

NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

August 24, 2005

Regular Meeting

Chairman Vincent Camilli called the regular meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 3 at the Newington Town Hall, 131 Cedar Street, Newington, Connecticut.

Commissioners Present

Commissioner Anest-Klett  
Chairman Camilli  
Commissioner Cariseo  
Commissioner Fox  
Commissioner Ganley  
Commissioner Kornichuk  
Commissioner Schatz  
Commissioner Prestage

Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Andersen

Staff Present

Ed Meehan, Town Planner

Commissioner Cariseo: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't here at the last meeting, but I did read the minutes, and I will be voting this evening.

**II. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- A. PETITION 32-05 1000 Willard Avenue, Paul DeFelice, 295 Orchard Avenue, Newington, CT 06111, owner and applicant request for Special Exception Section 6.7.2 Interior Lot, R-12 Zone District. Inland Wetlands Report required. Continued from August 10, 2005.**

Chairman Camilli: From what I understand we still have not gotten anything as a Wetlands Report, so this will be continued. Would anyone from the public wish to speak. So, we will just have to keep postponing until we get their report, or decision.

- B. PETITION 41-05 944 Main Street, Jeffrey L. Hedberg, 27 Garfield Street, owner and applicant represented by Attorney Leon S. Davidoff, 29 East Cedar Street, Newington, CT 06111 request for zone map amendment R-12 (Residential) to B-TC Business Town Center) for property known as 944 Main Street, approximately 14, 985 sq. ft. parcel. Continued from August 10, 2005.**

Chairman Camilli: As you know, the attorney requested that we put this off until the next meeting, because he is on vacation, but if there is someone from the public wishing to speak on this particular petition, we can hear from them.

Holly Harlow, 11 Edward Street: I did attend the last meeting, and spoke about my objections to this petition. I just wanted to underscore and reiterate my objection to the zoning change, and that is based on my understanding that this area of the green is historic property, and the state's

archeologist has suggested that the area be surveyed for historic items that could be lost during future development, and my objection is also based on the fact that I'm afraid that once this property is zoned for business, control over what happens to that property will be at risk. Regardless of what the current plan for the property is, I fear for the loss of historic elements and resources that might be there, as well as the identity that it gives Newington as part of the green area.

Chairman Camilli: Thank you. Is there anyone else from the public who wishes to speak?

Raymond Harlow, 11 Edward Street: I stand with my wife in opposition to the zoning of this area. I was reading in Newington Life today that Mayor McBride is starting a project to beautify the town green, and I think that I stand with him in that. This town green is very historic and this particular building is documents and records prove to be true, was originally built in 1722, and was the site of the first meeting house in Newington. There have been oral renditions of people who have said they found coins from 1723 there, and that is inside the building. So, any kind of interior, or exterior structural changes should be looked at really, really closely, and if it is zoned commercial, again, I'm sure the current owner doesn't want to change the design that much and make it look good, but after two years, three years down the road, I think all bets are off, and it could be changed to anything, and we live a block away from the area, and I've canvassed some of the neighbors in the neighborhood, and all are against it, including the neighbors that live right directly next door. He asked me not to say his name, but I think officially, somebody from the town should ask the guy who lives on the corner of Center Court and Ellsworth Street, his opinion, because it wasn't what was stated in the last meeting, and I can't speak for him, but maybe somebody could ask, he couldn't make it tonight, and I think it's just a bad bet all around, and I'm hoping that it would stay preserved as much as possible. I know that my family goes back over eighty years, and my grandfather actually help build this area that we are standing in right now, and is buried across the street from the place, and we would like to preserve the history as long as possible. I applaud the town for taking great care of the Kellogg-Eddy House, and the Deming house, and I think we should continue to research the last little slice of Americana in one of the oldest sections of America. Thank you.

Chairman Camilli: Thank you. Well, this petition is going to be kept open, so if you want to tell your neighbors to come and express their opinion at the next meeting, they certainly are welcome. That's the way that it works.

Raymond Harlow: All right. Thank you.

Chairman Camilli: Is there anyone else? Okay, we are going to be continuing PETITION 41-05.

- C. PETITION 45-05 277 Cedar Street, known as the Eddy Farm, Lucy Eddy Fox owner and applicant, represented by Attorney Robert Randich, 363 Main Street, Hartford, CT 06106 request for re-subdivision one (1) lot, R-12 Zone District. Continued from August 10, 2005.**
- D. PETITION 46-05 277 Cedar Street, known as the Eddy Farm, Lucy Eddy Fox owner and applicant, represented by Attorney Robert Randich, 363 Main Street, Hartford, CT 06106 request for Special Exception Section 6.7 Interior Lot, R-12 Zone District. Continued from August 10, 2005.**

Attorney Randich: Thank you. This matter was continued from two weeks ago. The Commission was about ready to close the hearing but I had failed to erect the sign that publicized it on the property, so I did put a sign up Thursday morning, two weeks ago, so I don't really have anything

to add to my presentation, but obviously I will answer questions from the Commission or the public if anyone wants to speak.

Chairman Camilli: I don't have any, I don't think the Commission does, but if there is someone from the public who wants to speak in favor of these applications? Against? Okay, I think the i's have been dotted and the t's crossed. We will close PETITIONS 45-05 and 46-05.

**E. PETITION 48-05 31 Harmon Court, Maria LaRosa owner, Sebastian LaRosa, 106 Broad Street Hartford, CT 06114 applicant, request for Special Exception Section 6.13 accessory apartment, R-12 Zone District.**

Chairman Camilli: Is the applicant here? Want to come up sir? If you could just state your name and address for the record, and we will have the Planner kind of walk you through this.

Sebastian LaRosa, 106 Bond Street: Sebastian LaRosa, 106 Bond Street, Hartford, CT.

Chairman Camilli: Ed, do you, I think it might be easier if you walked them through this.

Ed Meehan: Well, you got my staff report, and the Commission members have it in front of them. This is for an in-law apartment in a proposed new house at the end of Harmon Court. The street address would be 31 Harmon Court. As identified in the staff report, the application meets the requirements of the R-12 Zone as far as its placement on the site, area and side yards and so forth. The proposed in-law apartment also complies with dimensional requirements for accessory uses, and I can go through those if, the applicant has those before him.

Chairman Camilli: Do you want to do that, or

Sebastian LaRosa: Well, we have it, we read it.

Ed Meehan: Well, it's up to the Chairman.

Chairman Camilli: I think it might be best if you did it on this one.

Ed Meehan: Okay, this report is based on the plans that I put up which is the construction plan for the single family home which is what the staff reviews to determine if an application meets the dimensional requirements for an accessory use. For the benefits of the residents, or anyone who wishes to speak, the section of the regulations is Section 6.13 which permits accessory uses in the R-12 Zone, so this property complies in that regard. Point number two, the owner shall reside on the property, it's limited to two persons, and the applicant should submit a letter confirming to the TPZ that it is a relative. I don't know if you have that letter.

Chairman Camilli: Do you have that letter?

Sebastian LaRosa: No we don't.

Maria LaRosa: We weren't aware that we needed a letter.

Chairman Camilli: Okay, so before this gets approved, or voted on, we should have that letter.

Maria LaRosa: Is it just a statement?

Ed Meehan: A statement that the person who is going to reside, or persons who are going to reside in the accessory unit are related to you, as principal owners, mother-in-law, father-in-law,

Maria LaRosa: My mother.

Ed Meehan: Okay, that is what the Commission needs, and the approval, if this is approved, is limited to that person residing there.

Three, this gets into the dimensional requirements. The accessory apartment has to be at least five hundred square feet, and cannot exceed thirty percent of the gross floor area, and the remaining principal residence has to be at least nine hundred square feet. The proposed new home complies with these standards. The accessory apartment is 970 square feet, the principal residence, including garage, is 4682, that's a large house, that's the number I took off the architect plans.

Sebastian LaRosa: Yes.

Ed Meehan: Okay, and the accessory, the most it could be is 1600 hundred, almost 1700 square feet, at thirty percent, but you don't have to worry about that because you are only 970 square feet.

The entire structure shall maintain the appearance of a single family home, and building elevations shall be submitted. That's what is up on the wall. This is the front, which will face the street, this is the accessory side, where the apartment is, and it faces north. This would be the accessory as it relates to the west side of the property, and back, again, this is the back, it faces south. This property is a long deep parcel that extends all the way back to Chaffee school, the woods in back of Chaffee school. This is the east side, this is the garage. The actual area of the accessory which is on one floor, I outlined it in yellow. Garages, front door, big farmer's porch here, double French doors as you walk in, and this is the accessory. Bedroom with a walkout to a patio, second bedroom, kitchen, bath, so it has it's own entrances too. The entrances are separated and also the person in there could also be part of the main entrance to the family. These are the dimensions I mentioned. I took them off the architects plans from the map over there. That is where those numbers came from.

Number five is the, you have a separate kitchen and separate entrances, I just explained that.

Six, you need three off street parking spaces, I am going to recommend that you widen the driveway a little bit to provide those three spaces. Right now it is probably five or six feet too narrow. I think that should be looked at.

Finally, I mentioned the compliance with the zoning standards, but we have not reviewed this site as far as the grading and drainage for construction purposes. We would do that at the building and zoning permit application process. Because of this site, it's grade, it's going to be a little tricky, I know that there is a retaining wall on this site, it's very close to the neighbor on the west side, so there is concern where the leaders and the water from the roof coming off of that, so that is something that we look at with the Town Engineer when they apply for the building permits. So that is where it is.

Chairman Camilli: Any questions from the Commissioners?

Commissioner Ganley: Who lives there now?

Ed Meehan: It's a vacant lot.

Commissioner Ganley: A vacant lot. Thank you.

Well, there has to be some coincidence then between, because I read 106 Bond Street, we would have to know when the other people are moving in. First of all, we would have to know when the owner is going to be living there, so that the....

Chairman Camilli: These are the owners, her mother is going into the accessory.

Commissioner Ganley: Okay.

Chairman Camilli: You can thank the Town Planner, he did a good job for you. The only problem, it seems to me is this driveway, and I saw you nodding, so, if this gets approved, it would probably get approved with this in there, so you were probably made aware of that. As the Planner said, the other issues, such as the drainage and so forth, once you get by this process, then it would be with the building department for the drainage and so forth and so on. That will be a separate issue. Okay?

Is there anyone from the public wishing to speak in favor of this application?

Jesse Balardo, 30 Harmon Court: I own 30 Harmon Court, and I developed the street, on the development, I'm the builder over there, we just completed 30, and Sebastian and Mrs. LaRosa want to build a house across the street on a cul-de-sac that we just extended, so of course I favor it.

Chairman Camilli: Okay. Thank you for your input. Anyone else wishing to speak in favor, against? I don't think we are going to get anything more out of this, so we will close this petition which is PETITION 48-05. You are all set. We have to get that letter, that would have to be in before we would vote on it.

Maria LaRosa: Okay.

Sebastian LaRosa: Tomorrow:

Ed Meehan: That would be fine.

Chairman Camilli: You could write it now if you, you don't have to come back.

Ed Meehan: You could just drop it in the mail to me.

Chairman Camilli: See, in other words, we don't want it to be an apartment for somebody else, it would have to be for a relative, the accessory apartment, and you are attesting that it would be for your mother.

Commissioner Fox: And not transferable, right?

Chairman Camilli: No, not transferable. I think you are all set.

Sebastian LaRosa: Thank you.

**F. PETITION 50-05 48 Commerce Court, Zavarella Woodworking, Bruno Zavarella owner, Karen Roche, 250 West Point Terrace, West Hartford, CT 06107 applicant request for Special Exception Section 3.17.6 Recreation Use, I Zone District.**

Chairman Camilli: Is the applicant here?

Karen Roche: Yes, we're all here.

Chairman Camilli: You want to state your name and address for the record, and then we can begin.

Karen Roche: Okay, my name is Karen Roche, I live at 250 West Point Terrace, West Hartford. Everyone?

Chairman Camilli: Well, when they speak, so the secretary knows who is speaking.

Karen Roche: Okay.

Bruno Zavarella: I'm the owner of 48 Commerce Court and Karen is the applicant for the specified space. She wants to rent the area for his business to go into. The type of business is a cheerleading academy, which is mainly a drop off kind of thing, children are learning the cheerleading business, and the other business that would be involved would be basically a hair salon.

Karen Roche: That will be the hair salon that will accommodate mainly the clientele that I have already, and it's just like a one, maximum two person salon. We would kind of be on opposite, the cheerleading academy would be on opposite hours from the woodworking, so, and it's usually a drop off basis, parents don't stay. If we do have, usually our younger kids, the parents will stay, and that is usually during the day, and that is usually probably no more than three or four kids in a class, so it's in and out. As far as parking, we looked at parking, and if we thought it was going to be a problem, believe me, we wouldn't be getting into all of this, but we've looked at the parking, and we feel that, with our scheduling, that we kind of off set each other. We have looked at other areas in Newington that were similar, as far as a business, and there is a location on Day Street, which is industrial zoned, and that is New England Gymnastics Express. Their business is similar to what the cheerleading academy is going to be and they have even less parking than what we have, so we feel that our parking situation is more than sufficient for what we want to do. Any questions?

Bruno Zavarella: At the moment, I'm using, there are twenty-five spaces on the lot, and at the moment, between the hours of seven and four thirty, and sometimes five, depending, we're using probably less than half of those spaces, so the remaining spaces are eleven, twelve spots that are available at all times now. After five, obviously all the spaces will be available.

Chairman Camilli: Did you say that you will have people, kids there during the day as well? I thought I heard you say that.

Karen Roche: Yeah, it would just be probably like one class, because usually our classes mainly most of them are nights, and Saturday's and we would have one class, like a three year old class that would be like, depending on the enrollment, but no more than, we would not allow more than like four students, so that would be only one class. During that time, I would have to be teaching that class, so there would be nobody, the salon would be, that would be like my time away from the salon, so, to do that class, so that still would keep down the parking spaces needed.

Chairman Camilli: You wouldn't expect the three year olds just to be dropped off would you?

Karen Roche: No, they would be there.

Chairman Camilli: The parents, so you would need the parking spaces.

Karen Roche: Right, but what I am saying is that from the salon, the salon would be closed at that time, so that would be my time away from there, teaching the class, so there would be nobody at the salon, so it would balance itself out. I mean, we looked at this very intricately, and like I said, we really feel that parking would not be a problem, looking at the space. We really like Newington, we feel that Newington is a great town, and this would be very beneficial to

Newington, the families and we have a lot to offer, and I came to Newington over fourteen years ago when I opened Salon Sculptures, so we have been here quite a few years and we are proud of Newington and we hope that we will be able to continue this business here.

Chairman Camilli: Are there any questions from any of the other Commissioners? Ed, would you rather react first?

Ed Meehan: Well, I think they have a copy of my staff report and as I mentioned to the applicant when she applied, I think the first issue here before it gets into the issue of parking and how the business might operate is interpretation use question as to the Commission's view point whether this is a recreation use that falls under the requirements of Section 3.17.6. It would be one of the uses that needs interpretation and the second one is a hair salon in an industrial zone, in an industrial business property would be the second issue. Depending on how you interpret that, then I think you need to look specifically at the site, as far as its adequacy of parking, and the various times during the day and week that there would be peak demands on this property. It was approved for light industrial use, originally, it was expanded in 2003 again, for woodworking and millwork. At the time there were issues of parking discussed, with Mr. Zavarella. The record shows that there was concern that, given the size of the building, there wasn't enough parking, and the Commission took into account that the tenant was going to occupy the building that he owned, and that he knew what his employment work force was, so the twenty-one spaces approved were determined to be adequate. The site has no additional room for expansion, it's fully developed as far as all its side yards and front yard and Section 3.17.6, recreational uses in the industrial zone, I'll read it to the Commission and the public, and it says, recreational uses such as outdoor or indoor soccer, deck hockey, ice skating rinks and other similar spots facilities, but excluding billiards and pool rooms, bowling alleys, arcades, and other amusement types of uses. Retail sales and food service uses may be permitted in conjunction with a recreational use, when as determined by the Commission to be subordinate in accessory to the principal recreation use. That was put in the regulations, I want to say, maybe 2000, at the time when Connecticut Skating Center was trying to locate in an industrial zone and was working with the town to locate a hockey facility in Newington. So that is the section that I think that the Commission needs to look at. Is the applicant's proposal for cheerleading training, does it fall into that general definition of recreational uses.

Chairman Camilli: And also the other one, right? Personal business service.

Ed Meehan: Yes, I don't know of any hair salon in an industrial zone. In an industrial zone, in an industrial building. There may be a hair salon as part of the Fenn Road Stop and Shop complex, which the whole complex, the whole twelve acres was granted a Special Exception for retail uses, so there may be a hair salon in that area, it still stands as an industrial zone. I can't think of any other locations where we have a building like this, which is in a light industrial park, which has this type of use in it. So that, does that fall under personal and business services. I don't know. That again is an interpretation, of course.

Chairman Camilli: It's something that we are going to have to mull over as a Commission. I certainly want to study this a little more myself. Just for how this would proceed, it would be those two issues, and then the other issue of parking, and whether or not there would be enough, adequate space for parking, if we can get by the first two issues. It becomes a moot point if we don't see it that way, so that's all I am going to say, at this point, I'm not prepared to make any comment, either for or against at this point, but we got the recommendation of the Planner, and we know what his thoughts are. Is there anyone else that wishes to react, from the Commission.

Commissioner Fox: I just have one question through the Chairman, for the applicant. If this, the cheerleading training use is deemed as appropriate, and the hair salon, I think one of the caveats

that the Planner mentioned was that it would have to be subordinate, would you have clients other than your cheerleaders?

Karen Roche: At the hair salon?

Commissioner Fox: At the hair salon.

Karen Roche: Yes.

Commissioner Fox: Thank you.

Chairman Camilli: Are there any other questions from the Commissioners?

Ed Meehan: Well, what is subordinate in this definition is, if you have a recreation use and you want to serve food. That part has to be subordinate.

Chairman Camilli: The other question that I had, as you were talking, I was just trying to digest what you were saying, you also said that you were going to have one or two chairs for your salon.

Karen Roche: Right.

Chairman Camilli: Does that mean you are going to have another operator there working there at the time? In other words, you said that you were going to have one or two chairs for your salon.

Karen Roche: Right.

Chairman Camilli: Does that mean you are going to have another operator there working there at the time? In other words, you said that you were going to take, see, assuming you get by all the first two issues, I'm concerned also with the parking, if you have another operator, you are going to take the little kids during the day, but with the other operator, not be working at the time.

Karen Roche: That would be like a lunch hour type of thing. So the salon would be shut down at that time, so I could go teach the class. If I did have another operator, that is hypothetical, its just me going there but if I did have another operator, they would be going to lunch.

Chairman Camilli: Because it would matter as far as the parking. It's so tight there, that if you had an operator that had a couple of clients and then you had the mothers there, at the same time, and they had to park, and there are three or four cars there, and the operator's car, and you would take a lot of spaces, and I don't know if all of those spaces are there, to be honest with you.

Karen Roche: Well, see that's why when we looked at it, we thought of all those things, we did our scheduling to off set like, as far as our classes, our classes are not going to start until 5:30 at night. So, and that is when the woodworking shop would be closed, and then Saturdays, so that is why we are kind of, we really did look at all that.

Chairman Camilli: Okay, any other questions? Any questions from the Commissioners? From the public....yes?

Commissioner Fox: One thing that came to mind, would you be sponsoring competitions, between schools, between cheerleading clubs?

Karen Roche: I don't think we would be equipped for that, there.

Commissioner Fox: Thank you.

Chairman Camilli: Anyone from the public wishing to speak in favor of this application? Against? I think at this time we are going to keep this application open just because of this interpretative question that we have to go through. So, we will continue this petition, and we certainly aren't going to make a decision tonight.

Karen Roche: Right.

Chairman Camilli: And if you, as you go back over what was said, if you want to add something the next time, to further support your case, you know, you'll have a chance to speak again.

Karen Roche: I'd just like to say one thing, though. I'm not sure, as far as recreational use, if that is what we would fall under, but whatever like New England Express, whatever they are under, I would look at that to see if that is the category we fit under. They are on Day Street, and they are very similar to what we are doing.

Chairman Camilli: See, they may pre-date the new regulations. They may be grandfathered in. That is what I was just asking the Planner.

Bruno Zavarella: It's a question though.

Chairman Camilli: It's a legitimate question, I'm not sure, we would have to follow up on that to see.

Bruno Zavarella: Maybe you could see the situation there and see if there is anything.....

Chairman Camilli: Okay, thank you.

III, **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (relative to items not listed on the Agenda-each speaker limited to two minutes.)

None.

### III. **MINUTES**

August 10, 2005

Commissioner Cariseo moved to accept the minutes of the August 10, 2005 regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kornichuk. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YES.

### IV. **COMMUNICATIONS AND REPORTS**

None.

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

- A. PETITION 42-05 944 Main Street, Jeffrey L. Hedberg, 27 Garfield Street owner and applicant represented by Attorney Leon S. Davidoff, 29 East Cedar Street, Newington, CT 06111 request for site plan approval for professional office use and request for buffer waiver, Section 3.12.4 and Section 6.1.1E joint use parking. Continued from August 10, 2005.**

Chairman Camilli: That petition is also being continued by the petitioner's request.

- B. PETITION 47-05 40 Commerce Court, Carducci Enterprises, LLC, owner Lauth Property Group, c/o Lauth Construction, LLC, Richard Radabaugh, 401 Pennsylvania Parkway, Indianapolis, IN 46280 request for site plan approval 16,000 sq. ft. building, insurance claim center (auto) I Zone District. Inland Wetlands Report required.**

Jennifer Usher: For the record, my name is Jennifer Usher, representing Leonard Engineering. Tonight we are submitting a site plan package for your review. The site plan is basically a claim center located on 40 Commerce Court for Progressive Insurance, and in an industrial area of 4.23 acres of which about thirty-five to forty percent of that actually is a conservation easement, and just to sort of explain what the facility will do, and how it is going to work, I'm going to direct you over to Rick Radabaugh, of Lauth Construction, LLC, and just to give you a little introduction about that.

Rick Radabaugh: Good evening, my name is Rick Radabaugh with Lauth Property Group, Indianapolis, Indiana. We are the developer for Progressive Insurance, for this facility. We are building several facilities identical to this across the country for them. What this is, is an insurance claim center essentially that if you have insurance through Progressive, and you are in an accident, or you are in an accident and the other individual is responsible for fixing your car and has insurance through Progressive, you stand a chance of bringing your car to this facility. What Progressive does is, they will meet you on site, with their insurance people, and make an assessment as to whether or not your car is suitable to be brought to this facility. All cars that are brought here are intended to be driveable, they are all, for the most part, driven onto the site. Every now and then they may have one that may have a front axle or wheel broken, that may be brought in on a flat bed tow truck, but in general, most of the vehicles are driven to the site. You are given an appointment time, through Progressive, to bring your vehicle to this facility. When you come on site you come to the in-bound canopy which in the large prospective view would be on the right hand side, you bring your car into the facility, someone from Progressive will come out and meet you at that location, take down your name, your information, and do an initial assessment on the car. They will then direct you inside the building where a representative from Progressive will then finish off your paper work, they will then have a rental car there for you, and provide that rental car for you and a pager. You are then free to go home, run your errands, do your life like you would any other time. Progressive will then pull your car into the facility, to one of the nine inspection bays on the, that is where the internal inspection bays would be, where they will assess your car. No work will be done on the vehicle at this facility. They make the assessment, determine which pre-qualified auto body shop has the availability to do the work. The vehicle is then pulled to the back of the lot, inside a secured parking area. The vehicle is then taken off the site, the body shop will bring it back, Progressive will page you, you bring the rental car back to the in-bound canopy and go through the whole paperwork process again. They will then bring your car up to the outbound canopy side, hop in the car, and you are done. That is just kind of, it's basically a one stop shop where you don't have to worry about dealing with body shops, Progressive handles all that for you. We do have another facility very similar to this that is

going to be going up down in Milford, just a little further south of here, so there is going to be another one in the area. Progressive does a search for their sites passed on the number of customers and the number of claims that they have in an area, and they then provide us with what they call an epicenter. This site, this is definitely an area that they are targeting.

Jennifer Usher: Just to expand a little bit more on what Rick said, I would like the Commission to understand that the target for these cars is to only stay in this facility from twenty-four to forty-eight hours, so on occasion there would be a car that would stay overnight, but it is basically a very quick turnaround because as Rick said, these vehicles are driveable in most cases and that is what they are there for to be basically brought off-site, get fixed, brought back and give them back to their clients and customers. So, this will not end up being a place where you will find a lot of junked cars that you would be looking at all the time.

Rich Radabaugh: The intent is not to have a vehicle that during the accident and the initial investigation and the insurance investigation that is classified as a "total". A total lost. The intent is that those vehicles never make it to this facility. Now that is not to say that once they get the vehicle in, if it is an old enough vehicle it wouldn't be classified as a total, just because the price to fix it would exceed the value of the car. The intent is, as Jennifer said, get them in, out as quick as you can, basically within a forty-eight hour time frame. There may be some instances if a car comes in, for instance we have Labor Day weekend coming up, that if it were to come in late Friday afternoon, it may be there until Tuesday or Wednesday before it gets out in certain circumstances, due to holidays, heavy weather, stuff like that.

Chairman Camilli: So if a car really got mangled on the road, you wouldn't bring it here.

Rick Radabaugh: Chances are its not going to make it here. A lot of the vehicles that are brought here, simple fender benders, bumpers, somebody backs into your door in a parking lot, somewhere, skid off the road and hit a sign post or something like that, and bang it up a little bit...

Chairman Camilli: What kind of volume are you talking about on a daily basis?

Rick Radabaugh: I'm not sure, most like no more than thirty-five or forty vehicles per day, and that is at full operation. That is about what they would do.

Chairman Camilli: So you would have that many cars after they go through the inspection, waiting to be taken to a repair shop.

Rick Radabaugh: Potentially, yes, and the idea is not to let those cars to sit on that lot very long. That is why they do everything by appointment, so that they can control that because they don't want that to turn into a car lot. That doesn't do them any good, it doesn't do the customer any good for the car to be sitting at this facility for an extended period of time.

Chairman Camilli: How would you get rid of the totaled cars?

Rick Radabaugh: In accordance with Connecticut law.

Chairman Camilli: You wouldn't have a spot where you would keep them on the lot?

Rick Radabaugh: No.

Chairman Camilli: In other words, you don't want it to be a junk yard facility. We, this Commission has gone around and around with car operations, so we are a little cautious as to....

Rick Radabaugh: I understand.

Chairman Camilli: What about the screening? Is there going to be any?

Jennifer Usher: Actually, that will be on the engineering aspect.

Rick Radabaugh: There is an eight foot tall security fence around the rear portion of this facility that is kind of like an inch and a half squared tubular, kind of like almost a picket fence but it's eight feet tall, and at the top of it, the security features, it goes up and then kind of forks into a three pronged.....

Chairman Camilli: Is that the fence over there?

Jennifer Usher: Yes, it's right here at the back.

Chairman Camilli: Is that what it looks like.

Rick Radabaugh: Yes. When view on an angle, it does have a pretty substantial amount of opaqueness to it, due to the bar spacing.

Jennifer Usher: And just understand that we are going to be surrounding this with plantings, obviously, so you really won't be able to see the bars, and I'm just going to go to that. Actually, if you don't mind.....

Ed Meehan: Fenn Manufacturing, you said yesterday that they were going to be notified through your Wetland Notification process.

Jennifer Usher: Let me just go through the site plan real quick, and then I'll answer the questions. Basically we have a drive-in this way, drive out that way, as Rick mentioned. There is a canopy here, there is a canopy here. This is your in-bound canopy, your drop off, and that is your out-bound. The cars would leave this area, and move into the bay, which is in this area, and is also in the secured area. This is where the fence actually goes all the way around the place, through here, and then there are sliding gates on this side and this side. Again, this is your out-bound, so you pick up your fixed car here, and then go out this way.

To answer your question, the property owners, the abutting property owners, this property is actually abutted by Fenn Road, and Commerce Court and then the person who owned the property basically to the east and to the north is Fenn Industries Manufacturing. We need to talk with them, because what we are planning on doing, or trying to do at the moment is do a map amendment for the wetlands for the Conservation Commission, and that new wetland line that we are trying to have the Commission accept actually goes onto their property, so we are in the middle of contacting them anyway, and at that point I wanted to discuss with them that we are going to be grading up to them. Currently, if you are familiar with the site, Fenn Industries is basically here and has a parking lot that already goes onto our site that they have been allowed to use, that they were allowed to use at the time. They are aware, I believe, that that parking lot will no longer be able to be used.

Rick Radabaugh: They have actually re-stripped their portion of their parking lot, and are no longer utilizing the portion that is on our site.

Jennifer Usher: Just to, this is our basic landscaping plan, obviously we can embellish this more but our landscape architect showed that the fence is actually in this wall, and the trees are basically going to go around that so if you were standing here, you wouldn't necessarily be able to see straight through to the cars.

Rick Radabaugh: There is a substantial wetland conservation area, here and here, that is really going to buffer from Fenn Road. I was out there today, and a lot of that stuff is eight to ten feet tall.

Chairman Camilli: I think it's the other side that we are more concerned about.

Jennifer Usher: From Fenn Industries? Okay.

Ed Meehan: If I could just, this used to be Fenn Manufacturing's parking lot and I would say better than two thirds of this is paved right now. When the property was re-subdivided, it was bought by Carducci Industries, or Carducci Properties, and Rick is right. They put like a chain up to keep people off, and not park there, but I know that people from Fenn do park there at some time. The unusual thing about the site plan, as this goes forward through Conservation and comes back to you is the need to build a wall around this site. That heavy dark line is a wall, which raises this site, and there is also a drainage swale of rip rap along that easterly side. I think on your drainage plan it shows better.

Rick Radabaugh: Now the height on this wall is roughly, on average, two to three feet tall.

Jennifer Usher: Two to three feet exposed, obviously there is some below.

Ed Meehan: And then it is filled and graded up to that.

Jennifer Usher: Correct, and the reason for that is that this existing site is very flat, and to facilitate the drainage design, we needed to raise it up, because basically our low point is where the wetlands are, basically, here, I know that there is an existing culvert that we plan to use here obviously with the Commission's approval. But basically what we had to do to facilitate the drainage is move the building up, and then grade down toward the side, and we have to make sure that we had enough cover for our drainage pipes, which is a minimum of two feet by the Town of Newington standards. So that is sort of where we are, and why there is so much, why the retaining wall is there. The retaining wall is there because we need to grade at a two to one slope, in some cases a three to one slope. So do to that, and to make sure that we don't hit our property line that's where the retaining wall comes in.

Rick Radabaugh: To give you an idea of how flat this property is, there is a seventy-three contour that traverses through here, and this is a seventy-one, so there is really less than two feet of fall across that existing site.

Ed Meehan: People who park and use Fenn Manufacturing's parking lot now, they are going to park up against that rip rap along that property line?

Rick Radabaugh: Yes.

Ed Meehan: How is the appearance of that, it's on your property, how is that going to be visually to the people over at Fenn. Right now they are looking at a parking lot, now you are talking about putting a wall and some landscaping in between the parking lot and your facility.

Rick Radabaugh: You are asking, if you go out there and look at the existing paving that is out there today, and you look along this edge of that parking, there is existing rock and rip rap along that edge, taking care of the drainage that is going through there today.

Ed Meehan: On the west side of the parking lot?

Rick Radabaugh: Yes. Which is essentially, with them using that, it's really not much different than what was previously created.

Jennifer Usher: I do imagine that they will do something, I wouldn't think that they would just move the curb cut, they would probably come in and, but we can't do anything after our property line, obviously, but this is matters that we will talk about with them.

Ed Meehan: I think you need to coordinate with your neighbors, what that is going to look like, how it is going to work, both, if it gets approved, during construction and post construction. And the other question that I will ask now, I asked it in our staff meeting, is, why do you have some many parking spaces here? I mean, I don't know how many employees you have, but you have twenty-one, you have eight, you probably have fifty-four parking spaces out front. Why do you need so much pavement.

Rick Radabaugh: Progressive has a program which they plug in for each one of their facilities and what it takes into account is the number of employees, the number of people that may need to stop into the facility, the volume that goes through the facility and the amount of storage that they need in the back. Their employee count for this, and these are just approximate numbers, is they will have, essentially for every car that comes in, a person that will greet you at the canopy, a second individual that will be inside the building at the office area, and per inspection bay at the back, two individuals back there, one inspecting the vehicle, and one processing the paperwork. So they have a fairly substantial amount of employees that they have associated with this facility to make the process work as quickly as they possibly can.

Chairman Camilli: So how many are you talking, you have nine bays, you said.....

Rick Radabaugh: Can I turn back here real quick. You have the interior. It's actually an eleven bay building. Here is the in-bound canopy, this is the office area that I was talking about, and they actually have six greeter stations, they call them up here. This canopy here is set up to where they can have six cars underneath, therefore six greeter stations internally. Then the eleven bays in the back, so you could be looking at, in full operation of this, plus the twenty-two employees back in the inspection area, and another twelve up here, you are right at the potential for thirty five employees.

Chairman Camilli: That was the question, right, why so many parking spaces?

Rick Radabaugh: It's a really labor intensive process, just to help you, the customer out and make everything run smoothly.

Chairman Camilli: Do you have any more questions?

Ed Meehan: Well, I wanted him to explain how the site was going to be graded because they are raising the site to get that gravity flow for storm water, and the Town Engineer is looking at that one, there is a control point here in the southwest corner which is critical to getting the water off the site, and it depends on the volume and the culvert size. Peter Arbur is going through the hydraulic study now, and he needs to talk with Jennifer and also, if it doesn't work, then they are looking at on-site storage, which there is not much room, or any room on this site for on-site storage.

Rick Radabaugh: Most likely would end up with underground detention.

Jennifer Usher: Just to give you an idea of what we are looking at right now, I actually delineated the larger watershed that comes to this point here yesterday, and it is over two hundred acres,

which is actually quite a bit, over two hundred acres, so knowing that this site, existing, is already two thirds, maybe half paved, I'm really thinking that you are just looking at those numbers, that we aren't going to impact the existing culvert enough to be inefficient, but of course, that is a possibility and if it comes to that, then that's what we would do. That is the basic discussion that Peter Arbur and I have had, attack it this way first, see if it works, and if it doesn't we'll sit down again and look at it.

Ed Meehan: Would any drainage from existing Fenn Manufacturing be permitted to cross into your system?

Jennifer Usher: Existing conditions right now, and we are not really changing this, show that some amount of Fenn Manufacturing's water does sheet flow across this way. Under existing conditions, it actually flows across the site, this way, and out this way, or out this way. We're basically going to let the water do the exact same thing, except what we have done, is that we have created this swale, with rip rap, we have created a high point here, so basically the water will end up, either here, or here, so instead of going through the site, it's going to go around the site like that.

Ed Meehan: Is there an outlet?

Jennifer Usher: Yes, there is a yard drain right here and then it goes across there.

Ed Meehan: Okay.

Chairman Camilli: What is the material of the wall?

Jennifer Usher: (inaudible) lock.

Chairman Camilli: And it's going to be three feet, you said?

Jennifer Usher: On average, it's about two to three feet, exposed.

Rick Radabaugh: One of the things that is really driving that, with the drainage is the town ordinance specifying that drainage pipe must always be installed at a minimum of a half of percent, it doesn't specify the change in that slope based on pipe size, where if this facility, the storm drainage facility was designed more on a minimum clean out philosophy with that system, with the pipe sizes that we have, we could probably reduce the slope of the storm pipe, in fact lower the site to decrease the amount of fill that we need to bring in, but also reduce the amount of retaining wall that would be required.

Chairman Camilli: Any questions from the Commissioners?

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I have a question. Where are the rental cars going to be located?

Rick Radabaugh: They, what they will do is that they will contract with a national car rental company, not National, and those cars are brought onto the site on an as-needed basis. What Progressive will do is they will call them the night before and say, hey, we've got X amount of appointments in the morning, we need to have those many cars. Those cars are driven onto the site, Progressive does not allow them to load them on a semi-tractor trailer and bring them to the facility. They all have to be portered in, and a majority of those cars they do keep back in the secured parking area and depending on traffic flow and whatnot, the majority of those would most likely be stored in the back left hand corner, keeping them close to the out-bound canopy.

Jennifer Usher: So what Rick is saying is that they would be stored most likely in this corner, and then brought to the out-bound, where if you were a customer, you would walk out and pick up your rental car and leave.

Rick Radabaugh: It is by no means intended for you to be able to call them and say, hey I need a car.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I didn't know if they weren't being used, if they were going to stay there over night, how many cars were going to be there.

Rick Radabaugh: They try not to get a surplus of rental cars, they obviously have to pay to have those for the customers, and they bring them in strictly on an as-needed basis, and if they have extra that have them taken off site.

Jennifer Usher: Because it's by appointment only, they should know how many cars would be needed for the following day.

Chairman Camilli: If one had a fender bender, you don't necessarily need a rental car, would you? I mean, you would drive it in.....

Rick Radabaugh: Through this facility?

Chairman Camilli: Yes.

Rick Radabaugh: Yes, no work is done at this facility. The only thing that takes place is the inspection. If you have an extra car at home, and you don't need a rental, I'm sure they would be fine with that.

Chairman Camilli: No, I'm saying, a typical fender bender, you drive in, then you go to one of those bays, and they assess it. Does the company bring the car to have the work done, or could you drive it back out and take it yourself.

Rick Radabaugh: No, once it comes to this facility, it's, the keys are essentially turned over to Progresso, and they fix the whole thing, do the inspection when it is brought back from the body shop, it is run back through the building for the inspection purposes to verify that the work was completed, it was done to quality checks and everything is taken care of.

Chairman Camilli: So then essentially everyone that brings a car in, would need a rental car or some other form of transportation. Is that correct?

Rick Radabaugh: That's a pretty fair assessment, yes.

Chairman Camilli: Okay, I didn't know what the procedure was, so when you say you don't want to keep too many rental cars, but if you do forty a day, say, whatever you said there, thirty-five, forty, but that means that you would need forty rental cars, essentially.

Rick Radabaugh: That is why they are brought in throughout the day.

Chairman Camilli: Oh, I'm aware of that.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: So this isn't just drive in, get your estimate, take your estimate and leave if you don't want your car repaired. It's not like an All-State One, where you drive in, get your estimate and then you can.....

Rick Radabaugh: I don't believe so.

Chairman Camilli: I just wanted to understand the operation.

Commissioner Fox: Continuing on Carol's thought, you have no choice as to who the repair person is going to be?

Rick Radabaugh: Correct.

Commissioner Fox: Okay, that's not my question, my question, I want to go back to the number of employees. You mentioned twenty-two in the inspection bay....

Rick Radabaugh: Those are rough numbers, I don't have the exact numbers.

Commissioner Fox: Okay, because twenty-two inspectors, you have the capacity of twenty-two inspections at one time?

Rick Radabaugh: No. Eleven.

Commissioner Fox: Okay, so somebody is doing the paperwork while somebody is doing the inspection at the same time. That's why they need so many parking spaces.

Ed Meehan: It's labor intensive.

Rick Radabaugh: Get your car fixed and get it back to where you are driving your own vehicle as quickly as they can.

Chairman Camilli: Any other questions? I think you still have to work with the Town Engineer, and I'm also concerned with that wall, what it is going to look like. If it is going to look like an armed fortress, if it needs some planting.

Ed Meehan: Could you do a cross section through that wall for us?

Jennifer Usher: I'm not sure exactly what you are looking for.

Ed Meehan: To give a cross section of the height.

Jennifer Usher: You should, I can do that, and I can do that in a few different areas, but also just so you know, in your plans, on the detail sheet, I can't remember what sheet it is....

Ed Meehan: It's one of the large sheets, it shows the wall.....

Jennifer Usher: But I would be more than happy to do a cross section just to give you an idea, because it is going to be a different height, depending on where you are.

Chairman Camilli: Can you do anything to break that wall up, on the existing wall there?

Ed Meehan: Well, on the left side you are going to have some rip rap, and then it is going to be sort of backfilled, up to the wall?

Jennifer Usher: In this area, yes.

Ed Meehan: So you have a three to one slope up to the wall, or two to one slope up to the wall.

Jennifer Usher: For the rip rap, it's three to one, and then when you get into this area, or actually I think after you turn this corner, it ends up being two to one, I'd have to double check for sure. It's no more than two to one, let me say that, and that is with the grass.

Ed Meehan: So it is going to be maintained, and then you are going to have maybe two or three courses of block exposed,

Jennifer Usher: Yeah, in that area.

Ed Meehan: If we could have a cross section, it would be good.

Jennifer Usher: Sure, that would be fine.

Ed Meehan: Then, there are two issues before Conservation, so, the map amendment and the wetland permit, so you need to wait for them, but at staff level, we can work on this issue of drainage, the cross section, lighting details, some other information I need to get back from the applicant.

Chairman Camilli: And the other fence, how much of that is going to be visible from Fenn side.

Ed Meehan: I don't think you will see anything from the Fenn Road side.

Rick Radabaugh: Fenn Road would essentially be back over here, Commerce would be out this way.

Chairman Camilli: Okay, and where is that other fence?

Rick Radabaugh: This fence back here?

Chairman Camilli: Yes.

Rick Radabaugh: Here, and then the big wetland areas are here.

Chairman Camilli: But on this side, would they be able to see it, that fence?

Ed Meehan: Fenn Manufacturing, you would be looking into that fence.

Jennifer Usher: Yes, they would be looking at that fence. I mean, there will be some landscaping in there, but they will be looking at the fence.

Chairman Camilli: So you are going to have a wall, and then the fence. The wall is there, right, the black line.

Jennifer Usher: Yes.

Chairman Camilli: And the fence, that is all the way around. I'm just wondering what that is going to look like in terms of what they are going to be looking at.

Rick Radabaugh: It is an ornamental fence.

Ed Meehan: It's not a chain link fence?

Rick Radabaugh: It's not a chain link fence at all.

Jennifer Usher: It's a wrought iron design, again, there should be a detail on one of the architectural sheets.

Ed Meehan: The other thing that is happening, there is a driveway that goes out to Fenn road, and that is going to be removed and closed. There are a couple of columns out there now, brick columns.

Jennifer Usher: There is a driveway that is basically an easement for this property, or in favor of this property from Fenn Industries, that goes out this way, and connects to Fenn Road, we aren't going to be using that so we are planning on closing that and grassing it over.

Chairman Camilli: Is it going to look similar to that, because I didn't....the curbing.

Rick Radabaugh: Concrete curbing.

Ed Meehan: So that is gray block, split face block, and then metal paneling on the front face?

Rick Radabaugh: The bottom roughly thirty inches, is smooth block with a center score, so it almost has an eight by eight tiled look to it, and the effect that it is painted kind of a dark gray. The next portion up here is the split faced block, with above that the center scored smooth faced block with the dark gray, and then above that is the smooth faced with the center scored again, giving the eight by eight tiled look that is painted the same lighter gray as the split faced below. Then you have the metal, this is actually the front, and then the canopy on either side.

Jennifer Usher: I have to apologize, we did have material boards, but I forgot to bring them, so it was my fault, I'll be more than glad to drop them off to Ed.

Commissioner Cariseo: The air conditioning units, are they on the roof?

Rick Radabaugh: Yes.

Commissioner Cariseo: You won't be able to see them?

Rick Radabaugh: No. There is a parapet, the actual roof line is down here.

Chairman Camilli: You are going to look at the lighting, you said.

Ed Meehan: I'm going to look at the lighting, we need some more details on the lighting. Pole height and so forth.

Rick Radabaugh: They are a shoe box style fixture.

Ed Meehan: The lumens look pretty high back there, pretty bright.

Rick Radabaugh: Particularly in the back, in the secured parking area?

Ed Meehan: Eight, nine candle power, I mean that's about as bright as this room.

Rick Radabaugh: That is a Progressive security issue, simply because they do have somebody else's car there, and they are a risk management company.

Chairman Camilli: Any of the light going to be a problem?

Ed Meehan: Well, there is going to be horizon lighting. That is why I asked about the shut-offs, or the shoe box that is a cut-off.

Rick Radabaugh: They are shoe box with a cut-off.

Ed Meehan: You are going to get horizon light, I mean, there is no residential, let me think, there is residential up the street a little ways.

Jennifer Usher: Up the street is the Sears Outlet and Keebler and then another small industrial building.

Ed Meehan: And across the street is Fenn-Wood Apartments and then Pulte Homes is further up.

Jennifer Usher: Fenn-Wood Apartments is actually up on quite a bit of a hill.

Rick Radabaugh: The nice thing, towards the back of this facility is the wetlands that are there, and I kind of doubt that any trees there will be removed any time soon.

Chairman Camilli: Any other questions from the Commissioners. You are all set then, thank you.

Rick Radabaugh: Thank you.

**C. PETITION 51-05 58 Commerce Court "Big Sky" Health Club, WC Newington, LLC owner and applicant represented by Joseph Millett 58 Commerce Court, Newington, CT 06111 request for site plan modification to add 2,880 sq. ft. I Zone District. Inland Wetlands Report required.**

Joseph Millett: Joe Millett, 58 Commerce Court. Mike and I own the property and have been operating the health club, Big Sky since 2001. We are here tonight seeking approval to put a small addition on the building. What you have in the package in front of you, this is the plan that was submitted back in 2000. Roughly stated, our north face is here, south here, again we are on Commerce Court, a very busy road tonight, there's five properties on this road, and you guys have three of them in front of you. Basically what is happening is, we have been very fortunate, business is great and we would like to be able to expand because we would like to do more sport agility training conditioning for the high school and college people. We started out serving upscale clients primarily adults over thirty, what's happening is that we have a lot of parents asking us to do something for our kids. We are not dealing with little kids, we are dealing with athletes, high school, college, do something for them.

So the existing building is shown here, 19,300, as shown down in this corner, where your information is, we have, 130 were the required number of parking spots, and we right now have 174. We did that because one time, years ago, we didn't have enough, and we swore that would never happen again.

What we are proposing, and we have already gotten approval from the Conservation Commission, at their last meeting, is to put a small addition here off the southwest corner of the building. This is how the building looks right now, this is our property right now, and what we are talking about doing is going around this side of the building, so where this leader is, this downspout, we are building a second floor only addition is what we would like to do. Just bring this out, about a ninety-two foot run, the total length of the building is 150 feet. This would be ninety-two feet. We would come off the building about thirty-two feet. So to do that, we need to come into this conservation easement area by about twenty-seven feet by the time we make room for the trucks to work on this phase, and what have you.

The construction, as you can see from this drawing here, will be exactly the same as the building is now. We have drivet on the front two faces, and it's just a butler building on this side, so it's just steel construction here, all we are going to do is to take these existing windows, and break them out, and take this right around the corner, like this. So what you see here is just steel coming down to the ground. What is intended to be shown here is just that this is second floor only, the dimensions are thirty-two feet wide, by ninety-two feet long, again, as I said, just coming off this back side. What is shown here on the new plan, we are bringing the tree line back about, say, twenty-seven feet from where it is right now, so we can put five holes in the ground here for the steel support, for the farthest point out, and then five holes in the ground right up against the building. It's like putting a deck on your house and then enclosing the whole thing. And then leaving the underneath, nothing but trap rock, exactly what we are doing.

Mike: We aren't removing the tree length the whole length of the building, so we are still going to have the trees that will give us, like if you look right here, you know, the parking lot, you really can't see this side of the building, which is why it's just drivet, this side is, for esthetic purposes, so we still don't want to accent that side because it's not drivet, so the tree line is only going to be broken, I think just to the point, the ninety-two feet, not the hundred and fifty.

Joseph Millett: Our parking lot, as you can see here stops even with the building, so nobody ever comes around, nobody would ever be able to see this, other than from inside the building. After speaking with Mr. Meehan, the physical stuff, I respectfully, I have to ask for your indulgence if I could. We're up against a bit of a time crunch here, with construction schedules and lead time to order steel. So, we would like to ask if we could answer all questions tonight, and perhaps get a vote tonight, so we could get this thing ordered and into the ground before the winter comes. So, I would be happy to answer any questions to clear up anything for you.

Chairman Camilli: I don't have any, do any of the Commissioners have any, it's pretty straight forward. Does anyone have anything that they want to ask? Ed, do you want to make any comment? Is everything set?

Ed Meehan: Everything is okay, as the applicant mentioned they were before Conservation Commission for some time, and this building has been up in the air, up in the air physically, it's been raised. Just to clarify the parking a little bit, at one time when this building was first going through your reviews back in 2000, we had the Fire Marshal look at this, and he came up with a number of an occupancy of like 600 people, which required over two hundred spaces. So, 174 spaces, at the time that it was built was a generous amount on this property. I don't know how it is at peak hour, you need to tell us.

Joseph Millett: Anticipating your question, we took this picture last Wednesday night at 5:15, our prime time is between five and seven. We definitely fill up around the building, but we have created so much parking. What you are seeing here is this area there. This is the last thing that we fill up.

Ed Meehan: I think that speaks for itself. I know that there is a lot of extra parking, but the Commission needs to know about that because it's an unusual use in the sense of it's the way that this particular 2800 square feet are going to be used as I understand it. It's not for classes necessarily.

Joseph Millett: No, that's right. We talked about this. What we plan on doing up there is putting in a, it's kind of cool, actually, about a twenty-five yard long track with the surface just like they use in the Olympics, so we can help the kids get faster. The maximum number of people that we will be able to accommodate up there at one time will probably be between twelve and fifteen. So

we would be adding only that number of cars, and as far as our employees, they are the trainers that we already have on site.

Chairman Camilli: Questions? I think you are all set. We'll have to, if no one has any questions? We are going onto Old Business and Big Sky has requested that we perhaps consider this tonight, and in order to do that we need a motion to move this petition to Old Business.

Commissioner Fox moved to add PETITION 51-05 to Old Business. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ganley. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YES.

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

**A. PETITION 31-05 330-340 Alumni Road, also known as Lots 3A and 3B Newington Business Park LLC, owner, Chris Chiulli, applicant, 435 Evens Road, P.O. Box 485 Rocky Hill CT 06067 represented by A-N Consulting Engineer Alan Nafis, 124 White Oak Drive, Berlin, CT 06037 request for Special Permit Section 6.4 removal of earth products, I Zone. Public hearing closed June 22, 2005. Sixty-five day decision period ends August 26, 2005.**

Commissioner Anest-Klett moved that Petition 31-05 330-340 Alumni Road, also known as Lots 3A and 3B Newington Business Park LLC, owner, Chris Chiulli, applicant, 435 Evens Road, P.O. Box 485 Rocky Hill CT 06067 represented by A-N Consulting Engineer Alan Nafis, 124 White Oak Drive, Berlin, CT 06037 request for Special Permit Section 6.4 removal of earth products, I Zone be denied because the applicant has not submitted documentation from the owner of Lot 2, the proposed location of the crushing equipment, that permission has been granted to use this property for the placement of the temporary crushing equipment and for access to and from Lots 3A and 3B to Lot 1.

Secondly, the owner's permission has not been submitted for the stock piling earth material on Lot 1.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fox. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YES.

Chairman Camilli: The motion to deny this petition passes unanimously.

**B. PETITION 44-05 28 Elton Drive, Adel and Colette Gobran owners, Adel Gobran, 28 Elton Drive Newington, Applicant request for Special Exception Section 3.4.4 Home Occupation use, catering business, R-12 Zone District. Hearing closed August 10, 2005. Sixty five day decision period ends October 14, 2005.**

Commissioner Ganley moved that Petition 44-05 28 Elton Drive, Adel and Colette Gobran owners, Adel Gobran, 28 Elton Drive Newington, Applicant request for Special Exception Section 3.4.4 Home Occupation use, catering business, R-12 Zone District be approved based on the following conditions:

1. The catering business kitchen and storage area shall be limited to the 12' by 18' space attached to the back of the garage.
2. No commercial dumpster shall be placed on the property.
3. The hours of operation for commercial kitchen shall be 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

4. This approval is limited to the applicant and is not transferable without amendment of this Special Exception and a new public hearing.
5. This approval is for a one (1) year period which shall commence upon the date of the Certificate of Use. It is the applicant's responsibility to secure all necessary building permits and health permits prior to conducting this business.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Fox.

Chairman Camilli: The only thing that I can say is this was again a call by the Commission, and we had every neighbor from that neighborhood in favor of this application, so we put the safeguards in that we thought were necessary, and what was discussed, and if there are any other safeguards that are not on this, would be my only question to the Commissioners, if there is something there that we missed, but we tried to put everything in as possible.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I know that Commissioner Ganley had a concern about the vehicle and signage.

Commissioner Ganley: Gee, you must have been reading my mind. You know what that was, the van itself being parked continuously outside with that little sticker on it saying, etceteras, etceteras catering company, which is a form of advertisement, as opposed to being parked in the garage. I see you have already taken, let's look at number one for instance, storage area, my other concern was that some of the storage area would overlap into the garage and thus put the vehicle back onto the outside on a semi-permanent basis, but if you limit the storage area to the room, that leaves just the vehicle for our consideration, that is, we have to be certain that the vehicle doesn't have the logo on it, and it is always parked outside, which is a form of advertising.

Chairman Camilli: Is there anything in the regulations about that? Can't he have a logo on his vehicle? I'm not sure, I just asked the question.

Ed Meehan: Well, there is criteria in the regulations on the size of a vehicle that you can bring back to your residential lot, it goes by tonnage. This sounds like a panel truck, or a van and doesn't exceed, I don't believe that he exceeds the two ton criteria, or even one ton.

Chairman Camilli: I don't think we could prohibit that.

Commissioner Ganley: I will vote in favor of this, by the way.

The vote was in favor of the motion, with six voting Yes and one Nay, (Cariseo.)

Chairman Camilli: Okay, six yea's, one nay.

- C. PETITION 49-05 2089 Berlin Turnpike known as the Siesta Motel, SNIV Associates, owner Paul E. Randazzo, Percon, Inc., P.O. Box 290792 Wethersfield CT 06129-0792 applicant request for site plan modification to add 420 sq. ft. addition to front of building for office use, B-BT Zone District. Sixty-five day decision period ends October 14, 2005.**

Commissioner Schatz moved that Petition 49-05 2089 Berlin Turnpike known as the Siesta Motel, SNIV Associates, owner Paul E. Randazzo, Percon, Inc., P.O. Box 290792 Wethersfield CT 06129-0792 applicant request for site plan modification to add 420 sq. ft. addition to front of building for office use, B-BT Zone District be approved based on the plot plan "Showing Proposed

addition at 2089 Berlin Turnpike, " dated June 8, 2005, revised August 2, 2005, scale 1"=30' prepared by Nader Donat, P.E. & L.S.

Prior to signing by the Commission Chairman, this plan shall be revised to show a handicapped ramp access to the office area as required by the building code.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anest-Klett. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YES.

Chairman Camilli: Motion passes unanimously.

**D. PETITION 51-05 58 Commerce Court "Big Sky" Health Club, WC Newington, LLC owner and applicant represented by Joseph Millett 58 Commerce Court, Newington, CT 06111 request for site plan modification to add 2,880 sq. ft. I Zone District. Inland Wetlands Report required.**

Commissioner Cariseo moved that Petition 51-05 58 Commerce Court "Big Sky" Health Club, WC Newington, LLC owner and applicant represented by Joseph Millett 58 Commerce Court, Newington, CT 06111 request for site plan modification to add 2,880 sq. ft. I Zone District be approved based on the revised site plan entitled "Improvement Location Survey – Proposed" sheet X-02, dated Revised 8-9-05, prepared by Clarence Blair Associates, Inc. Scale 1" =40'.

The approval incorporates the requirements of the Newington Conservation Commission's Inland Wetlands permits, Application No. 2005-11 and Application No. 2005-12.

The Commission finds that the use of the additional floor area for recreational purposes can be accommodated based on the current parking count of 174 spaces.

The bond held for completion of site plan improvement shall also cover work associated with this approved addition.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kornichuk. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with seven voting YES.

Chairman Camilli: The motion passes unanimously.

**D. Capitol Region Council of Governments (CRCOG) of New Britain – Hartford Busway Project. Traffic Circulation and accessibility study report.**

Chairman Camilli: The Planner has put a draft on the table here, I don't know if you have had a chance, you probably haven't had a chance to read this, would we want to have this read, I think it might help. Any volunteers to read this?

Commissioner Fox: **Traffic Circulation and Accessibility Study Route 175 – Fenn Road – Ella Grasso Boulevard**

In May 2001 the Newington TPZ voted to support the concept of the New Britain-Hartford Busway project. The Commission submitted its comments as part of the Connecticut Department of Transportation's Environmental Impact Statement.

The Commission identified 11 issues which warranted further evaluation as the Busway project progressed. 4 of these issues specifically relate to the TPZ's concerns for traffic safety and circulation at the Route 175 – Fenn Road – Ella Grasso Boulevard area.

Because of the traffic issues identified by the Commission during the Environmental Impact Statement phase of the Busway project it is appropriate that the TPZ comment on the Draft Traffic Circulation and Accessibility Study prepared by the Capitol Region Council of Governments. This is a stand along report intended to evaluate existing conditions and future issues in the very busy Route 9, Interchange 29, Cedar Street and Fenn Road area.

**The Commission's recommendations are only related to the Accessibility Study's short and long range conceptual traffic improvement options.**

The Commission understand that separating land use planning from transportation planning is not prudent comprehensive community planning. However, the Commission is not prepared, at this time, to endorse the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) land use planning concepts for the Cedar/Fenn Station area. It is the Commission's practice and preference to have a subcommittee address the land use concepts associated with Newington's two TOD area. During fiscal year 2005-2006, the Commission will be working on revisions to the Town's Plan of Conservation and Development. This is an ideal opportunity to discuss TOD concepts within the context of Newington's new 10 year plan.

In its 2001 Environmental Impact Statement comments the Commission expressed concerns about:

1. The added intersection traffic at Cedar/Fenn that might result from the construction of the busway station
2. The impacts on the Holly/Ella Grasso intersection and Stop and Shop site drive from additional busway traffic
3. The existing present danger of Route 9 northbound off ramp traffic back up
4. The practical reality of CCSU busway users walking from the station to campus.

The Commission finds that the Traffic Circulation and Accessibility Study's short term conceptual improvements, pedestrian network and long term concepts are:

1. A good starting point for addressing the traffic concerns expressed in the TPZ's Environmental Impact Statement comments
2. Options to mitigate traffic problems, as they exist today without a busway or additional developments
3. Options to address the problems that will arise from growth of future traffic, regardless of what type of development occurs in the area.

It is the Commission's recommendation that the Accessibility Study's concepts be moved forward to more formal design plans and that the Town of Newington have an active role in the next phase of the process to improve traffic safety and circulation in the Route 175 - Fenn Road – Ella Grasso Boulevard area.

Chairman Camilli: I think that is it, the rest are attachments of what was done in 2001, to backup some of the statements that were made, according to what Mike read. I had an opportunity to look at this prior to tonight, I wanted to get a good look at it to see what the Planner had written, and be ready to react to what has been recommended. Anyone have any reaction?

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I wish we had gotten this in our package.

Chairman Camilli: It wasn't done.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Because now I would like to have this continued because I would like to review it, because Newington is very dear to my heart, and I'm here for the long haul, I'm not going to be retiring and moving out, and I'm extremely, extremely concerned, I'm dead serious, I'm really concerned what this is going to do to the rest of Cedar Street, to Main Street, to Willard Avenue, and it's not only me, you go and talk to people in the town, they are also concerned about this. It's not something that is just me, it's a lot of people out there and I've asked people, if there was better traffic flow, coming off of Route 9, would you be more apt to use that exit, and everyone that I have asked has said yes, because you are making it easier. I think we should keep it the way it is, make it like a Route 4. Farmington's dealing with it, people are finding alternate routes to use, I don't see the state going and trying to help them out. Route 4 is a state highway, you have Route 44 that is a death trap, I don't see them trying to do a busway or anything like that. I really need more time to look at this, but that is how I feel right now, and I think a further study should be made further down, and I don't know what this is doing for Newington, I think the state is just looking for what is going to help the state on Route 9 and 84, and that is my feeling.

Commissioner Fox: As you know, I kind of agree with Commissioner Anest-Klett. I do think, the study has to progress a lot further than it is now. Coincidentally, the last few weeks, I have had occasion to get off of Route 84 onto Route 4 in the center of Farmington, and I sure wish that there were alternate routes for doing that. Maybe if people see such congestion they will find other ways to get from the New Britain line, and that area, to the other side of town, especially since a lot of those people are going right through and not stopping in town, they are not residents. I think the study does need a lot more improvement. We have to find other ways of de-congesting traffic through Newington. Not only on the edges, the edges of Newington, but through Newington, again Main Street, Willard Avenue. Come next week, we will be fighting school buses again, all over the place and there is no way around it. I think I would like some more time also.

Commissioner Schatz: As Commissioner Ganley would say, an observation. I came down, going north on 9, and I hit the traffic light at the exit, coming into Cedar Street, and that was 8:05, and there were no cars coming out of Fenn Road, and there were probably a dozen at that intersection, and that was about five after eight. On the return trip, it was 3:30 in the afternoon, and there was about, between all of the intersections there, the four roads, there were probably maybe twenty cars there, at the most, which surprised me, because I was concerned, as Commissioner Anest-Klett said, about moving the bubble around. That surprised me, but then, maybe at 8:10 it was crowded.

Chairman Camilli: The way that I look at it, I don't know that this recommendation that went to the Council, how far this will go. I mean, again, I understand what you are saying, but I don't know that this, whether we recommend or not, to further study this, whether or not this whole process, could get stopped, or move forward. I'm not sure from what we do, by sending this to the Council, it just says that it is just a further study. A conceptual study. Can you maybe elaborate?

Ed Meehan: I think this is doing what Carol says, you need more study, and these are concepts that need to be fleshed out further. But, beyond that, the issue that you are speaking to is what the Cedar Street, Route 175 corridor study tried to look at, six or seven years ago, was the east-west traffic, and that came out with two or three very positive recommendations. Improving left turns, out front here, on Willard Avenue, at Cedar and Maple Hill, and it came out with a strong expression from residents and the TPZ that the section of Cedar Street, from Main Street to Maple Hill, other than some widening, widening at intersections, should not be four lanes, six lanes. That is the position that the Town took then, and I don't think it has changed. As far as

Newington trying to do what Farmington did, we're not Farmington. We don't have an historic town center, we're a completely different traffic complexion than they are, we have an interstate highway with two split ramps that touch down on our western boundary. They don't have a limited access interstate going through the middle of Farmington, so I don't think you are comparing apples to apples there.

This is just taking a look at what the problem at this intersection, and Ella Grasso is now, the problem was present and existing in 2000 when the environmental impact statement was done, and that is why the Commission's comments to ConnDot were made. We didn't know what the busway station would be. I think the thinking back then was that this was going to attract a lot of new trips into that intersection. In reality, I think this study shows, as well as the environmental impact statement showed, a 130 car parking lot is not going to be a major traffic generator, at this intersection. The problem is not going to be with the busway, the problem is where Cedar Street and Route 9 interchange 29 are located, given Newington's location in the region, given there is only four or five east-west roads in this town, to get to Route 9 or the Berlin Turnpike, and Silas Deane, it's either Cedar Street, Prospect, Robbins, New Britain Avenue, or Pane. That's the only way to go east and west. So, if you say we aren't going to do anything, then people are going to start using local streets. They are going to find their own ways to cut through neighborhoods. It won't be locals that are doing it, it's going to be people who live in your own neighborhood, who know how to get around the intersection of Willard and Cedar or Main and Cedar Street. I don't know if saying we aren't going to do anything solves the problem, I don't think it does, but I don't think this statement says that this is the end of it. I think this is sort of the beginning of studying whether you do some of these ramp improvements, whether the issue of Ella Grasso as far as channeling the traffic moves forward, which may help that little section of Fenn road, and then the issue that is really relative to the city of New Britain, I think, and ConnDot, is what they do about the access onto Route 9 over by Elmer's Place. I don't understand what the issue is, by saying that we don't want to do anything, we don't do anything it will go away. These cars aren't going to go away. They are going to keep coming. Am I missing what you are saying?

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I'm not saying the cars are going away, I'm saying that, maybe I just don't get it, there is going to be more traffic. My husband is on that road at four o'clock. It takes him forever, and it's not people who live in Newington, it's people cutting through. There has got to be another way to get these people, who are not residents of Newington, who don't patronize Newington, to be able to go a different way. People don't want to move into Newington because the traffic is so bad. I'll tell you, I do real estate, I mean, they want to move into Newington but they are like, I want to live on the outskirts, because the traffic is so bad through the center, so bad through Cedar Street. I would love to have a survey done in town, about how people feel about Cedar Street and about Main Street and the center. We need to ask our residents what they want. I mean, yeah, we're a sounding board for them, but I don't, I just don't get it and maybe I should just you know, not talk any more about this, and not vote on this, but this is something that I am extremely, extremely concerned about.

Ed Meehan: Well, you mentioned a survey. When the corridor study was done for Cedar Street, I know this came up at Council level, so I have this with me tonight, and it was a big issue when the corridor study was done because it was those people, those people from New Britain or those people from Wethersfield, using Cedar Street, and what the origin destination survey found out and this is what they say, five percent of the trips on Route 175, which is Cedar Street, are local trips, they are going from one point in Newington to another, fifty-four percent of the trips on Cedar Street begin or end in Newington, such as a Newington resident going to work in Hartford or New Britain. Forty-one percent of the trips on Route 175-Cedar Street neither begin nor end in Newington, are through trips. So those are the people who are going from Route 9, to the Silas Deane Highway or the Berlin Turnpike, to get into Hartford, or something. So, it's not, that is fifty-nine percent of the trips, considered local trips.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Forty-one percent aren't.

Ed Meehan: But still, you have to remember we are sitting in the middle of a limited express highway.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I understand that. How were these surveys done? Can you just explain that to me?

Ed Meehan: They probably do it through, origin, destination surveys can be done by commuting patterns, where people answer census, you know, where you live, where you work, they could have been done by questionnaire surveys, could have been done by traffic counts, I don't think they are stopping every car, but normally a lot of it is done by the answers on the census. Where do you work, where do you live?

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Yeah, but I live in Newington, I work in Hartford, half the time I drive through Hartford, because I don't want to drive through the center of town, because of the traffic, to come down Cedar Mountain. I'm just maybe, really dense and this is an issue that I'm really concerned about, and maybe I'm looking at it the wrong way.

Ed Meehan: Well, that is part of the purpose of the busway, is to get people out of their cars.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: But, I have another question, if the busway ends at a certain spot in Hartford, how are you doing to get from say the train station to where I work, at Columbus Boulevard. Now you have to hop onto another bus....

Ed Meehan: Right.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Right.

Chairman Camilli: They are going to have some vehicles to take you.

Commissioner Cariseo: I thought it was going to come off the tracking.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: But I use my car everyday at work.

Ed Meehan: Then you are one of those people that won't take mass transit. You're part of the problem.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Exactly.

Commissioner Ganley: We are not advocating shovels in the ground. We are merely advocating the study on a time when there may be shovels in the ground. At the time when they start putting shovels in the ground, I suspect that there will be some kind of an updating of the information that we have to date. That is pursuant to some fund that comes from some place to finance actual construction. So we are a long, long way away from shovels in the ground, or a complete and total solution to what is going on at the intersection. All we are asked to do at this point in time is sort of pass judgment on this study itself. The study doesn't do a darn thing to this town, and I want to express once again, to this town. It doesn't do anything to this town. Some may say that it doesn't do anything for the town, but that is okay also, that's their opinion. But the bottom line is, endorsement of this study does not automatically start Monday morning with shovels in the ground, to start moving concrete around and start building the highway. We are a long, long way from that, and there will be updates, I'm sure to whatever was in the present study to move whatever project they want to move along. Once again I would hope that we could just get this

issue out of here, we've consumed a lot of time, in this Commission, on the issue of a study, and I'd like to see it get out of here, so we can get on with some much more pressing business, which I have addressed to you folks. I'd like to see an up or down vote on this.

Commissioner Fox: Mr. Chairman, I know it's my second time around, and some haven't spoken, but let me, I was going to read this anyway, but since Commissioner Ganley brought it up, I think it's even more imperative that I do. Let me re-read the recommendation, or part of it anyway, "It is the Commission's recommendation that the Accessibility Study's concept be moved forward to more formal design plans and that the Town of Newington have an active role in the next phase of the process to improve traffic safety and circulation in the Route 175 – Fenn Road – Ella Grasso Boulevard area." To me that means, and this is why I'm a little bit, why I want to take a little more, I really was ready to go up or down. More formal design plans, to me that doesn't mean continuing the study. That means formalizing the design plans that have already been brought forth. That may mean shovels in the ground.

Chairman Camilli: Ed, do you want to comment to that. That's a good point.

Ed Meehan: It's well, each of the concepts have some options, choices, that were discussed with the municipal advisory committee and part of the brochure, so I think those would have to be looked at. They are still in concept form. Then your, if you follow ConnDot's normal process, you know, you would probably have to assign this a project number, you have to find funding for it, you have to establish your decision on which option you are going to choose, and then you have to assign staff. You are looking at probably two years, three years, after you have picked an option to do this, I think. If there are any rights of way involved, it could be longer, if you have to acquire somebody's property. And they would still have to have public hearings in the Town of Newington. Any time the Department of Transportation has a project that affects a highway in your town, they have a public hearing. Knowing how this has evolved, to this point, through CRCOG, ConnDot has had some role in this, but they haven't had a formal role, this has been done by, these concepts have evolved through municipal advisory committee and professional private transportation engineering firm, Fuss & O'Neil, working with CRCOG, so ConnDot hasn't had it's fingerprints on this, that much yet. They may not accept any, either of these concepts. So I don't think it is going to happen right away.

Commissioner Fox: I wasn't arguing the longevity of the project, or when things are going to start going, just the fact that, what it says to me is that, we will be agreeing that we should go on for more formal design plans. In other words, formalize, take the plans that are already there, none of which really are, and I've expressed this opinion before, none of them are really that conducive to easing the traffic in Newington. I'm talking about the whole town also, rather than looking for more, looking for ways, maybe not exactly, maybe not even at that intersection, or in that area.

Ed Meehan: That is all this study addressed.

Commissioner Fox: I know, and that is unfortunate.

Ed Meehan: Well, you could probably, my experience with ConnDot is, if they got this, they would go from concept to schematic to, you know, they would have to go out and do surveys, on the field, establish their control out there, and then assign it to some traffic engineer, and they would get a lot of this information again. They would do the traffic counting again, the turning movements, the level of service, and then they would make a project out of it. I think that is why it says here, the Town has to be involved in that, throughout that process. As far as the problems, outside of this immediate area, this study doesn't even come close to what is happening at the intersection of Cedar and Main, and Willard and Cedar out there. Those are two examples of

projects that were part of the Cedar Street corridor study six years ago. And they are still a ways from fruition yet. There have been things, in design, but they haven't come to fruition yet.

Commissioner Fox: Once again, after that, like I said the last time, I'll keep quiet for a while, my main concern is not only easing traffic on Cedar Street but not, as Carol said last meeting, and not moving the bubble onto the main streets. Getting commuters where they belong, whether it is on 84, the busway, but not through the center of Newington. I'm lucky to live on the south end, it's not that bad, but every once in a while, I wake up to tractor trailers right on the corner of Main Street and New Britain Avenue. Even though we are by the park, and by Lemire Field, which that jog was supposed to stop it.

Chairman Camilli: Well, I'm going to try to move this process forward, one way or the other. It appears that there is at least one Commissioner, and perhaps more, we haven't heard from all of them, that any study is not the answer. In other words, leave it in status quo. So I think it is up to the rest, we know that for a fact, that's okay, and you are entitled.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I would like to see a further study.

Chairman Camilli: Let me finish, that appears to be what, I don't know where the rest of you stand, and I want to hear from all of you before I make any kind of a decision, as to what is going to maybe happen. I think what we have to think, or discuss whether or not the traffic problems in the areas mentioned, ought to be looked at, and perhaps fixed. Now, as I said, Carol said, let's leave it alone, I don't, so that's not going to satisfy Carol to say, okay, any kind of study is going to do this, because, and I respect your opinion for that, however, there are probably other Commissioners who feel there is a problem there, the backup on 9, and so forth and so on, and it has to be looked at. Now just because that is being looked at, as the study goes forward under any circumstance, I don't think would satisfy Carol. Perhaps, maybe Mike, I'm not sure, we heard from Mike who was kind of on the fence. However there are other Commissioners who might feel we should look at it from what was done in 2001. Now, again, it's a good conversation and discussion because, yes, we ought to be looking out for Newington, and we ought to, and as Bob alluded to, squeezing that bubble around, where ever it might go, really doesn't do much for us. Nevertheless, there are safety concerns there now, that could be addressed and are addressed in the conceptual plans, in some form. So I think the rest of the Commissioners have to, if we want to move this forward, and say, yes there is a problem there on those certain intersections and so forth, and we should at least take a look at it, in terms of the studies, then we can move it along. Some people say, don't move it along. I can appreciate that concept as well. Leave it like Farmington, we're going to take care of Newington, and it's someone else's problem. The fact of the matter is, that problem is ours right now, so we're, let's just, rather than keep beating this around, I would like to hear from, we've heard from Carol, Mike, I'm going to ask you again, whether or not we should try to address the problem, or not address it. That is basically what this comes down to.

Commissioner Fox: I think we have to address the problem in a manner conducive to, as I said, lighten the stranglehold the traffic has.....

Chairman Camilli: Well, I think conceptually, we may get there.

Commissioner Fox: I don't think I can go with the recommendation the way that it is written.

Chairman Camilli: Okay, Bill, what do you think?

Commissioner Cariseo: I believe something has to be done to correct that traffic and the safety that is there. We certainly have to look at it, and see what the recommendations are. We don't have to agree with it. We don't have to go along with it, in the end, but if there is some way to alleviate some of these problems, we need to take a look at it.

Chairman Camilli: Ed, just so the Commissioners are clear, if we do look at it, I mean, by the recommendation of looking, we're not committing the Town to any plan, conceptually or otherwise.

Ed Meehan: No, I don't think you are, you haven't been asked to commit to a specific plan or a specific option. You have been asked to basically look at everything that was presented to you in the accessibility study and endorse it or move it on, and I think the way that you stated it, if you don't want to do anything, you want to leave it status quo, then say, we are going to ignore this study, and we don't want to move it on.

Chairman Camilli: And that is what I really want to know, because I don't think Carol's position is going to change, and...

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I want to see a further study, how this is going to affect the rest of Cedar Street, that is my concern. If I could see that in front of me, in black and white, but we can't do that, they are out of money, their study was just for that, that is why I feel the way that I do. Yes, there is a problem, there has to be a solution, but how is it going to affect the rest of Cedar Street.

Ed Meehan: That is what they did six years ago. That was the Cedar Street corridor study.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Right, but Maple Hill, that configuration....

Ed Meehan: That is all planned. This Commission voted on a plan, but it was turned down.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: Exactly, that's why I'm concerned with doing this.

Ed Meehan: That was self inflicted.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: I understand it was. But, that is my thing. If this, also included, we're four years down the road, from when that other plan, five years down the road.

Ed Meehan: Those approvals, again, they were concepts, they weren't put into design, but there was a proposal for Cedar and Mill Street, which has been designed, at the library intersection and the Senior Center, that's a little bit on hold; there were improvements for Willard and Cedar, that's been designed, it's through rights of way, it will probably be constructed. There was the construction plan for Maple Hill and Alumni, which got to the public hearing stage. The clear direction of the Town of Newington going back even before the corridor study was, what you are expressing now, do not mess with Main Street or Cedar Street. ConnDot had a plan, in the very early '90's to widen that intersection, to remove the parking in front of the stores, it was a disaster to the town center. The TPZ and the Town Council said, don't affect the town green, and they stayed away from that. Also as part of the corridor study, the intersection of Cedar and Fenn was not studied in depth because of the I-84 issue and the busway, and that is what is being done now. Then the other, east end of Cedar intersection of Berlin Turnpike, was joined together with the Berlin Turnpike corridor study, and there are plans for new ramps, there are plans for new traffic signals. That has also been studied. The overall major intersections have been looked at, from the top of the hill to Constance Leigh, all the way through to Fenn Road. As I said before,

the message that came out of that corridor study as I recall was, that between Main Street and Maple Hill, no widening. Just do safety improvements for turning, where feasible. That goes to this capacity issue through the middle of town. I don't know if it is timely to revisit that study. I don't know, but this sort of brings up the tail end of that, that wasn't done as part of the corridor study.

Commissioner Anest-Klett: There is a problem and something needs to be done, but I don't think this is the right way to do it, and I don't think this should be moved forward to a formal design to recommend to the Council that now, let's move on to a more formal design. If it was reworded.....

Chairman Camilli: Let me hear from Peter.

Commissioner Kornichuk: Well, my feeling is, I'm like Tom, I'd like to see this go one way or the other, up or down. Drivers are creatures of habit, they are going to travel the way that they want to travel. No matter what you do, you are not going to change people from driving on 175 if that is the way that they want to go, they are going to go that way. Unless you are going to put a stop sign out there, and you are going to stop everybody, if you are just cutting through Newington, you can't go this way. You're not going to do that. So let's just, one way or the other, let's get rid of this thing.

Chairman Camilli: Okay, Tom, I think.....

Commissioner Ganley: Abbreviated version, let's get this out of this Commission, I want an up or down vote, I'd like to see it tonight. I don't care how it comes out. Let's just get rid of it, and send it some place else. We have spent literally hours on this, literally.

Commissioner Schatz: I would vote in favor of moving it, even though I have concerns, I would move it along to the Council.

Commissioner Prestage: I agree that there is a problem with the traffic, my office is on Cedar Street, so I have to, I leave the office at five or six, I live on Rockledge, I want to go east to the turnpike. I can't. I go right, and go down to Willard and go down Willard that way to get home, so I agree that there is a problem. I also agree that it should be looked into further, but I also agree that we need to get this out of this Commission, this issue, and if we have to, to appease the other Commissioners, modify the language at the bottom, it is a draft. Make it your formal recommendation, but modify the language here in the last paragraph, and basically remove, formal design plans, or do something to appease everyone, and let's get rid of this.

Chairman Camilli: We were going to do that, and we'll take that out right now. We are going to remove, in the last paragraph, it is the Commission's recommendation that the Accessibility Study's concept be moved forward, and that the Town of Newington have an active role in the next phase of the process, through more formal design plan, leave that out. Does that take care of your...does that answer.....

Commissioner Fox: That will do it.

Chairman Camilli: As I said, I just want to get a consensus of opinion here. I can't honestly say that there isn't a Commissioner here who doesn't agree, because we all travel these streets, your husband isn't the only one, we all travel them, we all have that same thought in the back of our heads, how do we get around this traffic mess. I mean, it's not, the wheel wasn't invented tonight. The comments that you also made, that when you improve traffic problems, many times

you, it acerbates them rather than making them better, so those concepts are there. Before it ever gets to a formal design, whatever gets actually approved, I think those comments will definitely be part of whatever your thoughts are. I agree with you, if we had the old 291, there wouldn't be a problem, we understand that, but I think we have one, two, three, four, five, six, so it's about six, seven to one to move this forward, so we don't need a formal vote.

Ed Meehan: I think it's by consensus, this is not a formal vote, it's not an application.

Chairman Camilli: So I think it's basically the will of the Commission to move this forward, keeping in mind, those caveats that were alluded to by Carol, and as I said, in my opinion, from as much as I could gleam, this is a long way off, and what plan actually gets in the works, if any, I would hope would consider the points that you brought up. So we will move this forward to the Council with that deletion, more formal design plans.

Carol, the only thing that I can say is that I have been on this Commission a long time in terms of all of the things for that corridor study, and all of that stuff, the question of what happens on Cedar Street, all the way up and down has been, it's been discussed, the expression would be, ad nauseum. It's been done, frankly I was quite surprised at the Council at the time, when we tried to align Alumni Road and all of that, I was frankly surprised at some of the people who testified or came and spoke like it was the first time that it was ever done. It was done about ten years ago, this whole Cedar Street, and I would hope, whatever happens, that we would have enough juice to stop, as Wethersfield did, when they wanted to put in a, on the other side of 175, they stopped it, because they did not want it, for the reasons, I think more or less to what you were alluding to, similar reasons, I don't know. I don't know if they had the same safety issues and so forth and so on, they did it to slow that traffic down there and not make it an east/west cut through. But they had enough clout to stop that part of the 175 corridor study.

Ed Meehan: Is that the Griswoldville connector?

Chairman Camilli: Not the Griswoldville, the 175 on the other side. There was going to be a clover leaf. And they stopped that, so if we don't like what eventually evolves here, and we think it's going to acerbate the traffic in town, it would probably be up to the Council who would have the final up and down vote. We just want to know what kinds of solutions may be in the offing at this point.

## **VII. PETITIONS FOR SCHEDULING (TPZ Meeting 9-14-05 and 9-28-05)**

Ed Meehan: I know the Waterfall Festival Committee will be having an application before you, because that is coming up on September 24<sup>th</sup>, so they need to be, I talked to Val Ginn today and she has an application in, so it should be in for the 14<sup>th</sup>, and I'm not sure about Toll Brothers yet.

Commissioner Ganley: On that point, we were discussing at Rotary today, I want to make sure that you understand what we were discussing, there is some issue, probably not a significant one, it's probably a matter of detail, as to who ought to be applying for what kind of insurance relative to that particular festival. Rotary has a position, but we don't know if the other groups have umbrella organizations that may or may not provide insurance for them specifically at that, so that kind of has to be sorted out amongst the participants. We brought that up just today.

Ed Meehan: Should I talk to Val about it?

Commissioner Ganley: You better talk to Val to make sure that she shepherds that whole thing through.

Commissioner Cariseo: It wasn't done the last time. Each individual vendor did not have insurance.

Ed Meehan: I think the answer is, each individual vendor needs insurance.

Commissioner Cariseo: Right, but they didn't have it the last time.

Ed Meehan: The only additional insured is going to be the Town of Newington. But if somebody is jumping up and down in an air balloon, and they haven't got insurance, they should have it.

Commissioner Ganley: Sure.

Ed Meehan: And we want to be named as additional insured.

Commissioner Ganley: Well, if you would get to Val.

Ed Meehan: I will.

Commissioner Ganley: Thank you.

**VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**  
(For items not listed on agenda)

Linda Osten: I have a question.

Chairman Camilli: If it's not listed on the agenda.

Linda Osten: I think technically it is not.

Linda Osten, Capital Region Council of Governments, Principal Planner: I just want to, and the reason that I say it was not on the agenda, is that there were two questions that CRCOG had for you. One had to do with the traffic study, which you dealt with, but the second question, which is really very much your purview as a land use board and the reason that I have been here for the last several meetings, is to ask you about the land use planning that was done also for the New Britain Hartford busway and the question that we have before you was would you consider creating a subcommittee to look at those concepts in more detail, and that is the question that I have been waiting for some discussion on.

Chairman Camilli: Did you get a copy of this report?

Linda Osten: I did, and it wasn't clear, it said that it was the Commission's practice to have a subcommittee, but is it the intent to, but I didn't know what actions you need to do to create a subcommittee, because tonight's discussion and the last discussion was about the traffic project, which was an element, but not the land use part of it.

Chairman Camilli: A subcommittee will be formed when we start the work on the plan, so that is when it will be taken up at that time, and we will take a lot of testimony from many agencies at that time on, from the Economic Development Commission, and so forth, and will try to incorporate these particular issues also. Okay?

Linda Osten: Yes, and just one point of clarification, the question was raised about what happens to the busway at Union Station, that is the flexibility of a busway, it will circulate through downtown Hartford, just so you know the facts.

Jennifer Carrier: Just an amusing comment, if you had each developer from Commerce Court tonight, contribute six million dollars, you would have your east west parallel road. No, I just wanted to thank you all, I've worked with Tom and Michael individually, and Ed, they were on the subcommittee. I really enjoyed doing the study, and I just wanted to thank the Commission.

Commissioner Ganley: Mr. Chairman, procedurally, this gentleman didn't really know what was going on, so I said, if the Chairman will recognize you, you can step to the microphone.

Dan Turgeon, East Cedar Street: I hate to bring up this question after tonight, and I know the traffic, morning and work times, going either way. Sometime you wait two or three times for the light to change to get to the corner. It's very bad, I think the State goofed when they did 291 and they got turned down, the highway. I was here, I've lived in town since the early '40's. If they put that highway in, 291, it would have taken care of it. I remember when I used to pump a bicycle up there, the old road, the Children's Hospital, now you have a highway there. Another thing I want to know if there is a possibility you got commercial on the south side of East Cedar Street, is the other side going to go commercial. You know, you have Market Square coming down to Main Street....

Chairman Camilli: Coming down the hill?

Dan Turgeon: Coming down the hill, on the north side, between Hawley Street and Main Street, is that going to be designated commercial pretty soon, or is it going to stay residence.

Ed Meehan: Between Hawley and Center Court.

Chairman Camilli: It is designated residential.

Dan Turgeon: And that is how it is going to stay?

Chairman Camilli: Yes.

Dan Turgeon: I hated to bring that up.

Chairman Camilli: No, that's fine, I'm glad you did.

Dan Turgeon: Not only that, when they proposed 291, my brother-in-law had a station on the turnpike, where Main Street comes in there. They wiped him out, they wiped other people out, the lot has been empty for years, right by Bertucci's.

Chairman Camilli: That was a vote, by the citizens, I believe.

Dan Turgeon: I went to quite a few CRCOG meetings, and everything was going back and forth.

Chairman Camilli: That was quite an issue. Thank you for your input.

Dan Turgeon: Thank you.

## **IX. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None.

**X. ZONING ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS**

None.

**XI. STAFF REPORT**

None.

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Cariseo moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kornichuk. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Norine Addis,  
Recording Secretary