

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
TOWN OF SOUTHTON  
DECEMBER 1, 2020

The Planning & Zoning Commission of the Town of Southington held a public hearing and regular meeting on Tuesday, December 1, 2020 via WebEx teleconference. Robert Hammersley, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

The following participated:

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

Alternates: Theresa Albanese, Joe Coviello & Caleb Cowles\*

(Joined meeting in progress.)

Staff:

Robert Phillips, Director of Planning & Community Development

James Grappone, Ass't Town Engineer

Absent: Commissioner James Macchio  
Alternate Stuart Savelkoul

The Chair seated Alternate Joe Coviello in place of James Macchio for this evening's meeting. A quorum was determined.

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

A Moment of Silence was observed by everyone.

ROBERT HAMMERSLEY, Chair, presiding:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Regular Meeting of November 17, 2020

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve as presented. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

MINUTES ARE PREPARED SUMMARY STYLE. YOU MAY REFER TO THE ONLINE POSTING TO HEAR THE FULL 35-MINUTE PRESENTATION.

A. Proposed zoning regulation text amendment to repeal Section 18 – Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD), ZA 606, tabled from November 17

The Chair advised the commission had a desire to hear from our economic development director, Mr. Perillo, who is on line.

Louis Perillo, III, the town's economic development director presented. This is a proposed zoning repeal of the ROD. The rational behind it is this was conceived about 15 years ago and might no longer fit.

The Chair advised at the previous meeting Mr. Phillips did a good job presenting the history and it might be more productive to just open it up to the commissioners to see if they had questions for you to talk about on this.

Mr. Santiago started off. His concern is if this is repealed there are other parcels in town that this applies to and if this was repealed what if any adverse impacts would there be on the other properties and would it hinder other types of development down the road. I get it helping one particular area but I am concerned about adverse implications on other properties. Can you help us understand that?

Mr. Perillo explained the rational. If you look at the four districts in the ROD zone, three of them have changed in character and have come before this and other PZCs for modifications of uses within those defined areas.

One of the areas is in Milldale. The PZC recently changed the zone from industrial, a portion of the site, to business to accommodate a gas station. Adjacent to that, they put in a storage facility.

(Sites shown on the screen by Rob Phillips sharing his screen.)

At one of the other I-2 areas that got redeveloped, we had a fire. We have Cross Fit gym in another area.

The property ownership in the last 15 years has changed in all of these districts except for the one downtown. And, uses have come before the commission and they were granted. He explained there were three or four impacted properties that had changed regarding Milldale. I don't see housing being within the ROD fitting in with the harmony of what the ROD was supposed to replicate.

Plantsville Center, you changed some uses with Dean's Outdoor Center and the Lion's Den Coffee Center. You already have a residential component. The make up of that area included the former Gulf Shrimp industrial area on Summer Street. There have been changes of ownership and redevelopment within that area of town. We don't see the ROD regulations being put into use there.

For Plantsville, West Main & West Street, that area, one of the factories was actually demolished and removed. A distillery purchased property and renovated. We had a boutique hotel try to come in on one of the parcels. And, a gas station with a drive thru. We have new ownership on

several properties and the factory was reinvigorated with a pipe fitting sprinkler system type business. So, I don't really see the need for the ROD in that area. Explained interest about ten years ago but the new owner has no intention of using it in the ROD manner.

Three out of the four are no longer applicable. And, the one remaining has an approval that has to be substantially complete by September, 2021. We think there might be a better way addressing that site with less retail on the approval and something that makes sense moving forward given the changing environment.

Discussion.

He noted there was over \$5 million of remediation on that site and demolition occur on that site and we are in a much different position than 15 years ago with having the blight buildings removed.

(\*Noted that Mr. Cowles joined the meeting.)

Mr. Santiago offered that it sounds like what you are saying by removing this, it would help market it by getting some different ways to get something else in there as it is now too restrictive. By removing this regulation, where applied before is no longer applicable and the bigger parcel it will help market to have other things.

Mr. Perillo said something new would have to be created that is more in line with what we foresee given the current conditions and what we might want to see moving forward. Perhaps architectural standards, a larger component of open space publicly accessible, not putting buildings within a 100-year flood zone because parameters have changed since the approvals. Looking at when this expires, is there something proactive we can do and that's where the marketing comes into play.

The other aspect of it is, do we really need 25,000 sf of new commercial space and what would that do to our existing. Those are components we have to be very careful of. It's worth pausing and seeing if we want to pivot into a slightly different direction that allows for more public access and use.

Discussion.

Ms. Locks had no questions.

Mr. Gworek asked if there were currently and pending or proposed planning in any of these areas that if we remove this, it'll effect their development going forward or is everything kind of on hold with a wait and see kind of approach? Mr. Perillo said a component of the ROD is the assemblage of 10 acres. I do not see the potential of that within the defined ROD areas existing right now.

Discussion.

The Milldale area was discussed.

West and West Main Street owners' visions were discussed.

To have an ROD in three of the four areas where it is no longer applicable doesn't make any sense to have something that isn't going to be used on the books or could be used more efficiently through consideration of a text or regulation change within a defined area.

Mr. Gworek said anything that can get these properties developed and improved helps. Explained.

Ms. Volpe appreciated the background. She asked for a reiteration of the parcels that still fall under this ROD that don't conform. Mr. Perillo again went over the four parcels within the ROD.

Mr. Perillo went over the Milldale area, Plantsville Center, Summer Street section, corner of West & West Main Street.

Discussion.

The piece downtown has an approval that expires in September of 2021.

Ms. Volpe said when the ROD was envisioned it had it in mind for former industrial spaces. I wonder if it is worth not fully removing or replacing the ROD with something that might benefit some of the industrial historic spaces. I move towards the theories of adaptive reuse. They do remain pertinent to our town. We want to ensure they are used properly. I don't know if removing everything in the ROD is worth it. We might amend or replace with something that would benefit the structures as they continue to be developed.

Mr. Perillo pointed out they are being redeveloped. Fifteen years ago, the situation was completely different. Explained changes to industrial, housing, the recession. In the interim, the factories are fully occupied. Note the Carriage Bolt Building where it is being rehabbed for a distillery. It'll be preserved. These regulations are not applicable to these properties as they have been renovated and saved.

The Old Five Star Building is now Dean's Stove Shop. Explained the complete overhaul. The antique building across the street has a whole new renovated front. The buildings won't be sold for adaptive reuse.

The factories on West Street have been redeveloped and reused. Explained.

Most of these properties were in the ROD because they had contamination and it wasn't feasible to redevelop without adding a residential component. Explained.

With the contamination at the Peck Stowe Building, that's what led to the demolition of it.

These regulations aren't going to help redevelop anything of the other three sites in town and we think there is a better way of redeveloping the downtown 14 acres.

Ms. Volpe felt there may be in a place within our regulations to outline the future of some of the remaining industrial structures that we do have.

(Pause, pause)

Mr. Coviello asked: Leaving this in there, does it prevent anything --- I'm assuming you are saying the residential component is really irrelevant at this point --- but is this more of a clean up effort given where we are today? Mr. Perillo said it is more of a cleanup in the sense that it is applicable to one area now and really applicable to the other three. Thinking forward, I would think you would want more control of redevelopment and use. Adaptive reuse is different now than it was 15 years ago.

Discussion.

Retail is in a position of change and we have to look at an opportunity that we have 14 acres in the heart of downtown and is this really the regulation you want to have out there for potential future

development or is there something that collectively we can remove this, and see if there is a better way of getting access to the river for the whole town and is there a better design than what was created 15 years ago. That's what I'd like to pivot to.

This regulation did its job. We got \$5 million worth of information on investigative conditions on the site and significant remediation. That would not have happened if these were not put in. Now, there is a better way forward, I think.

Mr. Cowles commented that it seems like this was an opinion that had its day and that day has now passed us. I'm happy to see the other sites that were part of this overlay have been vigorously worked up and utilized. Hopefully, we'll see something more with the downtown.

Ms. Albanese went over the ROD regulations (retail, commercial, residential uses) and she was not totally grasping what can be done with all the potential parcels identified. Mr. Perillo said the intention of the regulation at that time was to take advantage of the residential as many sites were no longer appropriate for industrial commercial or needed remediation. A means of investment to get to the remediation was the housing density. That's how it was created.

Discussion.

The premise is each of the four sites had known or allegedly contamination and we were trying to get them cleaned up in a productive way that allowed for growth that was feasible.

Discussion.

Mr. Salka commented: Now is an opportunity if we decide to eliminate this regulation that we really take a look at enhancing a regulation that will pinpoint what we want to do downtown. We probably have to do something to make sure we fully utilize that property to our town's advantage. That's my only comment.

(Any members of the public to speak in favor of the application)

None.

(Any members of the public to speak against the application)

None.

The Chair indicated Mr. Perillo had done a great job answering questions and we appreciate your time and efforts on behalf of the town. Keep up the good work!

The Chair closed the public hearing on this item.

## BUSINESS MEETING

A. Proposed zoning regulation text amendment to repeal Section 18 – Redevelopment Overlay District (ROD), ZA 606, tabled from November 17

Mr. Salka made a motion to repeal Section 18 of the Redevelopment Overlay District which is ZA 606. Ms. Locks seconded.

Mr. Phillips reminded everyone if this passes, next the POCD would be amended to remove the references from that document. It requires a referral to the Town Council and up to 60 days for them to comment.

Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Effective Date: December 15, 2020.

B. Eleni Real Estate, LLC, site plan modification application for a two-story office/retail building, property located at 165 West Street, in the WSB zone, parcel size 2.13 acres (SPR #1802), tabled from November 17

Mr. Bovino, on behalf of the applicant, requested the matter continue to be tabled. No objection from the commission. Mr. Phillips explained the normal deadline for this would be December 1<sup>st</sup> but the Governor through Executive Orders has granted 90 extra days on any application, so it could go out another three months.

Request granted.

C. Execwest Retail, LLC, site plan modification for the construction of a 100 Grill Restaurant at the location depicted as Building 300 on previously approved site plans, property located at 99 Executive Boulevard South, in a B zone, parcel size 9.07 acres (SPR #1808)

Kenneth Knowles, Eaglebrook Engineering and Surveying, here on behalf of Execwest Retail, LLC presented. He went through the property history dating back to 2007. This piece was approved then but not built. It went through a site plan modification in 2009, again not built due to economic reasons. In 2015, the site plan modification is the site plan that was built with the Home Goods and Michaels and the small retail. Back in 2007, it was always intended that any future buildings go before the commission for a site plan modification. So, CHIPS was a separate plan modification for them. In 2018, we had a site plan modification which was not built. That bring us to today. North Star Execwest has been looking for a high-quality operator for that parcel.

This site plan modification tonight is for 110 Grille Restaurant at Building 300 which is the pad right next to the Mobile. No changes to the overall parking area. It's a gravel pad that has sat there waiting for the right tenant.

(Site Plan on the screen)

This is bordered by West Street on the east side and then down to Target and Lowes. Building 300 would be on the right-hand side, CHIPS is on the left, the Mobile and then this building.

The parking lot itself was constructed as part of the Michaels and Home Goods back in 2015-16. There are no changes to the interior of the parking lot.

(Pause)

The square footage of the building is 5,818, not including the patio. It was proposed to be a 6,000-sf building as shown in 2015. The restaurant has 223 seats, total, including the restaurant, the bar and any seasonal seats outside on the patio.

110 Grille and the property was granted special exception by the ZBA in October, 2020 for restaurant use with liquor sales both inside and outside on the patio.

He explained the site plan. All utilities were stubbed out in 2015. We do have water, sewer, electric conduit and drainage stubbed out to the site.

Building elevations were shown on the screen and discussed. The façade is a metal siding with a darker and lighter gray with a wood tone. A copper band wraps around the building with the name. The façade facing the patio and the parking lot was discussed.

The side facing the Mobile was discussed noting the dumpster and service area. There are arborvitaes between the Mobile property and this elevation.

The elevation facing West Street was discussed as trying to be sensitive to cars that travel on West Street. Explained. There is some screening to breakup the façade.

Hours of operation are 10:00 am to 12:01 am.

They did allow any kind of low-key live entertainment on the patio with the firepit.

I'm happy to answer questions.

Kim Wallace from 110 Grille added it is a family restaurant with a bar inside. We want to be in Southington to get people back to work that need to be back to work. We're a growing brand that is doing very well. Other locations were noted.

Site lighting was discussed in response to a query by Ms. Locks.

Mr. Santiago asked about the access from Executive Drive. Mr. Phillips explained. Mr. Santiago said his concern was accessibility and traffic flow at the site and exit/egress onto Executive Boulevard and if we need to do something in a better way there. Mr. Phillips said all of that was vetted when the original site plan came in for the anchor tenants and pad sites. We did have concerns over the double access point entrance/exit in that corner there and sight lines and lane merging. The SPD reviewed that and were okay with it.

Mr. Grappone added further the SPD did review it. The traffic division. After 2 or 3 COs in the plaza and they came up with signage and pavement marking modification. They feel what is out there works. We actually did get some extra right of way for a future easement along Long Horn's property in the event it had to be widened. We feel it's working. Not the best scenario. Accidents are minimal.

Discussion.

Mr. Gworek asked about the south side, the patio side. The 84 westbound ramp is there. Is the patio overlooking the ramp and the highway, do you plan on some screening? Mr. Knowles explained the patio is raised up and drops off towards the on ramp. There's brick pillars and in between those are planting boxes with some higher shrubs and grasses.

Mr. Phillips said planning response to comments were received and are satisfactory.

Mr. Grappone advised the application is less than two weeks old with a holiday. I got comments out today. I'll call them not major comments, housekeeping comments that need to be put on the plan. They can be worked out between the town and the applicant as far as I am concerned. Mr. Knowles concurred they can work on providing the information and he has no problem with it being a condition.

The Chair stated the motion should include the comments be worked to the town engineering department satisfaction. Mr. Knowles agreed.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve SPU SPR #1808 contingent on the comments by the town engineer for approval dated December 1, 2020. Mr. Santago seconded. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

D. Jack's Family Donuts, LLC, site plan modification to allow the following: extending the drive thru lanes to the rear of the property, moving the menu boards and call box to the rear of the site, relocating the dumpster, adding an additional menu board and call box and adding a pre-pay hut, property located at 1825 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, owned by Southington Development Partners, LLC, parcel size 1.19 acres, in a B zone (SPR #1770.1)

Jim Cassidy, engineer out of Cromwell, CT representing the applicant. Back in 2018 we were before you and received a site plan approval to construct a new Dunkin Donuts located at 1825 Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. (Site plan approved shown on the screen.)

It was for the construction of the new building. The site is 1.9 acres. It is accessed off the driveway that goes into the cinemas (indicated). It feeds around the front of the building. As part of the construction we built to new drive thru lanes. The first one, closest to the building (indicating) is the drive thru with the menu board on it. The second lane (indicating) was an On the Go lane. Customers are allowed to merge into regular traffic and get up to the drive thru window. The third lane (indicating) is a by pass lane. It all fed through the entire circumference of the backing back out to the main access drive. This building replaced the former Dunkin Donuts (indicated). There was a dumpster located at the back of the site.

The site plan was constructed and built in accordance with Dunkin's criteria drawings. (Shown on the screen). It was finished in last November and it was opened. Come March, the world changed.

Drive thrus look a lot different now. We found with COVID and power outages, the drive thru was not functioning well. The traffic queueing backed out into the access driveway and back up into the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike. The Franchisee of the shop want to do something to make it better, improve it so this situation doesn't continue to occur.

They asked me to figure a way to (1) get more queueing and (2) find a way to improve the overall circulation and effectiveness of people going thru the drive thru lane.

On the screen are the site plans submitted. They have asked me to look at a way to extend the drive thru to provide more queueing. Referring to the third page in, the site layout plan, where the dumpster is, it is going to be relocated. The crosshatched area is existing curb and pavement and the dumpster pad that would all be pulled up and removed. It is a little over 4,000 sf. There is the height

limitation bar for the two drive thru lanes that is going to be relocated. The menu board will be relocated, also.

In the new site plan, where the dumpster is, we're going to extend toward the back with a drive thru lane but when we get to the back, you'll see that the driveway opens up now providing three lanes. What will happen is we will relocate the one menu board to this first pad and then we are looking into adding this island and we are going to add a second menu board and call box similar to McDonald's. They can be servicing two people at the call boxes at one time. We'll still keep the lane open around the perimeter, so an On the Go customer will be able to merge back into the main drive thru. This whole area (indicating) will be the area of new pavement in addition to we are looking to adding another curb cut back to the movie theater property. This will provide an escape route. It also allows an opportunity to push the dumpster to the rear of the property where a truck can pull straight into the dumpster, back out, and head back down the main driveway. The reconfiguration of this driveway picks us up about 10 additional queueing spaces. We are going to have to eliminate two parking spaces (indicated). To accommodate, where we had the two drive thru lanes (On the Go and the drive thru), we're going to recurb this area. There is small island that we're going to remove and repave which will pickup three spaces. We were at 23 and we'll be at 24 picking up one space. They should not interfere with this parking (indicating).

This picks up an addition ten to twelve queueing spaces before you get to the drive thru window.

To help improve speed moving through the window, we are looking at adding a small 8 by 8 structure which we call a prepay hut. It is an isolated drive thru window where you can pay for the product and when you get to the window you can just pick it up. Construction will be the same materials and colors as on the site already.

Between the additional menu, call box and prepay and working with Dunkin on this, they feel they can dramatically increase the flow of traffic through the site. You will still be able to continue around the perimeter of the building and get out to the main access drive. We think this back improvement will help this queueing and help the overall circulation on the site.

Grading and drainage were discussed. With the new grading and creation of this new drainage system, we have slightly less runoff from the parking area going to the front detention basins. We did not bother rerunning the drainage calculations that we designed that basin for because the overall impervious coverage will be less going to that. Overall impervious coverage on the site is slightly increased but this depression in the center is designed to accommodate for that (indicating).

I did receive comments from planning but did not write a response letter to them. I reviewed them with the franchisee and we find them agreeable to. The comments consisted of two items:

- Where the driveway connects to the movie theater driveway there is one tree that will need to be removed and then along the edge of the drive thru lane here (indicating) there is another tree that needs to be removed. The requirement is we replant any trees that we remove and we are more than willing to do that. Explained.

- If we are proposing any new lighting it needs to be LED and Dark Sky compliant. We were not proposing any new lights on the site. Explained the lighting existing is adequate, but if the

commission feels it is not, we will add an additional light fixture on to the site plan and they will be compliant to the lights on the site.

That concludes my presentation and I will answer your questions.

The Chair asked about the additional curb cut on the far end of the property, that's on the access way into the back section and not on the Meriden Waterbury Turnpike, and it flows eventually back to the movie theater; is that correct? Mr. Cassidy explained the right to access the movie theater property. We do have rights to that driveway that connect to the movie theater property. Similar with the drainage system.

Discussion.

The function of the back driveway was discussed.

The curb cut is in/out, but they'd have to go around the building and signage would be added.

Discussion.

Mr. Salka felt this would mitigate problems on the M-W Road with the backup. Thank you for that.

Ms. Locks was concerned with pedestrians walking from the theater going to Dunkin Donuts and they were now going to have to watch the traffic coming in in the back for safety purposes. Can they be seen? Lighting along the driveway was pointed out. Mr. Cassidy said they'd have to promote some type of a walkway or crosswalk across the driveway from the theater. We can take that into consideration.

Mr. Santiago echoed the safety sentiment and wanting some sort of walkway. As to the entrance/exit, I get the entrance part of it. As to ordering, I see a lot of people cutting the line. Traffic flow was noted.

Discussion.

Mr. Cassidy would discuss with the owner leaving it as an exit only.

Further discussion on the traffic circulation. It was noted the busiest hours are when the movie theater is not open. Line cutting might be low.

Discussion on signage not to cause a traffic issue.

Mr. Gworek asked could you do another curb instead of exit only? Then you'd have to drive over the curb to get into the queue if you still wanted two-way access. Mr. Cassidy said that could be possible.

Discussion.

We have fire department and health department approval on this.

Mr. Phillips confirmed the prepay small building is not going to be used for beverage or food service. Health Department had that concern. Fire Marshal had no concerns. Mr. Cassidy said no food service, just for financial transactions.

Mr. Phillips said planning comments were addressed.

Mr. Grappone said this application came in later than the previous application and he did not have an opportunity for review. However, he shared the same concerns on traffic. It just seems like with the two islands there are a lot of two-way traffic points there for conflict. To me, this would be a great area to put a rotary in. I don't know if that would be entertained. It might alleviate a lot of two-way traffic concerns for the northerly entrance.

Discussion.

Mr. Grappone also noted the calculations on the drywell. The traffic is the issue at this point.

Mr. Salka agreed that the applicant should be allowed to design something to alleviate that potential problem on the north curb cut. The Chair encouraged the applicant's engineer to take the comments noted and try to work with the engineering department to address the issues. So, on the 15<sup>th</sup> when you come back, you'll have a revised plan or an action plan to address the comments.

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

E. CGS 8-24 Referral for the Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) of 47.951 +/- acres for a total cost of \$75,986 with a Town of Southington contribution of \$397,993 (50%) for property known as "Karabin Farms", 894 and 942 Andrews Street, as delineated on property survey entitled "Map of Property of Diane L. Karabin, by Weston and Sampson, dated June 5, 2020. MBL = 137010 and 137011 in an R-80 zone.

Mr. Phillips introduced the application to refresh everybody's memory as to what the purchase of development rights is. Every property has what they call a bundle of property rights. In this case everybody has a right to develop their property as outlined in the zoning regulations. This property is in a residential zone. They look at the before and after appraisal. Before would be as an existing farm with a farmstead in this case. It means the farm, farmstead home and the envelope that is tied to the farm allows for some development of accessory structures or modifications to the home to an extent. It is tied to the farm and must be conveyed with the farm. Before is the existing farm value of land with the farmstead.

The after appraisal is if it was developed at its highest best use. In a residential zone, the highest and best use 99% of the time is going to be a residential subdivision with single family lots.

The difference between those two appraisals is the value of the development rights. You would pay the property owner that amount of money in order to take the development rights from the property. It is a way of getting some value out of the property without having it go to residential development in the future.

For the town, it allows us to continue to maintain farm land and support farm land preservation. Also, it serves as a form of open space. Farm land is a perceived open space. But it is still private property with no public access without outside of whatever farm business they run.

It allows the owner to take out some of the value and put it right back into the farm operation or do whatever else they may see fit with the value.

It's a win/win situation.

Paul Chaplinsky, Chair of the Open Space Committee, presented. He showed a quick overview of the area. (On the screen) I thank the Karabin Family as this has been an on-going dialogue for quite some time now. They're been gracious and collaborative in working with the town to make this proposal come to fruition.

It's 48 acres in the R-80 zone. This is a development rights purchase so the owners maintain the use of the farm.

Strategically, this is adjacent to other town owned parcels. (Shown on screen) This is open space that is perceived. And, if not preserved, it could be developed in the future and this would maintain the look and feel in perpetuity.

Discussion.

He pointed out parcels that the town already owns on Flanders Road which connects to other open space including a parcel adjacent to Karabin. The New Britain Reservoir and additional town open space was noted. Sherry Drive property of about 10 acres was also noted. He pointed out land in the Southington Land Trust in the area.

Preserving this continues to maintain and wildlife corridor and a large tract of open space in this area for a long time to come.

He discussed the POCD and its support for proactivity for open space. (Page 27, 28, 30)

The Open Space Committee is also the Farm Heritage Committee and farm preservation and promotion is part of our strategic priorities for the town.

Page 31 of the 2016 POCD specifically calls out for enhanced preservation tools where purchase of development rights for preservation of open space, farm land or other land is one type of tool and technique that is recommended in the POCD. This is all consistent with that document in a number of different places.

I'd like to recognize a lot of team members who made this happen:

- Karabin Family. These are difficult decisions for families and it's because of their unconditional love for the community and strong collaboration we can make something like this happen.
- Town Staff including Rob Phillips, Dave Lavalley, Jeremy Taylor, Town Attorney and all the others.
- Town Manager Mark Sciota was instrumental in getting some of these things in place including this one.
- The State of Connecticut for getting the grant for the farmland preservation is a benefit to the town and its taxpayers because we are getting half of the funding from town tax dollars and half from the State.
- Thank the Open Space/Farm Heritage Committee. It's not often we have Bob Salka, who is on your board and sits on this committee, and this team works tirelessly to identify parcels for

acquisition by going through and vetting the process and maintaining strategic plans as we begin to work on each.

- Shout out to Dawn Miceli, former Open Space Committee Chair. She was instrumental in getting the dialogue started and the grant going with town staff on this parcel. Thanks to Dawn for her efforts.

Mr. Salka said Paul did a great job. These two pieces of property really are pristine as far as the town goes. They're broken up into two parts and I want to thank the Karabin Family for working with us. A long time coming and something the town really needs to do. Great job so far and something we want to continue on with.

I thank Paul for all his work.

The purchase money was explained again.

Mr. Phillips stated usually this type of recommendation is made by the town council and then it comes to the PZC. In this case, we're at PZC before the town council formally referred it out. That's because of the timeframe involved as time is of the essence in getting this done. Thus, the difference.

The Chair said all boards are to be thanked commended for their open space efforts. He noted he was glad to see the State of Connecticut was helping out with money, as well.

Mr. Salka made a motion to approve MBL 137010 and 137011, a favorable recommendation. Ms. Locks. Motion passed 7 to 0 on a roll call vote.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- Regulations Review Committee Update and Discussion

Mr. Santiago had nothing new to offer. The next meeting is scheduled for the 16<sup>th</sup> of December.

If you have any comments on Sections 2 and 3 of the regulations, let us know and we'll take it under advisement.

#### ITEMS TO SCHEDULE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Nothing new.

#### RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICAIONS

- Mount Southington, site plan modification application to remove existing ski school building and replace with 2,820 sf two story building, property located at 396 Mount Vernon Road, parcel size 98.91 acres (SPR #1809)

Mr. Phillips noted another application that came in from the Town on the Plantsville Pump Station at 806 South Main Street.

EXECUTIVE SESSION: To discuss pending litigation

Not necessary this evening.

ADJOURNMENT

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

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:52 o'clock.)