer from RLPS Architects for this project. I will speak with you tonight about the vision and the architectural infrastructure that we're seeking to develop with Livewell.

(Please refer to the on line posting to see the slides and hear the presentation.)

- Multi faceted updates to this entire campus will include significant renovations to the assisted living and skilled care residents. (Noted the two buildings.)

The addition of the new Community Resource Space (CRL) was indicated. The River Homes are on the right-hand side.

As mentioned, this will create a continuum of care that will allow the residents to age within the community.

The courtyard master plan was described as a series of free flowing indoor/outdoor spaces accessed at will by the residents. Intergenerational play areas, outdoor dining opportunities and event spaces were noted.

THE CRL creates a new courtyard for fitness activities, yoga and meditation.

The River Homes were discussed.

The Linear Park was noted.

- The River Homes were described as offering a cooperative living arrangement which supports independence while providing limited assistance. Explained the two homes on the site. The New England architectural style was pointed out and described.

- Each residence provides living quarters for 16 individuals with the comforts of a residential scale found in a traditional home (kitchen, dining room, great room living space along with a library, activity area and four seasons room.) Apartments were described for the care partner.

Parking is under the building hidden from the front façade (indicated).

- The CRL will define the next generation of care for adults living with dementia. Discussion.

- Destination spaces: café, demonstration spaces, greenhouse, classrooms, visual arts rooms, exercise equipment studios, yoga movement studios, wellness treatment rooms, performing arts theater, media learning lab, four seasons room, and the list goes on.

- Existing skilled care residential neighborhoods were explained. Renovated units are enlarged to create additional bathrooms and offer private rooms. Explained.

- The nursing residents living quarters renovations.

- The second-floor new administrative suite and staff lounge were explained.

- The River Homes, CRL and significant improvements to the existing community infrastructure are a testament to what can be created by partnering with people living with dementia. This plan will provide an unmatched environment to encourage all to Livewell.

Tom Daly with Milone & MacBroom indicated that concludes the presentation and we're more than happy to answer any questions.

(Commissioner Questions)

Ms. Albanese had no questions at this time. She liked the idea of having the residents experience the outdoors.

Ms. Volpe loved the spectacular presentation and the design. I like its walkable and you can access Mulberry Gardens more easily. Spectacular!

Mr. Cowles echoed Ms. Volpe's comments. He explained his familiarity with the facility and his appreciation for the great work done there.

Discussion.

My question is about the 16 occupant buildings, is there going to be skilled there or are they on their own in those areas and is that living for partners, too, like a spouse?

** Attorney Martocchio called in. I heard what was said. I have a spectacular team who put on a very detailed and specific summary of the project. A lot of thought and energy has gone into this project for the common good. ****

Mr. Smith answered Mr. Cowles: The licensure for skilled care will remain in the existing building and in the River Homes people could receive assisted living care or to live independently. The concept of that smaller space such that if you should have a spouse without cognitive impairment, they could live there with you. In the eaves of the 3rd floor there is an apartment that would be available.

Explained.

Ms. Locks loved the plans. Love the walkways. Great care is done there and I have one question. Where the parking is for the residential, you come in from the back and you park underneath the building? Attorney Martocchio explained the parking under the building. There would be garage doors.

Discussion.

Mr. Santago echoed the praise of his fellow commissioners. Are you looking to change the exterior of the existing structure to match the new buildings? Mr. Julius explained all the renovations to the old buildings and minor aesthetics.

Discussion.

Emergency vehicle access was discussed. Attorney Martocchio said they received some informal comments from the fire department / fire inspector. A fire access route has been developed and it is before the SFD for review and comment.

Mr. Santago asked about consideration for a curb cut on Mulberry Street. Attorney Martocchio said there has been a lot of consideration for a curb cut and possibly an easement crossing over Mulberry Gardens. They are in the works and not in our application.

Discussion.

Mr. Smith explained there are two ways in/out of the building.

Mr. Santago discussed the traffic in the area. Any additional stuff is a concern with traffic in/out. It looks like you are not concerned about that with what you have.

Mr. Salka echoed the praise expressed by previous commissioners. How many additional residents with the new vision include and how many new additional staff would this vision include? Mr. Smith said the number of residents remains approximately the same. Right now, we have 133 and I believe the number would be at 140 with the design. Only a few more residents living on the campus in

the future. They will have a lower level of skilled service requirement than those who live there. The staffing compliment will remain basically the same.

Discussion.

Attorney Martocchio advised a summary of that, the beds and current occupancy as well as expected future occupancy was provided in the submittals.

The Chair echoed comments by the commissioners.

(Those wishing to speak in favor of the application)

Attorney Andrea Gomes, Shipman & Goodwin. I am here tonight on behalf of Mulberry Gardens of Southington which is an affiliate of Hartford Healthcare Corporation (HHC). I'm not here to speak in favor nor to oppose the application. I have a request of the commission.

She gave background as to who Mulberry Gardens is and what our thoughts are on this application. We are at 58 Mulberry Street, directly abutting Livewell property to the east. Mulberry Gardens is a nonprofit community offering assisted living and memory care services.

They also own the single-family home located at 52 Mulberry Street which fronts directly on Mulberry Street. Explained location.

My understanding is Livewell or an affiliate may also own the single-family home located at 66 Mulberry Street, on the eastern side of the access drive. Explained.

Neither Mulberry Gardens nor HHC are here to oppose or to support these pending applications. The sole purpose of my attending tonight is to request the commission continue the public hearing on the SPU and site plan application for Livewell to the March 2, 2021 meeting. We are requesting the time to allow Mulberry Gardens an opportunity to review the application materials in greater detail and determine what it's property and business operations will be impacted in any way by Livewell's proposal.

I believe the commission has in the record a February 21, 2021 from Mr. Thomas Vaccarelli, Vice President of Facilities Construction & Real Estate for HHC essentially requesting the additional time to review the materials.

We are still in the process of reviewing the details and scope of the application, we have some preliminary concerns/questions we would like answered as well as reviewing the materials. The concerns are in two different categories.

The first is construction phasing and control over the anticipated 25-month construction schedule which I understand they hope to begin in July, 2021. Mulberry Gardens is concerned with Livewell's anticipated use of the single family at 66 Mulberry Garden (to the east of the Mulberry Gardens driveway). Will that property be used for construction staging or operations? If so, will contractors seek to cut off the Mulberry Gardens driveway to access the eastern portion of the Livewell site? Operations like that could clearly impact not only vehicle and pedestrian access and safety in/out of Mulberry Gardens but Mulberry Gardens operations on a day-to-day basis.

Also, generally regarding construction, will operations happen at all hours of the day impacting Mulberry Garden residents and patients?

What dust/noise measures will be employed to ensure no adverse impacts to any of the Mulberry Garden residents.

Secondly, just the potential short- and long-term effect of Livewell's development plans on Mulberry Gardens. In particular, we'd like the opportunity to take a deeper look at Livewell's anticipated long term use of the Mulberry Garden's driveway not only for its employees but for its residents. I appreciate Mr. Smith's information on the number of residents and staffing changes that will occur with respect to the application. That is all helpful for our consideration.

We are looking at potential impact to vehicle and pedestrian traffic circulation and safety to/from Mulberry Gardens and any changes that may occur in the future as a result of this application.

In addition, we question whether there could potentially be long term drainage effects. Understanding the Quinnipiac River is located directly to the south of the properties as well as recognizing that Livewell's application proposes an increase in impervious surface on site, we need and would greatly appreciate the opportunity to have the time to review the information to determine if there is any potential negative drainage impacts on the Mulberry Gardens property.

With that, I have nothing else to add but will conclude by reiterating we are not here to unnecessarily delay anything or to oppose or support their applications, we're here to ask for more time by asking you specifically to continue the public hearing on the SPU and the disposition on the site plan application to the March 2, 2021 meeting.

I note for the record, I understand and I didn't have too much time to review everything out there today, but I understand the conservation commission has not yet rendered a decision on Livewell's application, so by statute, the commission couldn't consider a decision on the zoning applications anyway.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity.

The Chair confirmed we are waiting wetlands approval on this. This public hearing will remain open until at least we get that. I will take into consideration your request to continue it to the March 2nd meeting.

(Anyone wishing to speak on this application.)

No speakers.

(Applicant Response to comments)

Attorney Martocchio are limited to the concerns expressed by Attorney Gomes. There has been a complete and open dialogue between my client and her client. My client does not own nor does any affiliate of the entity own the property referenced on Mulberry Street. That does not mean there are not active steps in place to purchase that property but I don't know the relevance of that to this application.

Secondly, with regard to the runoff and any other concerns she has addressed, they are all in very clear detail. We don't expect nor could we expect a decision rendered this evening. We are expecting a wetlands opinion letter or approval generated on Thursday and if so, I would ask this commission to keep the matter open to the next hearing, February 16th.

I ask it remain that way, assuming that is the way the matter concludes this evening and I do object on behalf of my client to it going any later or longer than that.

I offer with that the caveat that I am ready, willing and able to cooperate in any manner with Attorney Gomes' concerns or her client. All information is public. All been submitted.

If there are specific relevant concerns to this project, I have no issue meeting, consulting in any way, shape or form to address the concerns. But I would like it placed on the next meeting calendar as opposed to pushing it off further for many nonissues based on the documents submitted.

The Chair noted the concerns Attorney Gomes brought up. Is anybody available to speak on that?

- Construction phasing and scheduling such as the daily time schedules on that.
- Dust & noise. Anticipated long term use of Mulberry's driveway.
- Drainage effects.

If not, the public hearing is going to remain open until at least February 16th.

Attorney Martocchio did not have a response at this time. I would encourage Attorney Gomes and I could coordinate a ZOOM call or conference call to address these in detail. I could have the team available to address the issues. The Chair said that sounds like a great plan.

Discussion.

Attorney Gomes responded she examined the application materials available and in conjunction with my client flagged some potential issues. Truly my reason for being here tonight was to ask for more time. These are just initial concerns. I am always willing to cooperate and collaborate with fellow counsel, neighbors at a later date.

She explained the 30 days would give them time to have their own engineers examine the material. It's not just a legal discussion.

Mr. Smith offered they have reached out to HHC with no response for the past three years and most recently within the recent month with no date offered to us for meeting.

Discussion.

Mr. Smith said Mulberry Gardens was built after our facility and they were aware of the services we provided, the fact we were proving services to people with dementia and chose to add memory care services in what is basically our backyard. And, then chose to add additional adult day services after we had already introduced those services. Just a point of information that they be left not with an impression that we are now providing a level of services that is potentially putting in jeopardy the services at Mulberry Gardens but rather a sense that they understood what it is we were doing and we will continue to serve the population we have a mission to respond to and to work with them in numbers we've consistently worked with in the past. I offer that to the commission tonight.

The Chair advised them to get together between now and the 16th, have a conversation and try to address some issues and talk about things. On the 16th we will see where we are all on this. We encourage neighbors to talk and see what you can resolve prior to coming back on the 16th.

The Chair left the public hearing open at least until February 16th.

8. Business Meeting

A. 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 January 19

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented on behalf of the applicant. The property is located at 1615 West Street, served by public sewer and water. There is an ongoing restaurant business on the site named CAVA Restaurant. The business was in need of extra parking, therefore the owner purchased property to the north which he used until he was able to come to an agreement with the owner of the property next door. He purchased additional land surrounding the restaurant. This has allowed him to expand his parking to meet the restaurant's need and have enough room to propose a two-story medical building totaling 14,280 sf and related parking, drainage and landscaping.

The current business has two curb cuts plus one serving the property that he has just purchased. We are proposing to close the existing curb cut and change the existing south curb cut into one way, only.

The new building is proposed 94.6' back from the West Street property line. The minimum distance allowed is 75'. This allowed the required 25' greenspace along the frontage with a 4' landscaped berm.

The allowed coverage for the property is 40% and we propose 11.9%.

Street trees are provided along West Street together with low flowering shrubs and evergreens.

All lighting is LED, full cut off, shielded to prevent glare.

The design follows the guidelines of low impact development which includes hooded catch basins with 4' sumps, retention basins, plunge pool and long grass swales with check dams.

We provide underground storage for groundwater recharge taking roof water, which is cleaner water, into the ground.

We have provided a traffic analysis done by Fuss & O'Neill. It indicates that the development will result in a minimal traffic increase. Both driveways will operate at an acceptable level of service, turning in/out of the site.

Cars going out in the afternoon peak hour will experience a possible delay which will be stored on site and the delay deals with two or three cars back up on to our site. It will not affect the West Street traffic.

The analysis indicates for the southbound traffic a restriping or widening will be necessary for the left turn in movement on the west side of West Street. The extent and limit of the by-pass widening will be determined by CTDOT as part of the encroachment permit application.

We received staff comments and reflected them on the revised plans. Written responses were provided. All appropriate notes and details are on the plan.

Twelve of the proposed parking spaces on the southwest side are overflow parking on grassed area.

Any questions, I will be glad to answer them.

(Commissioner Questions)

(Pause)

Mr. Cowles asked if the acquisition of the additional property was completed. Mr. Bovino responded the applicant tried and the effort failed. Explained.

The Chair brought up a stipulation on the applicant a couple of months ago and that was when the access road was built, in the rear of this lot, that there be a tie in. I see that on the plan? Mr. Bovino advised they provided an easement at that location where it makes sense. Explained the easements provided.

There are sidewalks existing and we propose new ones along the frontage added Mr. Bovino. It covers the length of the property on West Street.

The Chair asked for further comments from staff.

Mr. Phillips brought up the ingress/egress of the site. Mr. Grappone said he would like to have Sev review that for the benefit of the commission as to what is going to take place as far as ingress/egress for the site and he did agree with most of the traffic recommendations which is a sliver widening that was proposed by the traffic engineer. However, he was still concerned about the left turn exiting the parcel. If you wouldn't mind going over that, Sev.

Mr. Bovino said the proposal is to turn the southerly curb cut from a two way into a one way, entrance only. The proposal before you tonight is for the northerly curb cut which is two way currently to be maintained as two way. There is no way to get out of this property until development occurs to the east of us.

The traffic report indicated they looked at the left turn movement and they felt that movement was possible because there is gaps in the traffic due to the traffic lights existing on Spring Street & Welch Road. However, the commission felt at the time that they would not like to see the left turn movement. It is up to the STC when we apply to determine if the left movement is a safe turning movement.

Mr. Grappone noted the southerly entrance current width was reduced to restrict, along with signage, people wanting to exit the southerly entrance. Mr. Bovino said there was a Do Not Enter sign at the intersection in the back (Indicating). And, it will be signalized in terms of one way, also, over here (Indicating). We can restrict the driveway. Right now, it is 24' and we can restrict it if you want. Mr. Grappone said if it is just going to be an entrance, reducing that is appropriate. Otherwise, even with the signage you'll have people trying to make that illegal exit. Mr. Bovino said that was no problem.

Mr. Grappone had no problem with that as presented. The final say on restricting the left turns exiting the northerly driveway will be up to the encroachment permit requirements with the DOT.

The Chair asked if it would be appropriate to suggest tying in the northerly part of this lot to any future development that might occur there similar to Queen Street? I know we have it to the east, the access road. Mr. Phillips responded this is all part of the same property (indicating). I think the idea was that this area all along the eastern and northern side is all owned by the same entity and the future development would be tied in from this angle over here (indicating) bringing it to the east and then north over here (indicating) towards a common access. It's close to or they would have to put in a traffic light on the northern end. Mr. Grappone agreed. Mr. Phillips felt over to the north might be redundant and probably not used.

(Discussion)

This item is ready for action.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve SPR 1802. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed 5 to 2 with Ms. Volpe and Mr. Cowles opposed.

The Chair advised Items B, C, D & E were all tabled collectively. All items have public hearings which remain open.

B. Class Act Auto wash, special permit application for proposed car wash, property located at 1656 Meriden Avenue, 291, 307-309 Meriden Waterbury Road, in a B zone (SPU#648)

Tabled.

C. Class Act Auto wash, site plan application for proposed car wash, property located at 1656 Meriden Avenue; 291, 307-309 Meriden Waterbury Road, in a B zone (SPR #1812)

Tabled.

D. Livewell Alliance, Inc., special permit application for expansion of existing campus to include additional structures for semi-independent living, greenhouse and facility center. The expansion will include renovations to the existing structure, property located at 1261 South Main Street, in a B Zone, parcel size 6.5 acres (SPU #645)

Tabled.

E. Livewell Alliance, Inc., site plan for expansion of existing campus, property located at 1261 South Main Street, in a B zone, parcel size 6.5 acres (SPR #1813)

Tabled.

F. Referral of 8-24 Ordinance Appropriating \$4,500,000 for Costs Related to the Acquisition of Development Rights – Country Club Estates, and Authorizing the Issue of \$4,500,000 Bonds and Notes to Finance the Appropriation (MR #561)

(Minutes are prepared summary style. Please refer to the online posting to hear the full 20-minute presentation.)

Mr. Phillips noted the presentation had been sent to the commission for review. (On file in the Town Planner's office.)

The Chair advised right now the property has approval for 114 units. What is being proposed is we purchase the development rights for the property and therefore the 114 units approved will not be done. There are a lot of things the presentation talks about in terms of infrastructure costs and costs to a variety of different systems including the education, public safety, sanitation systems. It is all in the presentation.

The idea is if we approve this, it goes back to the town council. The BOF at some point weighs in as well and then it goes out to referendum as it exceeds the threshold. They were trying to do that sometime in May.

Mr. Phillips went through the presentation slides highlighting items.

- Appraised at \$4.7 million for highest and best use which is single family development. The family agreed to \$200,000 less.
- There are supporting goals & policies in our POCD for preserving open space including using the purchasing development rights tool.
- There are definitions of how open space is perceived.
- The layout of the 114 lots was shown. Extensive road network. The land lends itself to a maximum buildout outside of the wetlands.
- Development disruptions versus preservation adds a lot more open space.
- Educational impact was discussed.
- Residential development costs more than the revenue it takes in. Much more than business or agricultural uses.
- Assessor's slide went through revenue calculations.
- Bond Costs slide was explained.
- Maintenance Costs slide was explained.
- Timeline for the referendum to be scheduled for May 4, 2021.

Ms. Volpe talked about the history of the site and why it was important to preserve it for the quality of life for our residents and this absolutely does that.

Discussion.

Mr. Santago offered that the town must make it clear and educate residents we are not buying the golf course. People need to understand what this is and isn't. People need to be educated on what they're spending their \$4.5 million on. That is a misunderstanding people may have. The town needs to do a good job of saying what this project is and what it is not. We are not buying the golf course. We are buying development rights and all that preservation stuff. For a project like this to go to a vote, the people who put the information out are saying it to people who know what development rights are. To the public, that is very confusing to people. They need to know what development rights are and what the town is actually buying. Ms. Volpe agreed it needs to be explained.

Discussion.

The Chair said he felt it was an asset we would be able to keep.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve MR#561. Mr. Cowles seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. Release of \$17,000 E & S Bond, 54 Tridell Drive (SPR #1433)

Ready for action. Mr. Salka made a motion to approve SPR #1433. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

9. Administrative Items

Nothing this evening.

10. Items to Schedule for Public Hearing

* Michael Browning, special permit application for parent/grandparent apartment, property located at 157 Whistling Straits Drive, in a R-40 zone (SPU #643), February 16

Mr. Phillips reminded the commission of 8-30g on the doorstep. He has requested from the applicant they submit zoning regulations for a complete application and they are working on that right now. Once, complete, we will schedule it for a public hearing maybe the 2nd of March.

11. Receipt of New Applications

Nothing new.

12. Adjournment

Ms. Volpe made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Salka & Mr. Cowles seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon the meeting was adjourned at 10:22o'clock, p.m.)