

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
TOWN OF SOUTHTON
NOVEMBER 4, 2020

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and regular meeting on Wednesday, November 4, 2020 via WebEx teleconference. Robert Hammersley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

The following participated:

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

Alternates: Theresa Albanese & Caleb Cowles

Absent: Alternates Joe Coviello & 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 being led by Kayleigh Phillips who was celebrating her 10th birthday today.

A Moment of Silence was observed by everyone.

ROBERT HAMMERSLEY, Chair, presiding:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Special Meeting of October 20, 2020

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Special Meeting on October 20, 2020. Ms. Albanese seconded. Motion passed on a majority voice vote with Mr. Gworek abstaining.

B. Regular Meeting of October 20, 2020

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of October 20, 2020. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Eleni Real Estate, LLC, Special Permit Application for two buildings on one lot, property located at 1615 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPU #639), extended from October 20

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented on behalf of the applicant. The property is at 1615 West Street. Last time we met, you expressed interest in having the applicant work for the possibility of purchasing additional property. He did approach the property owners to the North (Sepko family) and to the South (Church). They could not work out a deal. That effort failed.

You also were concerned about traffic. We ordered a traffic review which was done by Fuss and O'Neill and a letter was submitted with the conclusion that the two uses can live and operate together without a problem on West Street pending the state approval of the traffic report which will be done at site plan time. He concludes for now that the driveways can work and we have to do some widening for a south turn movement coming from the north.

Those were the concerns in addition to the legal standards of the lot itself which I think was resolved. I'll answer questions.

(Those wishing to speak in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those wishing to speak in opposition to the application)

No response.

(Commissioner Comments)

Ms. Locks was curious about the temporary building now put up on the property and how the traffic flow is going to work if that temporary building is causing a different circulation problem on the property now. Mr. Bovino said the building is temporary. It is to replace the tent that was there. That'll be removed once the virus situation comes to an end. The traffic will be as proposed on the site plan.

Will the building be taken down when all this construction is being done? Mr. Bovino said yes. The building will be done. Then the building is just for the holiday season she further asked. Mr. Bovino said it is to continue the business because they wouldn't be able to operate based on the restrictions. They installed this building versus having a tent and they blocked the entrance. Ms. Locks noted another entrance that connects to the building. Mr. Bovino said there is no entrance now. They blocked the southerly entrance so everyone comes in on the northerly side. When this is over, the building will be removed and the curb cuts will be reactivated. It also depends on who the site plan will go and the full traffic study and what the recommendations are going to be.

Ms. Locks noted that is quite the large building, bigger than the tent was. Mr. Phillips interjected the temporary structure is permitted per the Governor's Executive Order. They are attempting to recreate 100% capacity by expanding the floor area with the extra building. They're aware that when the emergency order ends or at the end of the calendar year depending on what happens with the virus, that has to be removed.

Mr. Macchio, Mr. Cowles, Ms. Volpe, Ms. Albanese and Mr. Gworek had no questions for this item.

Mr. Santago clarified that this application is not to expand CAVA. This is for a separate building, a separate business that is on a property that CAVA owns, correct? Mr. Bovino said it is for a medical/office building.

Discussion.

Mr. Santago asked if there were a tenant right now. Mr. Bovino said no.

Discussion.

Mr. Santago explained basically you are asking for an office building near an existing restaurant with the hopes of a tenant but not sure if the rest of the regulations will be applied, or not. Mr. Bovino said this is not a speculation building. Once approval is granted, he will market it and when he has the client, he will build it. He has five years to build it. That's not a speculation building.

Discussion.

Mr. Salka said if they have five years to develop this, and they presented a 9-page traffic study, how valid is that study we have now versus what will happen four years from now? The traffic could increase on West Street over that period.

The other question is what really changed between the last meeting and now when they requested a 12-1 date for a review versus now?

Mr. Bovino responded when they do the traffic, they do a projection for the future traffic. Things could change in the future as with any approved site plan. You deal with the present, project the expected traffic in the future based on historical data and provide an estimate. They look at the traffic, driveways, curb cuts and the traffic lanes on West Street to come to a conclusion.

As to the date the 12-1 date was the longest date we could have before we had to make a decision. It is not like we were going to plan to present on 12-1. That was an outside date. The reason we are here because we tried the negotiations, got the answer and were able to come back to continue this process.

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

B. 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 #641) continued from October 20

Mark Lovley, President of Lovley Development, 710 Main Street, Plantsville, CT presented. We've worked with engineering on the plan. We've added some sidewalks in and as per request, we put pines in to block that back development. We've added to the south in the open areas pine trees. As we go along if we see some open spaces, we will add the pines trees or arborvitaes into those areas to block that in. We've worked with Jim Grappone and got his comments back to him.

We got the comments back to planning. Water wanted us to do a loop system and we revised that plan and sent that back to them.

(Those speaking in favor of the application)

No response.

(Those speaking in opposition to the application)

No response.

Kelsy (no last name given) 39 Mount Vernon Road, expressed her appreciation to the applicant for taking into account our perspective as far as keeping our privacy. With the new site plan, we will get a nice line of trees. This is not for or against, just merely an appreciation comment.

Mr. Lovley also added they did move he homes about 25' more away. Whatever can be done to maintain the privacy we have is appreciated she responded.

(The Chair shared his screen.)

Mr. Lovley noted the sidewalks are going all the way out from the end cul de sac to Pacer Lane. You can walk throughout the green space and walk to Pacer Lane and do the sidewalk network around Pacer Lane. We put the guest parking here (indicated). We do have two parking spots in every garage and every driveway has at least enough space for two more cars, some have space for four cars in the driveway, also. We did put more plantings up on the north side, on the cul de sac to Southfork to block that whole area. We cannot plant in the CL&P easement.

With the entrance, it is a little boulevard with a stone monument in the middle to dress it up. Putting arborvitae trees along the side (indicating). Any sparse spots, we will plant trees. We have the street tree planting area throughout the development.

We spread the homes out a little bit more and they are about 27' apart now instead of 25'.

No children under 18 can live in these units per the ARCHZ and our condo documents.

(Any members of the public who would like to speak on this application)

No response.

(Commissioner comments)

Ms. Locks liked there is more area to walk with the greenspace and all the trees and plantings proposed. She likes the plan now.

Mr. Gworek appreciated the extra coverage on the north and south side. He liked the sidewalk, as well. As to the trampoline in the north, has there been any issues with clearing that up? Mr. Lovley responded he has been in contact with the neighbor and he is going to move it. He wants to tie into the sewer we're bringing up Southfork.

Mr. Macchio had no questions. The little improvements he put in he likes.

Mr. Cowles had no comments.

Ms. Volpe said she appreciated the developer heard us. The sidewalk is great. I like the greenspace implementation. I feel heard and I appreciate that.

Ms. Albanese echoed all commissioners. We appreciate your taking everything we said into consideration. Looks good.

Mr. Santago had nothing further other than to echo previous comments. Thank you for listening.

Mr. Salka echoed previous comments. Thank you for working with us on the greenspace, plantings, sidewalk and little additional parking he put in.

The Chair felt the developer did a great job. You did incorporate things we brought up last time.

Mr. Phillips had one comment in chat, from Kelsey. She wanted to ask with the cattle fence right now sort of dividing our properties, what is going to happen with that and do you have a timeline. We use that to keep our dogs fenced in and I don't want them in the backyard if the fence is not there.

Mr. Lovley said he had no problem leaving the fence up. I'll stop over and see you to work something out for the future. We're looking to get started just before or after Christmas.

Discussion.

Mr. Grappone brought up an EPA regulation called the community sewer system regulation. It's a state statute. Especially, if we under the ARCHZ start approving more of these types of applications where you have private roads and the utilities are somewhat owned and maintained by the association. This issue came up when Jensen Communities was sold to Sun Communities. During the title search they realized they needed to get an approval from DEEP as it was a community sewer system and there was no agreement between the town and the developer and DEEP required as part of the closing documents that it be ratified.

This has been brought to our attention. I talked to Mark about Kingsridge, doing something similar. It's my understanding the water mains in these developments are also going to be private.

It's a document that addresses maintenance of the system by the association. If the association doesn't maintain the sewer lines over time, the town has the right to lien the property for billing purposes if we have to repair a clog, et cetera, due to non-maintenance.

Discussion.

This is ready for action from an engineering standpoint.

The Chair closed the public hearing at this time.

C. Proposed zoning regulation text amendment to repeal Section 18- Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD), ZA 66) opening of public hearing was tabled to November 4

Mr. Phillips recommended the PZC consider tabling the opening of the hearing until the November 17th meeting. The Chair said without objection, this item would be tabled until November 17th.

D. Christine Plourde, Home Occupation, application for Cottage Food Industry, property located at 17 Alyssa Court, in an R-20/25 zone (HO #77)

Christine Plourde, noted K & L on the line as well. They are my two middle school girls who are with me in this endeavor. We are dipping anything we can find in chocolate. This is made to order. A side business and they are no service hours such as 9:00 to 5:00. We'll work when we have orders to fulfill them. At this point it is custom orders. The majority will be delivery, meeting people to exchange product offsite, generally. Some pickups might happen at the house.

(Those wishing to speak in favor of the application)

Dina Bonola, a neighbor, stated she and her family were in full support. We're excited about it. Be successful.

(Those wishing to speak in opposition of the application)

No response.

(Commissioner Comments)

Ms. Locks asked about putting signage in front of the house. The applicant responded: No, no.

Mr. Gworek, Mr. Macchio, Ms. Albanese, Mr. Salka & Mr. Santago had no questions.

Mr. Cowles asked about the process with DCP and their licensing program. The applicant explained she hasn't gotten that far yet because she had to get town levels approvals, first. She felt it seemed easy as long as you stick to the typical cottage good items.

Discussion.

Mr. Cowles asked about advertising. She said she is working on a webpage and also social media is very powerful. We have to make sure we can handle whatever orders we get. It is a side business.

Ms. Volpe commended everyone's effort in doing these. It is vital during this struggling time and the idea is incredible as you are inspiring another generation to learn, economics, cooking, et cetera. You have my support.

Discussion of other dietary options.

The Chair said this is a great thing and he had no questions.

The Chair closed the public hearing.

BUSINESS MEETING

A. Eleni Real Estate, LLC, Special Permit Application for two buildings on one lot, property located at 1615 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPU #639), extended from October 20

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve SPU #639. Ms. Locks seconded.

Discussion:

Mr. Santago explained he had reservations about this. About an office building next to a restaurant on West Street on a nonconforming lot. If this was an expansion of the existing business, I might think differently. But it is not, so I have reservations about this one.

The Chair asked if traffic was a reservation for him. Mr. Santago said part of it is. But the other thing is that for all the other nonconforming businesses there, we now set the precedence to say that the WSB is an idea but not necessarily held firm where we wanted 2.5 acres, I get it is a nonconforming lot, but I have a hard time with letting everybody else on West Street now do that that has that.

And, I've got a business that I don't necessarily know if that business is going to impact the other. One of the criteria of special permit is that will one business take away the viability of the other and that kind of thing. For me, it's a little too unknown for me right now.

All of those factors are entering into my agita on this.

The Chair's concern was the traffic on West Street and the amount of curb cuts on West Street. I don't want it to be something that looks even remotely similar to Queen Street. In the WSB we do require that businesses tie into an access way once that is available to them. I ask if the proponent of the motion would be agreeable to making sure that we stipulate that to be clear that when and if an accessway becomes available that this property would be required to tie into that and also close the curb cuts they currently have out there.

Explained.

Mr. Phillips added they could abandon that temporary parking on the northern end of West Street. They're not going to need that.

Mr. Bovino said the northern parking lot has been abandoned. Their property is no longer owned by CAVA. As far as stipulating to curb cuts on West Street, I think it has to be based on what the traffic and the State of Connecticut decide. We have no objection to tie into the future connector when it becomes available but at this point, we would have to defer to the State of Connecticut.

The Chair disagreed. He stated the STC plays no role in whether we have an access road or a requirement in our regulation that you have to tie into it. The regulations right now require that you have to tie into it when and if it gets constructed. I want to be clear that when that access road is built, you are going to have to tie into the access road. I'm asking of the proponent of the motion would be willing to stipulate that to be clear. Mr. Bovino said that they don't object to that as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Salka said he would amend his motion to include that access point. Ms. Locks seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Grappone brought up on the traffic, DOT needs to review this from an encroachment standpoint. But part of the traffic study made a recommendation about a deceleration lane for a bypass for somebody that is travelling southbound and turning left into the northern driveway. That is a safety standpoint and I agree with that.

I throw out what the PZC's feeling is for excluding left turn lanes coming out of driveway on to West Street. I think that the traffic engineer misunderstood and I thought he made mention that he disagreed with the left turn from 221 to the site. I agree with that from the bypass standpoint. But exiting the driveway, I think the applicant should consider no left turn lane.

Mr. Bovino responded we will take those considerations when we get to the stie plan. We don't want to agree to something that is going to turn out to be unnecessary. In the report, he did indicate that if we close that, it's not as good as if you have both. He doesn't want to eliminate the left turn coming out because the traffic generated by the two businesses is a little bit different as to the time of the traffic. We have gaps in the traffic because of lights on the north and south. He would like to keep it open until we have a total picture of this traffic. But we know the commission is concerned about that and we will take that into consideration.

Discussion by the commissioners on the left-hand turn exiting.

Mr. Salka included in his motion about the prohibition of the left-hand turn exiting the site. Mr. Phillips said you can pass any kind of a motion with stipulations but it will ultimately lie with the DOT. Ms. Locks seconded.

The Chair recapped: The motion right now is to approve the application with the stipulation to require that the property be tied into the accessway when and if it is constructed or available, close the curb cuts on West Street and provide for a right turn only lane on the exiting on to West Street. Mr. Salka agreed as did Ms. Locks.

Mr. Cowles asked about the parking lot layout. Is it going to be just a big parking lot until we get a tenant? Mr. Bovino responded there is a parking lot there now for the restaurant. And, then there are some open areas, the old house and the garage. Eventually the house and garage will have to come down to make room for the future building and the additional space.

Mr. Phillips confirmed the drainage is already installed for the parking area. Mr. Grappone said just for a portion of it. The medical office building parking lot (inaudible). If they put additional impervious area over there, I would recommend the second detention basin get constructed. As it is right now with the gravel lot being paved with the first detention basin, we're going to be okay.

Nothing is going to be built (building & parking lot) until a tenant is secured asked Mr. Cowles. Mr. Bovino responded he built the parking lot to take care of his business. If he needs additional parking, he will expand that but he would have to provide the drainage for it. The concept is to have a medical office building with related parking. The concept also was to share parking. Some parking will be used by the restaurant in the future. The medical use will not need as much parking as the restaurant use. Right now, he has the parking he needs and he's waiting for this approval to market it for the additional building. We are not going to build the entire parking lot now and then the building later.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino said he was concerned about where this is heading with this approval. In front of you we have a special permit request for two buildings on one site. They are different. But traffic is traffic. If we address the traffic concerns, it doesn't matter what kind of use we have there. I agreed to the stipulation that when the connector road is there, we will be required to connect.

You said we need to close the curb cut on West Street and make it only a right turn. That's pretty drastic of a stipulation to make at this point before all the facts are on the table. I would object to that stipulation to close the curb cut and make it a right turn, only.

The Chair called for a roll call vote.

Motion passed 4 to 3 with Mr. Macchio, Mr. Santago & Ms. Volpe opposed.

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), extended from October 20

Mr. Phillips recommended a tabling of the site plan for responses to comments. Mr. Salka made a motion to table. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

C. 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 #641) continued from October 20

Ms. Locks made a motion to approve SPU#641. Mr. Salka seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. 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, (SPU #641) continued from October 20

Sev Bovino, Planner from Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented on behalf of the applicant. This site plan is for 15 age restricted units, ranch style. Similar to South End Road. The separation distance is about 27'. We have more than the 20% of greenspace that is required under the regulations. We have provided visitor parking as indicated during the special permit. Sidewalks to Pacer Lane and we added some benches in the project.

We received staff comments. We went through the wetlands application process to do the sewer crossing and received approval.

We responded to staff comments in writing and the plans were revised to reflect those comments. We have the appropriate landscape, street trees, landscaping around the units of low flowering shrubs and also, we have added additional buffering to the south and north as required by the special permit.

Drainage was reviewed by the town engineer and approved. We have a low impact development type of drainage system. We're reducing the number of pipes and catch basins on the project. We have swales and areas that collect water in the center of the turn arounds. Water runs along the southerly via grass swales, 300' or more before it enters a water quality basin and then exits into a drainage ditch to the west. The water eventually runs into a wetland to the north.

The entrance is a boulevard type of entrance with landscaping in the center. We have arborvitaes also on the south and north sides to screen the driveway and we are connecting to an existing sidewalk that was left from when Pacer Lane was constructed.

We are connecting into the sewer at the north of this property. The sewer needs to be extended. The water line will be looped through the project as preferred by the water department.

Any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

Engineering and planning indicated it was ready for action.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve SPR#1804 as submitted. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

E. Proposed zoning regulation text amendment to repeal Section 18- Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD), ZA 66) opening of public hearing was tabled to November 4

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

F. Christine Plourde, Home Occupation, application for Cottage Food Industry, property located at 17 Alyssa Court, in an R-20/25 zone (HO #77)

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve HO #77 as outlined to the commission. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

G. 8-24 referral for the purchase of 55 Sherry Drive for \$400,000 (MR#557)

By way of background, Mr. Salka explained this property is a 9.67-acre parcel in an R-40 zone. There is an open field along with a large wooded area. It is connected to a current open space piece of property that the town owns. It is a wildlife corridor. It will have hiking trails as there is parking in that little cul de sac on Sherry Drive. Very little wetlands. Mostly open field. If the town did not acquire this, being in an R-40 zone, that was prime building property for five or six homes.

I am recommending we support this proposal.

The Chair noted a good job by Mr. Salka and the open space committee.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote. *

* No motion or second offered.

H. Request for road acceptance, LaCourse Pond Place from Marion Avenue to its terminus, a total distance of 745 feet (.14 mi), subject to receipt of a \$19,000 maintenance bond (S #1315)

Mr. Grappone said this item is ready for action. We did confirm that the deeds for the proposed roadway have been filed on the land records and public improvements are all constructed and are ready for acceptance.

Aldo DeBacco asked to be allowed to speak. I live at 74 LaCourse Pond Place. Plantsville.

Ms. Verna indicated she would like to speak after Mr. DeBacco.

Mr. DeBacco said there is a question on the ownership of the land they're coming in with the road, 50 by 150 or so. I've been paying taxes on it for three years already. That's one issue.

The number two issue is they created some kind of an engineered drainage system and with all the storm drains on LaCourse Pond Place flow into these containers or design system and from there they flow into the five-acre pond on this property. It's spring fed. Whatever the design --- I called DEEP and you people --- we had severe weather and three quarters of the pond turned brown. Like chocolate.

Number three is they took down a fence I had for my dogs and they never put it back.

The design system abuts the parking lot and my driveway. It's a safety issue. From the top of my driveway to the top of this invert, it's over 20'. Somebody comes to visit me at night and decides to backup and turn the car around, they could fall into this thing and eventually fall into the pond. Something has to be addressed. This is a safety issue.

I am making you people aware of this and what can you do for me on this issue. I talked to the engineer and everybody and nobody does nothing about it.

Mr. Grappone explained Mr. DeBacco was part of the development and he owned the land from the previous owner and I think it is V-Squared and Liz Verna is the V in V-Squared. She purchased the land from Mr. DeBacco for a certain price. I have been out to the site. I went out after the rainstorm. I did not see erosion at the pond. I did see the drop off he is referencing. I think it could be cleared up just by putting up some kind of fencing. There is other fencing that is shown as part of the development of the other lots. That safety issue could be resolved by fencing and it's just a matter of the two developers working it out.

This was all part of a large tract of land with an existing house on it. Subdivision lots got carved which created the subdivision. That leads to some of the concerns he has.

The Chair asked staff if the commission had any authority to do anything on this?

Mr. Phillips said what is before you right now is the acceptance of a roadway. It's really not related to this.

Mr. Grappone stated he did confirm that Mr. DeBacco actually signed the deed over the V-Squared who did the development of the roadway.

Mr. DeBacco interjected he never signed it. Never signed any deed there.

Mr. Grappone indicated he had a signed copy of his signature.

Elizabeth Verna, the managing member of V-Squared, 26 Maplevue Road, Wallingford, CT spoke. As Mr. Grappone expressed the title of the property is owned solely by V-Squared. Property taxes have been paid by V-Squared. A site plan bond was posted by V-Squared. And, recently, we gave permission to transfer the remaining \$19,000 that was in a site plan into a maintenance bond because there are three items of street trees that Eversource asked us to move out of the easement.

We're asking that the town accept the road. We have been addressing any of the incomplete items that were on the subdivision approval plan since June. I believe that we've met all the criteria of the public safety with the (inaudible) departments as well as wetlands, engineering and planning & zoning.

We submitted final as-builts. And, the property is owned by V-Squared, LLC. And, it is recorded on the land records that I've provided copies of.

I'm asking the commission to approve the acceptance of the road and that any of the issues that Mr. DeBacco has are issues on his own property and they should be taken care of by him.

Mr. DeBacco showed his tax bill and I paid. How they own that property, I do not know.

The Chair said in front of us is a proposal for the town to accept the road. The issues that you raise are outside of our purview on this agenda item. Mr. Phillips said you are looking at accepting the roadway as a public infrastructure. That's what we are looking at right now.

The status of the development, problems or issues by Mr. DeBacco, that is not in front of us right now. Mr. Phillips believed that was irrelevant to the agenda item right now.

The Chair explained that the commission did not have a role to play in the items that might need to be worked out at time. Mr. DeBacco said it is the commission's job to protect his property rights. The danger of the 20' invert, drop --- would you like that next to your property, driveway? And, now I am supposed to put a fence? She's saying that's my problem? It isn't my problem. I didn't create that engineering thing.

The Chair said this is just asking us to accept a road to add to the town inventory. Nothing behind that. The dispute you might have with the developer --- (inaudible) --- .

Mr. Grappone said the motion is for road acceptance and he believes everything is in order with respect to the deeds, I'd be more than happy to share that information with the town attorney for a review. You can either table or accept the road subject to the town attorney's review of the deeds.

Mr. DeBacco said I am asking you to table it tonight.

Ms. Verna said she is asking for acceptance of the road. The deeds as Mr. De Bacco knows, the property is owned by V-Squared. We would like to have it accepted tonight. There are two property owners that purchased lots. I made a commitment to them we would have everything done by a certain date so a table creates a bit of a burden.

There are two other residents that purchased two lots out there. The building permits, financing, they need a town approved road.

We've met all of our obligations that engineering and zoning has proposed to us. I don't see why the road shouldn't get approved this evening.

Discussion about approving this subject to review by the town attorney. Mr. Grappone offered he has a degree of confidence that everything has been done properly, thus the recommendation to move forward subject to his review. I will get the deeds to Jeremy now.

Mr. Santiago made a motion to accept the road subject to the town attorney's review of the warranty deed for the street per town engineering recommendation. Ms. Locks seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

I. Request for road acceptance, Aspen Way from Loper Street to its terminus, a distance of 1,560 feet (.29 mi) and Teakwood Dr from Aspen Way to its terminus, a total distance of 440 feet (.08 mi) subject to receipt of a \$30,000 maintenance bond (S#1312)

Mr. Grappone explained this is Phases 1 and 2 for Woodland Heights Subdivision. Phase I was construction of the road Aspen Way. Phase 2 involves Teakwood. The public improvements are in, accepted and reviewed by the town engineering department and we recommend acceptance on both streets.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve S#1312. Mr. Macchio seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- Adoption of 2021 meeting schedule

Ms. Locks made a motion to accept and adopt the schedule as written. Mr. Salka seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- Regulations Review Committee Update and Discussion

Mr. Santiago said the only thing was if indeed people had a chance to review the handout, we did last time in regards to different ways to present to the regulations. We'll be working on the Excel diagram with the history of the regulation changes going back 30 to 40 years. Rob's team is working on that. We were wondering about your thoughts on the presentation of the regulations.

You can email me or Rob and let us know what you think if you didn't have a chance to look at it.

ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

- Michael Treviso, Special Permit application to construct a garage in excess of 3 spaces, property located at 212 Valley View Court, in an R-40 zone (SPU #642) November 17

- Severino V. Bovino, V>P> (KJA) agent for Michael Riccio and David J. Carabetta, application to change zone boundary from R-20/25 to B, property located at 307 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, owned by Compagnos, LLC parcel size .83 acres (ZC #568), November 17

RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

Nothing to report.

ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 o'clock, p.m.)