

# NEWINGTON TOWN PLAN AND ZONING COMMISSION

## Regular Meeting and Public Hearing

April 24, 2013

Chairman David Pruet called the regular meeting of the Newington Town Plan and Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room L101 at the Newington Town Hall, 131 Cedar Street, Newington, Connecticut.

### **I. ROLL CALL AND SEATING OF ALTERNATES**

#### Commissioners Present

Commissioner Carol Anest  
Vice-Chairman Michele Camerota  
Commissioner Michael Camillo  
Commissioner Cathleen Hall  
Commissioner David Lenares  
Chairman David Pruet  
Commissioner Frank Aieta-A  
Commissioner Audra Ekstrom-A  
Commissioner Kenneth Leggo-A

#### Commissioners Absent

Commissioner Stanley Sobieski

#### Staff Present

Craig Minor, Town Planner

Commissioner Ekstrom was seated for Commissioner Sobieski.

### **II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Pruet: Mr. Minor, any changes to our agenda?

Craig Minor: Yes, two items I'd like to add to the agenda. This would be under New Business. Application 23-13, TPZ approval for an outdoor restaurant seating at 24 Fenn Road, Mooyah's, Hayes-Kaufman Newington LLC owner, Mooyah's Fenn LLC applicant, Matt Rusconi, 45 South Main Street, West Hartford, CT. *contact person, and it's on the table in front of you, the application, the site plan sketch, and my comments on that.* And another application, same type of activity, Petition 24-13, TPZ approval for outdoor restaurant seating at 2551 Berlin Turnpike, the Sloppy Waffle, 2551 Berlin Turnpike LLC owner, Luz Ramos, 164 Eddy Lane, Newington, Connecticut, applicant/contact person.

Chairman Pruet: Anyone have a problem with adding these to the agenda?

Commissioner Anest: I have a question. On the application, 2551 Shunpike? That should be Berlin Turnpike?

Craig Minor: Oh, I'm sorry, that's a typo.

Commissioner Anest: No, it's on the actual application.

Craig Minor: They left that blank, and I wrote that in, that's my handwriting. It's 2551 Berlin Turnpike.

Commissioner Anest: We're not in Cromwell.

Craig Minor: No we're not. We definitely are not.

Chairman Pruet: Okay, I think we will go ahead and include that for this evening.

### III. PUBLIC HEARING

#### A. Petition 15-13 Zone Change (Planned Development to Planned Residential at 2116 Main Street. Town Plan and Zoning Commission, applicant/contact, State of Connecticut Department of Transportation, owner. Continued from April 10, 2013.

Chairman Pruet: Mr. Minor, if you could just present what we have so far on this petition?

Craig Minor: The hearing was opened at the last meeting, and comments were made by the neighbors in favor of the zone change, comments by the current owner of the property, DOT, not so much opposing the zone change as getting a decision promptly so that they can proceed with selling the property, but a number of questions came up during the hearing as to how the property came to be zoned that way in the first place, so I have a report addressing that. If the Chairman would like, I can read it.

Chairman Pruet: Yes please.

Craig Minor: Number one, history of the zone designation. During the public hearing on April 10<sup>th</sup>, the question arose as to why and when the property became PD Zoned in the first place. The assumption was that it occurred around the time of the State's attempt to create a limited access highway known as I291 which would have been an eight lane freeway between I84 and I91. Concerns over environmental impact and community disruption led to the state abandoning it by 1979. I examined the collection of zoning maps in my office to see if there is any connection between zone changes in this area and the proposed I291.

Map Number One, and the Commissioners have that in their packet, dated 1955, shows the area at the south end of Main Street to be zoned R-20 and B-1, local business zone, on the Berlin Turnpike, extending 200 feet to the west. This is well short of the house at 2116 Main Street and at that time the house was clearly in the R-20 Zone.

Map Number Two, 1962 shows that a very small area at the southern tip of the R-20 Zone was changed to B-1 effective May 4, 1962. The lack of any bold zoning boundary lines and the choice of texture used by the map's creator makes it impossible to tell exactly where the new boundary is, but Map Number Three, dated 1978 makes it clear and it does not appear to include the house at 2116 Main Street.

Map Number Four, dated 1987 is where the big change was made to what was by then called the PD, Planned Development Zone. It was widened by an additional 200 feet which included the house at 2116 Main Street. The zoning remained unchanged up to now, as shown in Map Number Five, present.

I do not have any zoning maps between 1978 and 1987 so I don't know exactly when that change occurred. Since I don't know when it occurred, I don't know which TPZ minutes to review to find out why, and reading through ten years of zoning minutes would be like looking for a needle in a haystack. Even if we did know why TPZ widened the PD Zone, from 200 feet to 400 feet, thirty something years ago, it wouldn't give us any guidance as to what the proper zoning is now for the house at 2116 Main Street.

Number Two, potential use for the property if changed to RP: Section 3.3, uses permitted in all residential zones includes both one family detached dwellings, that explains my initial confusion over the Sterling Drive/Barkledge Drive and other PD Developments in town, a small "personal business" is also allowed by right, and home occupation or professional office by Special Exception.

Number Three, potential use of the property if left as PD: A. Any use allowed in the B Business and B-BT Berlin Turnpike are allowed in the PD Zone. That allows a very broad range of uses. Similarly, any use that is allowed by Special Exception in the B and B-BT Zone are also allowed by Special Exception in the PD Zone. B. It should be noted that the small amount of frontage on Main Street, roughly 108 feet, and the required twenty-five foot wide landscape buffer along the northwest property line, severely limits the development potential of this site. This is further limited by the fact that the area south of the house is "upland review" area which is regulated by the Newington Conservation Commission. Furthermore, I was told by DOT that obtaining an STC permit for any commercial development would be problematic. The most likely commercial use of the property would involve remodeling the house into a professional office which would have little impact on the neighborhood.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you. At our last meeting, seven persons spoke in favor of this petition, and one person spoke against it. Having said that, if there is anyone wishing to speak in favor of this petition, add anything new or if you would like to speak on it please come forward and state your name and address.

Colleen Bielitz, 2110 Main Street: Good evening Mr. Chair, Commissioners, nice to see you again on this lovely spring evening. I feel that we are old friends now that I have been here so often. I did want to, I did read the remarks by Mr. Minor, so I'm looking at, if we change the zoning to residential it would be basically a win-win since Mr. Minor has stated that a small person business is also allowed by rate and a home occupation, professional office by Special Exception. Since really, in number three, what you are stating is that the DOT says that a STC permit of any commercial development would be problematic, and in your opinion would be basically remodeled from a house into a small business, I think why not then just change it to the residential zone and that way it can be a house, or if someone wants a Special Exception to it and have a business there. I think you know that my feelings are, I just don't want, I've spoken, I actually had Laura read a letter last time that it's the commercial encroachment that concerns me and I just want to make sure that since it is such a small property that I think a residential zoning, I think somebody else could come in, maybe a family because it is a small house and a nice property, or a small business, I would not be opposed to. I just don't want any thing commercial, even buying that and making it part of the other business up the street adjacent to it, so that's what I have to say. Thanks for your time.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you. Anybody else wishing to speak in favor of this petition?

Lori Dobowski, 2107 Main Street. Mike and Alex Tanner build that house in 1950, and they lived there as a residential property until they were forced out by the State of Connecticut in the early seventies because of I291. Other houses destroyed at this time were the Mortensen's on the corner, Soche's on the corner, the old farm house that that Linehan's lived in was a post and beam construction farmhouse that was torn down, the Niederfringer house was also torn down, which was next door to the girls, and Mr. Hall's house which was right next me, the old Victorian was also destroyed during this time because of I291. That property was always residential and it was part of our neighborhood growing up and I hope to have it that way. Thank you.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you. Any further comments from the public speaking in favor of this petition? Seeing none, anybody wishing to speak against this petition?

Amy Martinez, DOT: Just to keep everybody up to speed. The department did not receive any bids on the property last week, which is not surprising given the cloud that hangs over the property regarding the zone change issue. There were a number of people who were interested, however the uncertainty of the zone change prevented prospective buyers to submit any bids. At this juncture, I would like the board to know that the DOT doesn't necessarily take issue with the zone change per se, they would however like a determination made as expeditiously as possible. At this point in time, it has been a (inaudible) in advertising the property unnecessarily as the prospective zone change prevented the sale of the property. The property is now vacant and will remain so until we can find a buyer. The zoning office has made it clear that this property cannot be utilized as a residence, if the property remains PD which basically precludes the DOT from renting the property as the likelihood of a commercial tenant trying to move into that space is negligible. In reviewing the minutes of the meeting from March 13<sup>th</sup>, the department was somewhat taken back by some of the comments made, on page 26, that implied that because the property was owned by the State of Connecticut it is acceptable to change the zone, where if it were privately owned, they would not consider that change. This tone was reiterated at the last meeting on April 10<sup>th</sup>. The DOT acknowledges that I291 project has impacted the Town of Newington and that the board is trying to deal with that. We do caution the board in making a decision based solely on who this property is (inaudible.) In essence that it is acceptable to change the zone because the owner of the property is the State of Connecticut. The DOT owns this property like anyone else, and to appear to have different rules applied is a little bit disheartening. That being said, if the decision is made based on the merits of all of the arguments, that's fine. We are okay with whatever the decision is, but this is just something that we noted in our investigation. The DOT would like to divest itself of the liability of this property and return it to the tax rolls of the Town of Newington and would urge you to make a decision as soon as possible so the property not become an attractive nuisance and a blight.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you very much. Any further public participation speaking against this petition? Commissioner comments on the petition so far?

Commissioner Anest: I don't think we are doing this because it is the State of Connecticut that owns the property. If this had been brought to our attention previously, it would have been addressed as well, but when the property went on the market it was brought to our attention as to what the zone was, and we were all under the impression that it was still a residential zone. We have heard from the public and the majority of the people are in favor of this zone change, and based on the history that was provided to us by Mr. Minor, I don't see a problem in supporting the zone change from the PD zone into the residential. I don't believe it is spot zoning, it has a history to it.

Commissioner Lenares: I am fully supportive of changing this back to residential as well, for several reasons. One of the reasons that Ms. Martinez pointed out, and I was one of the Commissioners that pointed out that the State does own this piece of property rather than an individual owner, and that is not the only reason to take into consideration a zone change. I wouldn't be in favor of it if this was a private owner that owned this piece of property forever, and then all of the sudden you wanted to pull it out from underneath him, and now change it to residential when it was commercial all along. But we looked at a little bit of a history here and I think their piece is a little special in terms of the history, that it was residential and then it changed to whatever throughout the years, but I would be fully supportive of protecting the residents, to change this to residential, to keep it residential, especially because they spoke out so much, and it's not only because they spoke out, but my feelings are that this house

was residential at one time and it should go back to that, or, if a small business opened up, like Dr. Bielitz pointed out that can operate for those special exception rules, then so be it, I think that would be the best thing right now.

Commissioner Hall: I was the one that brought up to have us go back and see originally what the zoning was, because it was always my understanding that that was residential. I've been in town for many years, as you can see, I'm not young, I have quite a few years of history with Newington, I did know the original family. I was shocked when we found out that it was not residential any more, but it made perfect sense when we found out when it had been changed. I291 was a project that was going to impact Newington, still does, to this day. So, to return it to its original state, which was residential, I am fully in favor of, and that also does not preclude someone from doing a small business. If you look at the other end of Main Street, down near Bonair, originally we had a dentist, and then we had a podiatrist at one point, and I believe we also had an attorney early on. Then about four houses down, if you remember the name Jerry Scolar, he owned a house, he had an attorney's office as a portion of that. Perfectly legal. That house now has a photography studio in it. Again, perfectly legal. They blend in very well with the neighborhood, so if somebody wanted to have an accountant's office, a dentist, whatever, they probably could do that with Special Exception, but I think the highest and best use of that plot is to return it to residential. It's a cute little house, it's on a nice property and I think it would be the best use to return it to residential.

Chairman Pruett: Okay, thank you. Further Commissioner comments on this?

Commissioner Aieta: Just to reiterate what Cathy said. I think this piece of property, you have to draw the line somewhere and stop the sprawl of commercial properties on Main Street, and this is where we're drawing the line. To change it, I know that we had originally talked about changing it to a PUD Zone, but because of the property next door, but going over the history of it, you see that it was originally R-20 and I think that we would be in good stead by reverting back to the original zone of the property, and under the Special Exception Home Occupation there are a number of businesses or professions that could use that as a home occupation to go along with the rules and regulations that apply to the Special Exception. Doctor's office, dentist office, it's a home occupation, accountant, it could lend itself to those uses.

Chairman Pruett: Further Commissioner comments on this? I just want to state for the record that it is not our intention to single out the DOT, we do need all of the facts, that is the purpose of a public hearing. There are neighbors, and we, they are good neighbors, and we hope that we are good neighbors to them. Our intentions are to do what is best for the Town of Newington and for the residents. Having said that I think the consensus that has been reached is to support this petition, and I believe we should close it and move it to Old Business to be voted on at the next meeting. That's what we are going to do, it's officially closed, the public hearing, we'll move it forward and vote on it at our next meeting.

**B. Petition 16-13: Special Exception (Section 3.2.8: Charitable and Civic Event) for the annual "Farmers Market" at the Municipal Parking Lot. Town of Newington, owner, Val Ginn, 56 Farmingdale Road, Wethersfield, CT, applicant/contact.**

Val Ginn, 56 Farmingdale Road, Wethersfield: Once again, this is going to be our fifth annual Farmer's Market, and our goal this year is to keep it growing a little more like we do every year, but this year I'm partnering with the Downtown Business Association so our main thing is to get more people to the center of Newington, more people to the center of Market Square, so again, I ask the Commissioners to approve the situation here for the Farmer's

Market. It's our fifth year, I hope it goes on and on and people are beginning to realize that there is a downtown, Market Square, and there is also a Farmer's Market, so, if you have any questions for me, I'd be happy to answer them.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you Val. Staff comments on the petition?

Craig Minor: I asked the Police Department if there were any problems with the event last year, and I got a response from Lt. William Jamison. "I reviewed the information that we had from last year and find no obvious issues. Give me a call if you need any further information or have any questions."

Chairman Pruet: Okay, this is a public hearing, we're going to call upon the public. Anyone in the public wishing to speak in favor of this petition? Anybody in the public wishing to speak against this petition? Seeing none, Commissioner comments on this?

Commissioner Aieta: When do you plan on starting this?

Val Ginn: We're going to start on June 13<sup>th</sup>, and go to the end of October. It will be Thursday from three to six, and Saturday from nine to one.

Commissioner Aieta: I notice that they come in every year. I was wondering if we could possibly give them, so they don't have to come back next year, do it through the staff review, the police department review and go over that.

Craig Minor: *Actually it might seem like that, but she come to you three years ago, and got a three year permit. Other people may come before you for similar events, but hers was three years last time and I recommend that it be three years again this time.*

Val Ginn: I think you might have been thinking about the Waterfall Festival.

Commissioner Anest: I have a question. I have had a couple of town residents ask, why don't you do it earlier in the week? Because you buy your veggies on Saturday, and then you are out by Monday or Tuesday, but then you have to wait until Thursday, people were wondering why.

Val Ginn: Well, normally most Farmer's Markets, the reason that I have it Thursday from three to six is because I'm trying to really take the people who work late into consideration, and Saturday people who get out early between nine and one in the afternoon, but I don't know if you realize, most farmers have their Farmer's Market once a week. Wethersfield for instance, has it from three to six and that's it. Newington is more unique, because we have it twice during the week.

Chairman Pruet: I'll entertain a motion to close this and move it to Old Business and we can vote on it tonight. Do I have a consensus on that? Okay, good. The consensus is that we will close this and move it to Old Business and vote on it. Thank you.

IV. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (for items not listed on the Agenda, each speaker limited to two minutes.)

John Bachand, 56 Maple Hill Avenue, Newington: I had a couple of items. One of them is a question for the Town Planner. He's been helpful to me, keeping me up to date on a project that has been going on, off and on, next to my house and I just wondered if, after I leave, if he could address it and what the status is. I have some other questions, but basically just the

status of it. One other item, last night at the Town Council meeting I gave them a document that I found that revealed that there was a reservoir on Cedar Mountain, and this goes back to (inaudible) and I don't know if anyone on this Commission is interested in that in any way, but if they are, the Town Planner knows how to get in touch with me, or the Mayor, I gave him the document. We're going to research that a little more to learn more about it, but it was an old reservoir and it was constructed for the Children's Hospital, on Cedar Mountain. Thank you.

Craig Minor: What Mr. Bachand is referring to is the Packards Way subdivision. It's an eight lot subdivision, although two of the lots are occupied by existing houses. The developer kind of closed down for the winter, but her contractor is back on the job. They had a pre-construction meeting with the staff a couple days ago, and they are about to resume work on the road. I don't know what Ms. DiMauro's schedule is, how quickly she can finish it, but she's back on track, she's been in contact with the Town Engineer pretty effectively, and hopefully they will finish it this year.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you. Anybody else from the public wishing to speak.

**V. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None

**VI. MINUTES**

April 10, 2013

Commissioner Anest moved to accept the minutes of the April 10, 2013 regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hall. The vote was in favor of the motion with five voting YEA and one abstention (Camerota.)

**VII. NEW BUSINESS:**

**A. Petition 11-13: Site Plan Modification at 43 Mountain Road. The Metropolitan District, owner, Beth Nesteriak PE applicant, Darlene Buttrick 53 Southampton Road, Westfield MA contact.**

Eric Pizzaferrato, Metropolitan Water District, Main Street, Hartford, CT: With me this evening is Beth Nesteriak. The site plan modification application before you this evening is for improvements and upgrades to the water pump station located on Mountain Road. The pump station was constructed in 1964. It serves approximately 6,000 water services in Newington, Rocky Hill and Wethersfield. The service is achieved by pumping water from the distribution system from the West Hartford elevation, 291.5 to the Vexation corner, elevation 407. The tank farm is located on the border of the Newington and Rocky Hill town line and consists of four above ground storage tanks with the capacity to hold 3.5 million gallons of water for the service area. I can show you a diagram of that. On this picture here, the Newington Pump Station is located right here in Newington. This lighter green shaded area consists of the Newington Pump Station service, and here at this blue dot is the tank farm, elevation 407. The water is pumped from the elevation 291 here to the Vexation tank farm here and serves the entire light green shaded area which consists of Newington, Wethersfield and Rocky Hill.

Chairman Pruet: Staff comments?

Craig Minor: Well, this application has been pending for a while, we've had a number of meetings between the staff and the applicant. They made significant number of changes to the original submission, and at this point they have addressed all of the comments that I had in my previous e-mail to them, letter to them. There are still some slight engineering issues remaining, but I do have an e-mail from the Town Engineer today stating, Mr. Minor, we have reviewed the proposed site plan, as it pertains to the above referenced project. The applicant's engineer has satisfied all but a small number of comments. I would recommend this plan for consideration with the caveat that the applicant's engineer satisfies the Town Engineer's comments and letter of April 24, 2013, and I will discuss this in more detail later on. There were the site items that the Town Engineer wanted them to keep working on, and I have actually those, I have that letter. These are the outstanding items, they deal with drainage and some details that the site plan needs to show, for example, an eight inch floor drain is not permitted to connect to the storm line, needs to be connected to the sanitary; and some licenses need to be shown on the plans. But again, these are all things that the Town Engineer is satisfied can be addressed as a condition of approval.

Chairman Pruet: Good. Commissioner comments on this application?

Commissioner Hall: I just have a question. When I was reviewing this, this, the way that this works is definitely an engineering feat. My understanding is that it goes from what is essentially the Connecticut Regional Center off Mountain Road, in that direction, and it ends up in Rocky Hill at Vexation Hill, which is actually in back of Candlewyck.

Eric Pizzaferrato: Correct.

Commissioner Hall: Very high. So it has to cross 175, it has to cross the Berlin Turnpike, under, it has to climb some hills, it's absolutely incredible. That is the distance, it goes from the Regional Center up to Rocky Hill, correct?

Eric Pizzaferrato: Correct.

Commissioner Hall: Congratulations, because one thing that this area does have is excellent water pressure, so it obviously works. Thank you.

Chairman Pruet: Further Commissioner comments on this? What is the recommendation of the Commission. We can close this and move it to Old Business. That's our consensus, we're going to move it and vote on it tonight.

**B. Petition 21-13 TPZ Approval (Section 3.23.1; Accessory Outside Use) for Tent Sale at 2661 Berlin Turnpike ("Sleepy's) Sleepy's applicant, Alan Silkoff Trustee owner, Andy Smith 2661 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT contact.**

Andy Smith, Carriage Road, Portland: I represent Sleepy's which has four locations in town. Tonight I'm here to talk about 2661 Berlin Turnpike for a tent sale. We'd like to conduct a tent sale from the period of 5-17, to 6-2 which is leading into Memorial Day. We'd like to put up a 20 x 20 tent to put mattresses in during the day and pull the mattresses in during the evening. We'll man the tents.

Chairman Pruet: Staff comments on the petition?

Craig Minor: I have an e-mail from the Fire Marshal. "Craig, the revised plan looks good, no fire department concerns. Signed Chris Schroeder, Fire Marshal.

Chairman Pruet: Any concerns from staff?

Craig Minor: No, well, originally I did because it was in front of the set back line, and zoning regulations prohibit stockpiling of materials in front of the set back line, but they were able to move it back without any problems.

Chairman Pruet: Okay, good. Commissioner comments on the petition?

Commissioner Hall: I know, I'm chatty tonight, I believe we had this same set-up last year, didn't we?

Craig Minor: It's in a different location.

Commissioner Hall: It was?

Craig Minor: Yes, last year it was tucked between the Army Surplus and.....

Commissioner Hall: Right.

Craig Minor: This is at a different Sleepy's.

Commissioner Hall: All right, which one.....

Andy Smith: It was at 2547 Berlin Turnpike last year.

Commissioner Hall: Just give me a landmark. I know there is one at Stew's.....

Andy Smith: The one we are going to do it this year is the one by Pier One.

Commissioner Hall: All right, so a little bit farther down, there is much more space, and it is set back from the highway a little bit more. I know there were some issues with the one last year.

Craig Minor: Right.

Chairman Pruet: Any further Commissioner comments? Is it the pleasure of the Commission to close this and move it to Old Business. We'll take care of it tonight sir, under Old Business.

Andy Smith: Thank you.

**C. Petition 22-13: TPZ Approval (Section 3.23.1: Accessory Outside Use) for Tent Sale at 3440 Berlin Turnpike ) PC Richard & Son.) PC Richard & Son, owner/applicant, Tom Stagis 358 Jude Lane, Southington CT, contact.**

Tom Stagis: Good evening Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. We are looking to hold a tent sale, we did last year as well, from June 6<sup>th</sup> to the 16<sup>th</sup>, on our property at 3440 Berlin Turnpike. The tent is 30 x 60. Everything will be the same as last year. We will need two days for set-up on the 4<sup>th</sup>, and break down immediately.

Craig Minor: Again, from the Fire Marshal, no problem with the tent location. The tent and the electrical equipment are subject to final inspection prior to the event, from the Fire Marshal.

Chairman Pruet: Very good, Commissioner comments?

Commissioner Anest: Reading the application, signage?

Craig Minor: I did contact the, I believe I told Mr. Stagis to check with the Zoning Enforcement Officer to make sure whatever signage they wanted would comply with the zoning regs.

Tom Stagis: We'll do that.

Chairman Pruet: Commissioner comments?

Commissioner Aieta: Also, they are requesting the temporary signs, the stick in the ground signs along the front of their property, which is not allowed.

Tom Stagis: We're not requesting those.

Commissioner Aieta: So the only signs that you are looking for is on what?

Tom Stagis: Temporarily on the trailer, to the left of the tent, and we also want to put a couple of signs actually on the tent.

Commissioner Aieta: Have you considered moving this operation into the center aisle to that people who are coming into Friendly's and exiting out to go southbound on the Berlin Turnpike would have a straight shot to do that instead of going through a maze of parking.

Tom Stagis: The thing is, we really want visibility from the turnpike, and the more you push it back, you lose that visibility.

Commissioner Aieta: I understand, but last year there was, I got a complaint from the manager at Friendly's that people were exiting onto the Berlin Turnpike, cutting across, making an illegal turn to go south on the Berlin Turnpike, so that was a problem. Some of the parking, where the truck is, is parking that Friendly's uses as part of their, I don't know how that is cut up there.

Tom Stagis: Yeah, they may use some, and then we actually moved the parking down to allow folks to park in that area, and then there is obviously other parking spaces that can be used.

Chairman Pruet: Have you discussed this with Friendly's too?

Tom Stagis: I did not, I was unaware of the issue, but I certainly can do that.

Chairman Pruet: Make sure that you can coordinate with him, and discuss this.....

Commissioner Aieta: So if you left this the way that you have it, you would not be able to use that aisle way to make the straight shot to go south, so you would have to cut through the, something to think about, I mean, there was a problem there last year. I brought it up to the Commission that I thought it was a problem. I had complaints from people and it forces people to do an illegal turn onto the Berlin Turnpike which is very dangerous.

Chairman Pruet: Any other comments on that? Any comments after reviewing by the Police Chief.

Craig Minor: Yes, actually the Police Chief reviewed this one also and had no objection to it.

Chairman Pruett: Would it be a problem if we approved this with a contingency plan, if he talks to the Manager at Friendly's, and they agree to move that over, would that be a problem as this is presented now for.....

Craig Minor: I don't see why as long as we have the Fire Marshal review the changed location, if you end up changing it after discussing it with the Friendly's manager.

Chairman Pruett: Why don't you do that Tom, talk to Friendly's and.....

Commissioner Aieta: Even if you moved it one, I'm not saying move it all the way back to the wall, I'm saying, move it into the next bay, move it here, so that we have a clean shot going, I mean, that was the main entrance and exit to both your building and the Friendly's. You could only come in from the other entrance on Pane Road, it's only an in, from the northbound, and people, what they are doing is because of the activities there, they are leaving and trying to go south because they don't know that they have to maneuver through this whole parking lot to get back to go south.

Tom Stagis: Would signage be an opportunity? We could put signage there to show folks the way out.

Commissioner Aieta: Just trying to alleviate a problem before it happens. There were problems there last year.

Chairman Pruett: If you could remove a potential safety hazard, I think that would be good for you, and the following year too....

Tom Stagis: Okay, so just follow up with Friendly's and come back here?

Chairman Pruett: Yeah, call Mr. Minor and coordinate that, make sure that we are on board with what you concur with. Make sure that it's not a safety issue. That can be alleviated in a positive way. What is the consensus? Close this and move it forward? Okay, we are going to move this forward into Old Business.

Commissioner Aieta: Mr. Chairman, just before you move it because I won't have the opportunity to talk after this, if you are going to approve it, you are approving it for this location, I don't think my request is outrageous. I'm just saying, move it to the other side of the island so we have a clean entrance way in and out of the thing. I suggest that you make it part of the condition, just move it over like ten feet. You have to go all the way, when the cars are parking here, and all this activity the main entrance, the main driveway for this whole thing is right across here. You have to go in front of Richard's and go out onto Webster Street. That's how you go southbound because, the people that are in this parking lot, if they get confused, they are exiting at Pane Road, and they are making the turn to go south which is an illegal turn. There is only a right hand turn to go north at that entrance. Just move this here, I mean, you are moving it ten feet and then you will have this aisle way clear.

Chairman Pruett: I don't think that's a.....

Commissioner Aieta: Unless you are putting product out into that bay. Is that what you are doing?

Tom Stagis: Yes.

Commissioner Aieta: You are, so you blocked the whole bay out.

Tom Stagis: Yes, we did that for safety reasons.

Commissioner Aieta: Well I don't think it was well thought out.

Commissioner Anest: So is it roped off?

Tom Stagis: It's blocked off.

Commissioner Anest: Oh, okay, so from that curb to that curb it is blocked off.

Tom Stagis: No traffic, correct.

Craig Minor: So we could move this over one, over the curb, and let this be the area that is cordoned off.

Chairman Pruet: I think, due to safety reasons Tom, we are going to require you to do that, eliminate any possible concerns, it does make sense, so we will make that notation.

**Petition 23-13**

**TPZ Approval of Outside Restaurant Seating**

**24 Fenn Road (Mooyah's")**

**Mooyah's Fenn LLC applicant**

**Hayes Kaufman/owner**

Chairman Pruet: Is the petitioner here?

Commissioner Aieta: I thought this was, Mr. Chairman, point of order, on procedure, I thought this was going on, on Petitions for Scheduling. Not the petition, you want to hear it tonight?

Chairman Pruet: We can put it on under New Business.

Craig Minor: To discuss.

Commissioner Aieta: I don't know, I thought it was to be scheduled, scheduled for the next meeting to hear it, didn't you Carol?

Commissioner Camerota: I think it said that initially, but then it said it could be heard tonight.

Craig Minor: Well my intent was always to put it on the agenda to be discussed, my intent was to ask the Commission to allow me to add it to the agenda even though it came in at the last minute, put it under New Business, to then be discussed, but probably not acted upon because your custom is to not act on things the same night, and that is what I told the applicants, that I would ask if it would be okay to add it at the last minute, but I warned them not to expect that it would be acted on tonight. I never meant to have a public hearing, it just needs TPZ approval.

Chairman Pruet: I understand.

Commissioner Aieta: This meets the time requirements to sending it in, there is no time requirements.

Craig Minor: That's just a housekeeping custom, and that is why I asked the Commission is they had any objection to adding it to the agenda, because I didn't have any problems with it. I was physically able to do it, and the deadline requirements, that's for the Commission's convenience, that's not because of a statute.

Commissioner Aieta: Obviously you didn't make it clear to the applicant because I don't think he is here.

Craig Minor: That's right. Although we don't know why he is not here, but he knew that I was going to try to get it on the agenda for tonight.

Chairman Pruett: Staff comment on this, do you want to hold it for.....

Craig Minor: Well, I think it's up to the Commission.

Chairman Pruett: Seeing that the applicant is not here, I would table it, and comment on it at the next meeting.

Craig Minor: I don't see Ms. Ramos either.

Commissioner Aieta: I think they thought it was put on the agenda to be scheduled for the next meeting.

Craig Minor: No, they knew that it was to be discussed, I don't know why they aren't here.

Chairman Pruett: Just for the record, we are going to table that for the next meeting.

**Petition 24-13**

**TPZ Approval of Outside Restaurant Seating**

**2551 Berlin Turnpike ("The Sloppy Waffle")**

**2551 Berlin Turnpike LLC owner, Luz Ramos 164 Eddy Lane, Newington/applicant.**

Chairman Pruett: I don't believe the applicant is here, so we are going to continue that under New Business for the next meeting.

**VIII. OLD BUSINESS**

**Petition 11-13**

**Site Plan Modification for Pump Station in the PL Zone**

**43 Mountain Road**

**The Metropolitan District, owner/applicant**

Commissioner Lenares moved to approve, with conditions, Petition 11-13: Site Plan Modification at 43 Mountain Road The Metropolitan District, owner, Beth Nesteriak PE applicant, Darleen Buttrick, 53 Southampton Road, Westfield, MA, contact.

**Conditions**

1. This applicant shall revise the site plans to address the Town Engineer's letter of April 24, 2013 to his satisfaction.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anest. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with six voting YEA.

**Petition 16-13**

**Municipal Parking Lot**

**Special Exception (Section 3.2.8: Charitable and Civic Event) for "Farmers Market"  
Val Ginn, 56 Farmingdale Road, Wethersfield CT, applicant/contact**

Commissioner Hall moved to approve, with conditions, Petition 16-13: Special Exception (Section 3.2.8: Charitable and Civic Event) for the annual "Farmers Market" at the Municipal Parking Lot, Town of Newington, owner; Val Ginn, 56 Farmingdale Road, Wethersfield, CT applicant/contact.

**Conditions:**

1. This approval is granted for a three (3) year period to May 1, 2016 with the requirement that future event dates and compliance with the Town Ordinance be coordinated with the Town Planner's office.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anest. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion, with six voting YEA.

**Petition 21-13**

**TPZ Approval (Section 3.23.1: Accessory Outside Use) for Tent Sale**

**2661 Berlin Turnpike (Sleepy's)**

**Sleepy's applicant, Alan Silkoff Trustee, owner**

Commissioner Ekstrom moved to approve Petition 21-13: TPZ Approval (Section 3.23.1: Accessory Outside Use) for Tent Sale at 2661 Berlin Turnpike (Sleepy's). Sleepy's applicant, Alan Silkoff Trustee, owner, Andy Smith 2661 Berlin Turnpike, Newington, CT contact.

**Conditions:**

None

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lenares. The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion with six voting YEA.

**Petition 22-13:**

**TPZ Approval (Section 3.23.1: Accessory Outside Use) for Tent Sale**

**3440 Berlin Turnpike ("PC Richard & Son")**

**PC Richard & Son, owner/applicant**

Commissioner Camerota moved to approve Petition 22-13: TPZ Approval (Section 3.23.1: Accessory Outside Use) for Tent Sale at 3440 Berlin Turnpike ("PC Richard & Son") PC Richard & Son owner/applicant; Tom Stagis 358 Jude Lane, Southington CT, contact.

**Conditions:**

The location of the trailer and the tent shall be moved back so that they are to the left of the median closest to the Berlin Turnpike.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anest.

Craig Minor: Could we say to the east?

Chairman Pruet: That will be so amended.

The vote was unanimously in favor of the motion with six voting YEA

**IX. PETITIONS FOR PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULING:** (May 8 and May 22)

- A. Petition 18-13: Special Exception (Section 6.2.4: Freestanding Business Sign at 3573 Berlin Turnpike (Gateway Plaza.) Brown Realty LLC, owner, James Brown, 59 Cove Road, Lyme CT, applicant/contact.
- B. Petition 19-13: Zoning Text Amendments to Section 5.9.3A (Requirements for Site Plan) and Section 6.1.1.C (Parking Standards.) Hayes Kaufman, Newington Associates LLC applicant, Mark S. Shipman 20 Batterson Park Road, Farmington CT, contact.
- C. Petition 20-13: Special Exception (Section 3.15.6 Place of Recreation) at 102 Pane Road, H&H Investments LLC, owner Bounce Around Inflatables LLC, applicant, Santiago Gil 50 Woodruff Circle, Berlin, CT, contact.

Craig Minor: We have three items. The first item Petition 18-13, Special Exception for a free standing sign at 3573 Berlin Turnpike, Gateway Plaza, Brown Realty LLC owner, James Brown 59 Cove Road, Lyme, CT applicant/contact. This is for the standard pylon sign. It actually, the location of the sign was always on the site plan, but when the site plan was approved back in 2011 the applicant didn't specifically request a public hearing for the free standing business sign, so that's why it is on your agenda for action at your next meeting, or for hearing at your next meeting.

The next item is an amendment to the Zoning Regulations, Petition 19-13, Zoning Text Amendment to Section 5.3.9A Requirements for a Site plan and Section 6.1.1.C, parking standards, Hayes Kaufman Newington LLC applicant, Mark S. Shipman 20 Batterson Park Road, Farmington, CT contact. What Mr. Hayes' attorney is requesting is that we revise the regulations in two places, but the first place is kind of because of the second one. What they are asking that we do is to change the parking regulations for shopping centers that have an anchor tenant of 60,000 square feet or more and it actually makes a lot of sense because right now, and basically just look at the total area of the shopping center rather than break down each individual tenant, figure how much parking each individual tenant requires, which is kind of what we have to do at this point, because once the shopping center is approved, and over time, tenants move in, tenants move out, it gets to the point where technically, Art would need to go out and count who's a restaurant, who's a business, who's a retail, because all of these things require a different amount of parking, to see if there is enough parking at the shopping center for a new tenant. For example, I had someone come in today who would like to open a restaurant in the space that used to be a dollar store. Well, a dollar store is retail and that requires six spaces per thousand, but a restaurant requires twenty spaces per thousand square feet of area open to the public. It is conceivable that a modest restaurant might require more parking than the store that was there before it. So not only is that a headache for the landlord who is trying to keep his property occupied, it's also a headache for the Planning and Zoning Commission because we might have to tell a prospective tenant, sorry, you can't go in there because your business requires too much parking for that space. So, one of the things that this amendment would do, would be to simplify it. On large shopping centers, the amount of parking is based on the size of the whole shopping center and we don't have to get bogged down with doing what I would call blended rate of parking, which, that's a good idea. I haven't analyzed the regulations thoroughly because we've got quite a while before we can have the hearing on it, but that in a nutshell is my understanding of what it is they are looking to do.

Commissioner Hall: So right now you don't know whether he wants it to be fewer per, or more than, so he's just saying regulate, but we have to figure out which way he is looking to do it? Is he looking to do it so that it's not as specific, because I'll tell you, living with it on a daily basis, in a particular shopping center....

Craig Minor: I think the net result would be that there would be less parking required.

Commissioner Hall: Required, but guess what, when people have more use of a space come in, it's not good, I'll tell you that right now.

Commissioner Anest: How many shopping centers would this affect?

Craig Minor: I don't know, I haven't analyzed it.

Commissioner Aieta: In the Town of Newington, maybe two. Yeah, I'm sorry, Target, Walmart, Fenn Road, and Kitts Lane, so maybe four?

Chairman Pruet: I think a lot of investigation is going to be needed for this, so I would not recommend that this be put on, do you have a recommendation for this?

Craig Minor: Yes, but my recommendation is that we can't schedule it until the second meeting in May, because of the legal requirement that zone changes have to go to the regional planning agencies thirty days before the hearing, and the next hearing, and the second meeting in May is less than thirty days from now, so you really couldn't have the hearing until early June anyway, which is plenty of time to talk about it and research it, but you don't want to think about it or talk about it too much before the hearing because that gives the impression of pre-judgment and so forth. It is what it is, so let's schedule it for a hearing and I'll have some analysis for you, and during the hearing you may want more analysis.

Commissioner Aieta: Just as a side note, just about the parking regulations. The regulations, the standards that are in our regulations are there for a reason. A retail store, requires a certain number of parking spaces. You get into a restaurant, the uses are more, you see it, you see it just by driving down the turnpike, and going to the different shopping centers, you see that the restaurants require more parking than a retail spot. That's just the way it is, and that's why we broke the regulations, the regulations are broken down to specifically say, if it's a restaurant, you need X amount of spaces. If it's retail, there's all different classifications, and it's there for a reason.

Chairman Pruet: I think we'll have a lively debate on this.

Craig Minor: And then the third application that requires a public hearing is for Petition 20-13 Special Exception Section 3.15.6: Place of Recreation at 102 Pane Road, H&H Investments LLC owner, Bounce Around Inflatables LLC, applicant, Santiago Gil, 50 Woodruff Circle, Berlin Ct, contact. This is one of those bouncy places, they have birthday parties, and he would also, in the fullness of time, wholesale those units from that spot, so I told him, well put that in the application now, so that if you do do well, and you have a mind to do wholesale as well, the Commission doesn't feel that you were leading them on when you first only talked about having parties, so let's talk about it all at the same time and I believe they are in Berlin now, and they are looking to relocate, and this is where they would like to go.

Commissioner Aieta: Where are they in Berlin so we can go see the operation?

Commissioner Hall: Woodruff Circle is a residential street.

Craig Minor: I found them, they have a web site with their address.

Commissioner Aieta: Just a note, you should read the regulation on places of amusement and the number of machines they can have, it's spelled out in the regulations. 3.11.1 I believe. At one point we did not allow like arcades and stuff like that, now you can have pinball machines or video games and machines as an accessory use to another type of a use.

Commissioner Hall: Where is 102, what building is that?

Craig Minor: It's behind the printer.....

Commissioner Hall: Image Ink?

Craig Minor: Yes.

Commissioner Aieta: Just so I understand, I drive by there all of the time, is it the parcel where he has the gas company in it now? There's a gas company in that space. Does he plan on doing this inside or outside?

Craig Minor: There's a.....

Commissioner Aieta: There is some kind of a gas, it's not gasoline, it's.....

Craig Minor: If you look at the site plan that was in your agenda package, that shows you where they are going to be occupying in the back building, the back of the building where the printer is. There's another tenant in that building that has equipment of some kind.....

Commissioner Aieta: Is he taking over the whole 7,000 square feet?

Craig Minor: Yes. The area that is marked out by hand is the area that he will be occupying.

Chairman Pruet: I think there is an easement in parking there.

Craig Minor: There is.

Chairman Pruet: From previous tenants.

Craig Minor: Yes.

Commissioner Hall: Seems to me that we had a petition last year that never went in to.....

Chairman Pruet: Right.

Commissioner Aieta: You are going to check the parking requirements for the site?

Craig Minor: Right.

Commissioner Aieta: Because there is not shared parking with the parcel next door and

Craig Minor: No, there is, but I have a number of questions about parking.

Commissioner Aieta: Because if it is very successful, there's not many parking places on that site.

Craig Minor: In fact, I was out there the other day and I noticed that there is a lot of equipment, I don't know what it is.....

Commissioner Aieta: That's the gas company that I was referring to...

Craig Minor: That are in these parking spaces, and I mentioned that to the Zoning Enforcement Officer and asked him to look into that because you can't store your equipment in a parking space, so that issue will be resolved too.

Chairman Pruet: Okay, so we will put that on for May 8<sup>th</sup>. June 12<sup>th</sup> is for the zoning amendment.

**X. TOWN PLANNER REPORT**

**A. Staff Report**

Craig Minor: Zoning Enforcement Issues Raised at previous TPZ meetings; Number one, façade changes at CVS on Main Street, the red panels have been removed.

Commissioner Anest: It's like white paper, they should be the raised.....

Commissioner Aieta: I don't know why they didn't put back what they took out. Unless they threw them away.

Commissioner Anest: It doesn't look good, the red almost looked better.

Craig Minor: Okay, the raised panels, I will see about them.

Commissioner Anest: This looks like white contact paper.

Craig Minor: I'll make sure that this is not what they were supposed to have. Farmington Bank, I have not been contacted by the owners, I don't expect to be contacted by the owners, so what would you like me to do?

Chairman Pruet: I don't know what our actions could be unless the traffic authority, police, or if they delegated it to you, rules it a safety hazard, I don't know what else we can do.

Craig Minor: We were hoping that the weight of a good idea would carry the day, but didn't happen.

Commissioner Aieta: I don't think it is anything that we did as a Commission that, I mean, we went with the plan that they gave us, and then it looked all right when we did it, but then when they put it in, it ended up to be something different. I don't know.

Craig Minor: I guess I'll take it off the list of items that we.....

Chairman Pruet: Unless we get some traffic accidents, or some other issues, I don't see where, our hands are tied.

Craig Minor: We tried.

Craig Minor: Pickup truck cabs in front of 127 Fenn Road, the owners did not respond to the ZEO's informal letter, so he sent them the official notice of violation by certified mail. No response has been received so far, as of April 19<sup>th</sup>, and I didn't talk to Art about this today, but this is normal, his normal process.

Number of Newington residents at New Samaritan: I called the Director of the Agency who runs the facility last week, but I haven't heard back from him. I will call him again, I haven't yet, but I will call him because that is a good question, how many Newington applicants ended up in there, as opposed to applicant's from other towns.

Temporary sign at Hartford Avenue and North Mountain Road: They had applied for a temporary permit.

Old Performance Bonds held by the Town: I submitted the revised report, I spent a couple of hours on it this week. I'm not going to go over it, some of them, the work is done, so it's just a matter of inspecting them by the staff to make sure that everything is done in accordance with the plan, and so we will release the bond properly. One of the larger ones I found was for a new street that actually had been inspected, by Ed and the Town Engineer back in 2011 and was supposed to be released and it just never happened, so I'll follow up and make that one happen. I have not yet written to the two or three individuals who are just in complete default of their bond. They refuse to do the work, and now we should just tell them that we are going to take the money and keep it and put it in the general fund or where ever the Town Attorney recommends that the money go. I'm not recommending that we go on their property and trespass, well, in one case it was a house where the driveway was built too close, we're not going to go in there and rebuild the driveway for them, but I think in that case I think the bond should revert, default, whatever, to the general fund.

Status of the Modern Tire Appeal, nothing since we got copies of Modern Tire's response to our attorney's response, but no date has been set yet for a court appearance.

Newington Junction Planning Study: I did meet with the consultant yesterday, they were in town, they walked, drove along Day Street and looked at all the businesses there, and then I met them when they finished that. I met them at the Dunkin Donuts, and from there, they were going to be walking up Willard and looking at all of the property between Willard and the Fastrack Station, all the uses back there, and then come back to you about in a month or so with a sort of preliminary report and to get guidance from you as to what you are looking for in the way of recommendations from them. Then they will be issuing a final report probably in a few months.

Low Impact Development Regulations: The log jam has been fixed, we've worked out our differences over the contract language and the contract has been signed and they have begun work on this project.

The Affordable Housing Regulations Grant: I did make copies of the application that was submitted last week to get it in under deadline. I'm not expecting or asking the Commission to make a decision tonight as to whether to endorse it or not, I know there are a lot of feelings about it, but the TPZ does need to make a decision to endorse it or not by May 15<sup>th</sup>. So, at your next meeting, if the Chairman agrees, I'll put it on the agenda for discussion and then possible action.

Chairman Pruet: Okay, fine.

Craig Minor: And that's my report.

Commissioner Aieta: On the application, for the, I thought we made it clear at the last meeting that we didn't want the words affordable housing as part of this application, that we were looking for a study to study senior housing in the Town of Newington, not affordable housing in the Town of Newington. Our master plan of development which we spent months and months and months on, we said that we were not looking for high density housing in the Town of Newington.

I think the Town of Newington has affordable housing just from its existing housing stock, and the prices that, the pricing that is in the Town of Newington. I don't think we are in default of anything with a deficiency in affordable housing.

Commissioner Anest: Could you explain the difference between affordable housing and high density?

Craig Minor: Oh yes, absolutely.

Commissioner Anest: So affordable housing has nothing to do with the density.

Craig Minor: It's just that high density is a way to achieve low lower income housing without the Town having to subsidize it.

Commissioner Anest: And affordable is.....

Craig Minor: What affordable means is an apartment or a mortgage payment, whatever, that is no more than thirty percent of the monthly income of a family that earns eighty percent or less or whatever the area median income. That is affordable.

Chairman Pruett: Do you know the parameters?

Craig Minor: I think it's \$84,000, family income for this area. So a person should spend no more than a third of that in rent or for mortgage payments. That's rather high. What we call *affordable housing* is actually, we're not talking about low income housing by any means. This is housing that would be affordable by .....

Commissioner Aieta: Most of the affordable housing is subsidized by the.....

Craig Minor: Now you get into the definition of affordable under the 8-30G statute, which we are not talking about, so unless you want to go there, we could be here all night. That gets complicated, but we're not talking about that.

Chairman Pruett: But your grant does say senior housing, correct?

Craig Minor: Yes. Strictly senior. Well, affordable, but for seniors.

Commissioner Anest: What was the discussion last evening then, when they didn't talk about seniors?

Craig Minor: What happened was, one of the Council persons didn't understand the grant application itself, she was reading the form and because some of the form, the questions, didn't say senior housing, throughout, she was concerned, but that's the form. Those are the questions, and my response to all of these questions, in every case, had the word senior, or senior affordable or age or something in there, so that was just a misunderstanding on the part of the council person.

Commissioner Hall: And I think and correct me if I'm wrong, that affordable housing regulations is a category and your subset is your senior overlay, so in the category of affordable you are applying for senior overlay. So you have to apply to the State under the Affordable because that is their categorization, but within that you are stating that we are going for it because we are looking for the senior only.

Craig Minor: Exactly.

Commissioner Hall: Also, when you are thinking of high density housing, think of Blueback Square folks, because that is high density housing, and that ain't cheap. So, you have to get this concept of what high density and all the rest of this is. It's not 1960's affordable congregate housing for people you know, to come in and have a very low rent. That's gone. All of this new thinking of affordable and high density or anything else that you are thinking of, is a whole different category.

Chairman Pruet: Other comments? Good, thanks, anything else on your report, does that complete....

Craig Minor: That's all I have.

Chairman Pruet: Any questions for Mr. Minor on his report?

**XI. COMMUNICATIONS**

None

**XII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** (For Items not listed on the Agenda; each speaker limited to two minutes.)

Terry Borjeson, 45 Glenview Drive, Newington: I'm not sure how quite to do this because I am the liaison to this committee and I also serve on the Town Council. I did want to make some comments on what was said tonight and make a clarification. Can I do that?

Chairman Pruet: Absolutely.

Terry Borjeson: I was one of the key players in reviving this money that is coming through CCROG which is being funded by HUD and basically I said because I know that Craig had come here in December and talked about affordable housing and people weren't really interested, so I have been doing a lot of work on this area, and I have a main consideration for senior housing. I think we have a moral obligation to our seniors in this town, to help take care of them, the demographics are getting to be pretty amazing. The affordable housing piece, it's senior affordable housing period. We're not talking about low end, we're talking about wanting to have fairly high end, similar to what is being done in Berlin right now. There was a lot of discussion last night about having reasonable housing for our seniors that want to live in Newington. Right now there are 132 seniors on the waiting list for housing in Newington, and I cannot give you the exact number of Newington residents that is, but I know we are talking about New Samaritan, and I believe Diane gave us a rate of about fifty percent, maybe fifty-five percent. So, that's not one hundred percent, but I think it clarifies some of it, so even if you were to put in units, and we got fifty to sixty percent of the people in Newington, we are addressing a major concern and a major need in the town. In addition to that, again, the 80-20 piece of that, we've been looking at a lot of demographics. I'm involved with the busway, Fastrack, I on a sub-committee for that, four towns, the Department of Transportation, the Capital Region Council of Governments, so we have been looking at this very closely, and the demographics in Connecticut, and the demographics in Newington and there are two groups of people right now that are looking for housing. The biggest need is seniors, baby boomers, a lot of us, we're downsizing, and looking to still be in a nice house, but they want to live in Newington because they have been here, they have raised their families here, they might have lived here all their lives, that's the biggest group. The second

biggest group right now is the echo baby boomers, Generation X, so that's the kids of baby boomers that are starting to work, and they are also looking for some type of housing. I came forward with the senior housing because I think it is something that we can all look at and see that it would make a lot of sense for us. But basically the stock of single family homes, a lot of single family homes are not going to be adequate for our seniors. I've been involved, my wife has been doing a lot of volunteer work with the Thanksgiving and Christmas food and gifts, and we have actually been going out to people who can't get in to get the services, most of them are seniors. We were in three of four houses where the woman's husband had died, they are living in a house that is way too big for them, they are having trouble paying the taxes, they are having trouble maintaining the property, and they are looking to stay in town because they have been here forever. That's the kind of need that I was thinking about when we did this, so that's the kind of need, I know there was some concern last night, that affordable housing senior ends up not being senior affordable housing. That's all we are looking at right here. The money we would be getting, there's no strings attached. So they can come back to us and say, you don't have the demographics, and it doesn't make a lot of sense, you don't have enough people that are going to buy it, okay, that ends that. They could also come back to us and say, you've got fantastic base and a lot of people that would buy. We can still say no. There are no strings attached to this \$20,000.00. This is an opportunity to look forward and see what our needs are. Diane spoke with the seniors, as Craig did last night, and the demographics are going to get higher for our seniors, and I think this is an opportunity, and this isn't going to happen, this is probably a fairly long term event. We will be looking for developers, and they'll be looking for money, so I think we are looking ahead to the future, so I just wanted to say that we're not committing ourselves to anything, other than getting \$20,000 to do a look at what we have here and what is needed.

Chairman Pruet: Any questions for the Councilor on this, an opportunity clear things up on this.

Commissioner Lenares: I just wanted to say, Terry, you did a really nice job explaining actually what the purpose was that this was intended for thank you for all of that, it was great.

Chairman Pruet: Anyone else: I think the study is warranted, it's in our ten year plan, to look after our senior and hopefully we will have something to digest and follow through. Anybody else from the public wishing to speak?

Gary Bolles, 28 Burdon Lane: You should be commended for being so polite. Thank you. I want to echo John Bachand's concerns about the Packard's Way development only because you have Maple Hill Avenue that backs up to Vincent Drive, and I know several neighbors on Vincent Drive, I know of one neighbor alone has four sump pumps in his cellar, and if that development is not done correctly, and I stress that if we don't hold the developer's feet to the fire per se, I'm going to have problems, because I am on Burdon Lane. Right now, as I have said in past meetings, I have two sump pumps, initially after a heavy rain, that thing just goes and goes and goes, so I want to make sure that development is done correctly so we don't have any further problems. Thank you.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you for your comments. Anybody else from the public?

John Bachand 56 Maple Hill: I just want to say, regarding the senior issue, I think there is no more noble cause than to look at this, and it's all new to me so I don't have that many personal comments about it, but I just want to say, it's definitely a noble cause and you said, for our seniors, but it's going to be for all of us, we're not doing it for someone else, it comes that quick. I just think that you have to look at, I've looked at the maps a little bit as to where the suggested sites will be, and that twenty percent that was going to be the affordable part of

it, it looks like they weren't big projects anyway, not very many added to the total amount of housing. I think one of the sites was the former Cashway Lumber, down on Francis Avenue, there is a junk yard there now or something.....

Craig Minor: No.

John Bachand: Well anyway, they didn't look like they were high yield sites to begin with and twenty percent is going to be pretty small so I wish there were some way, might be a new thought for me, but if there was some way with our existing housing we could somehow make it more compatible for people to age in place, or whatever the term is. My mother is 86, she lives in a two story house, she's fortunately still able to go up and down stairs, she mostly spends all of her time on the first floor. Unfortunately, our town is mostly two story houses, it would be great if they were all ranch houses, it would be perfect, people could stay in place, but when half your house is unusable because you can't go upstairs, it's not very practical. Maybe there are some things we can do to make those houses more suitable, adaptable.

Chairman Pruet: Thank you.

**XIII. REMARKS BY COMMISSIONERS**

None

**XIV. CLOSING REMARKS BY THE CHAIRMAN**

None

**XV. ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Camerota moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Anest. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Norine Addis,  
Recording Secretary