

Continued from Page 32

Atty Karpel

in terms of traffic, use. I might mention that Amy Bloom's practice here in Middletown is typical 5 days a week, normal week day 8 - 5. Dr. Laub's hours are mornings and late afternoon, early evening but only three days a week. Dr. Gilliam's practice is limited to Monday and Thursday, here in Middletown and Dr. Rubenstein's practice is limited to Tuesday and Wednesday, just for short afternoon hours. There are no staff people employed except for a part time secretary that handles the work for all of them. The maximum that they presently have coming to their office on Main Street is typically six people - three therapists, three patients - but generally it is only two therapists, two patients. Because of the hours I just gave you, there is very little overlapping by more than two people. Their practice is also a fee paying private practice, it is not a clinic and they don't treat groups for group therapy. It is not a practice where they treat the acute patient. The patient needing long term care that has acute problems, they see either in New Haven at an office, or at the school outside this immediate area. You recently - when you made your zoning changes - changed this zone from R4 to MX. Even as an R4 zone offices would have been permitted. They are also permitted in a MX zone. I would like to point out to you that also permitted in an MX zone and all of the MX uses, you are probably aware, are Special Exception uses. But also permitted in an MX zone would be an ambulance service, fraternity houses, medical and dental clinics, neighborhood stores, banking facilities, nursing homes, rooming houses, housing for the elderly and public utility buildings, to list just a few of them. So that the potential uses in this zone are the ones that I mentioned, again, subject to a Special Exception being granted. The legal questions that I have to present to you for your consideration are actually a single question. We are seeking a Special Exception under Section 44.08.26 which is referred to as the Adaptive Reuse section. Under that section, homes that have been listed on the 1979 list prepared by the Greater Middletown Preservation Trust has either historical or notable homes are subject to this type of adaptive reuse under the Zoning Code and I am sure that you all will remember when that change was made it's intent is to, hopefully, preserve some of the historical and notable homes so that they are not torn down and other uses made and to encourage people to continue the use even if it is a change of use, continue the existence of the building and upgrade the style of the building. This particular house is not listed in that 1979 study. However, I don't believe that the '79 study was an all inclusive study and, as a matter of fact, we did approach the Greater Middletown Preservation Trust and in part of your package Ruth Madison has answered our request by visiting the site and indicating in her letter that this house that was known a long time ago as the Doctor Spade House, built in 1909, is an historic building and in that letter she points out some of the features that cause her to conclude that this building is of historic nature. The legal consideration that I think that you have to face is, when the Middletown Zoning Code indicates that the site or the house must be an historic or a notable house as set forth in that study, did you intend that to be all inclusive study? I tend to think that you certainly didn't because there are probably many more houses that escaped notice when that original study was done. Also attached to the application is a site plan and we have shown on it 6 parking spaces which, of which, I think 5 are technically needed because of the square footage of the house is just a shade under 1,000 but it is close enough for Peter Nelson, the Architect, to decide to have shown 6 spaces. What

Continued from Page 33

Atty Karpel

he did not show is a buffer zone. Again, under the Adaptive Reuse section you have flexibility in deciding how the site can be designed. We have no objection to doing away with the parking spaces which we really don't think we are going to have a great need for in creating a buffer, but if we put the buffer there is no way you would accommodate six spaces. The other is not legal issue but a....

Change of tape

....site shares a driveway with our site. There is a common driveway that leads between both existing houses and there is a driveway easement that states that both parties have a right to mutual use of it and that neither party using it will in any manner block off the use and the - at all times it will remain open so that if somebody has to get in or out of either site there will not be a car parked in the driveway. That agreement also states that the expense for maintaining it would be shared between the two properties or property owners. My clients have already had a brief and tentative conversation with the next door neighbor and made it quite clear that should their application be approved this evening that they will, in writing, notify him that they will undertake the entire maintenance and upkeep of it since their use would probably be of a greater nature than the neighbor's use. Unless you have any questions, I would like to ask if it is possible that this item might be put on the Agenda for New Business for this evening.

Chm Gionfriddo

I would assume we would come to some conclusion on this, this evening. I have strong feelings on this but no questions so I'll save it for later. Anybody here have any questions in particular dealing with the plan, etc.? If not, thank you. Oh yes, Phil(Karpel)

Atty Karpel

Just let me point out, in conclusion, because I know what your strong feelings are, Steve (Gionfriddo), that we do recognize that this area, High Street, is basically a stable, somewhat, not somewhat, predominantly residential in nature. That is the reason why I prepared the site location showing some of the existing uses so that you would see that while that residential character is there, there have been some intrusions and we feel, quite frankly, having changed the zone to MX that would allow a series of different uses. Ours is, we hope, in keeping with basic residential character of that neighborhood since we will not be changing the exterior and the use of the interior is not a high density use and we don't intend that it will ever become one.

Chm Gionfriddo

Yes, George(Reif)

George Reif

Last week when we were talking about Zoning Code changes and buffer strips someone suggested that they be 10' or more, I was trying to make the point that there were sites in town on small lots where there would be a problem with 10'. This is a good example.

Chm Gionfriddo

Good point, George(Reif) Anyone else have any questions or points to

Continued from Page 34

Chm Gionfriddo

raise? If not, thank you, Phil(Karpel). Any members of the public wishing to speak in favor of this proposal? Any members wishing to speak in opposition, raise points, questions? Yes....

Tony Christina

My name is Tony Christina, I live at 449 High Street. I don't have any objections to what they are going to do there as far as the land and the parking, that's up to you folks, but my main concern is I'm not familiar with what MX and what R4 means and all the rest of that. What I would like to know is, letting them do this, will that open up High Street to become another South Main Street where every other house is a professional office or medical center, etc., etc.? As far as I know, from Washington Street all the way down to EIS there are no offices, it is all residential, they are all two family houses, etc. and this is the only question that I can raise. I'd like an answer to that.

Chm Gionfriddo

Okay, does it open the door? No, in a sense, no, because each one is a Special Exception so it would have to come here so the Commission would have to grant Special Exception after Special Exception, I would assume if we are going to make the change but that, you know, you have raised the same concern that I am going to be raising later. Is changing the character of a primarily residential area and potentially running into the type of problem that you are raising. As long as it is an MX zone, it is a Special Exception use it has to....why are you raising your hand, it's not?

Mr. Reif

Really, this application has nothing to do with the fact that this happens to be an MX zone. The reason he is here applying for what he is applying is because it is an adaptive reuse.

Chm Gionfriddo

Adaptive Reuse. So, consequently, all MX zone uses are permitted uses.

Mr. Reif

It is irrelevant. Any historic building, anyplace in town can....

Chm Gionfriddo

I am going beyond historic buildings. His question goes beyond historic buildings. He is saying, 'does this approval open up the door to this becoming a series of offices all down High Street'?

Mr. Reif

The MX zone does permit as a Special Exception....

Chm Gionfriddo

Well, that is what I said, it is a Special Exception.

Mr. Reif

Right, but the category they are applying for is also a Special Exception.

Chm Gionfriddo

All I am saying is for that to happen would require us to approve a series of Special Exceptions. Okay?

Tony Christina

Yes. I also think that the traffic in that area is going to be - getting

Continued from Page 35

Tony Christina

in and out of that driveway with cars - that is a bad area right there on the corner of Liberty Street and I think that should be taken into consideration, also.

Chm Gionfriddo

Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to be heard. If not, we will close the Public Hearing on Item #2. Is there a motion to make this Item 6.5 under New Business.

Comm Leinwand

So moved.

Chm Gionfriddo

Is there a second?

From background, Unidentified Commissioner

Second

Chm Gionfriddo

Any discussion? If not, all those in favor? All those in favor? Any opposed? All right, the motion carries. We'll move to Item #3 on the Public Hearing.

Sec'y Carta

Item #3: Proposed 2 lot resubdivision located near the corner of Saybrook Road/Coe Avenue. App/Agt Carmelina Santostefano/T.F. Jackowiak.

Ted Jackowiak

Good Evening, everybody. ....(Inaudible)from Carmelina Santostefano who owns a piece of property right on the corner of Coe Avenue and Saybrook Road. It is proposed that she divide that piece of property which consists of about 2.8 acres into two lots. The lot that she is retaining is the home in which she has lived in for many years and that will have 76,000 square feet. The lot which she wishes to convey has 33,600 square feet. There is water and sewer available and it is just a simple, straightforward division. I don't think there are many things that I can comment more about it, if you have any questions I would be glad to answer them.

Chm Gionfriddo

Ted(Jackowiak), the Public Works Department comment indicates that one of the lots fronts on Coe Avenue, an unimproved road, and they are suggesting the driveway should front on Saybrook Road and should be a hammerhead turnaround. Do you have any problem - do you envision any problem with that?

Ted Jackowiak

No, I don't, Steve(Gionfriddo).

Chm Gionfriddo

Anyone else have any questions? If not, thank you, Ted(Jackowiak).

Ted Jackowiak

I wonder if this could be put on....

Chm Gionfriddo

It will be put on. Any member of the public wishing to be heard in favor

Continued from Page 36

Chm Gionfriddo  
of this proposal? Any member wishing to be heard in opposition, or raise question, etc.?

Charles Harris  
Charles Harris, Chamberlain Road. I have nothing to object to whatsoever except that we've run into the same thing again, Mr. Chairman. On the signs. This time it is not nailed to the pole, but it leans right tight against it and I think it shows lack of respect for the people that work for the utilities who you and I and everybody expects to take care of our lights when they don't work and our telephone when it doesn't work. If I may, through you, so that someone can get to George(Reif), is it a big problem to add to the sign section of the Subdivision Regulations that these signs will never be nailed to any public utility structure and that they will not be within 10 feet of any public utility structure so that if some poor lineman has to go there on a dark, rainy night he doesn't break his neck trying to fix somebody's service. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo  
Thank you, Charlie(Harris). Anyone else? If not, we will close the Public Hearing. Is there a motion to make this Item 6.6? Is there a second? Any discussion? If not, all those in favor? Any opposed? Motion carries, we move to Item #4.

Sec'y Carta

Item #4: Proposed Special Exception to permit a 29 unit multi-dwelling units located at 283 Cross Street. App/Agt Michael Interbartolo, Jr./Atty Cartelli.

ITEM #4:  
SPECIAL EX-  
CEPTION/29  
UNITS/283  
CROSS ST/APP  
AGT/M. INTER  
BARTOLO/CAR  
TELLI

Atty Borkowski

Good evening, I am Joseph Borkowski, I practice law with the law firm of Fortune and Cartelli, in the City of Middletown. This evening I appear before you representing Michael A. Interbartolo, Jr. of 108 Maverick Street, East Boston, Mass., in his application for a Special Exception for the construction of 29 Condominium units to be known as Butternut Hollow Condominiums. The property intended for development is located on Cross Street and is presently owned by Vincent J. Greco and his wife, Grace T. Greco. Mr. Interbartolo has an option to purchase 3.674 acres of Mr. & Mrs. Greco's land holdings on Cross Street. Mr. & Mrs. Greco would retain some .727 acres on which their home is located. That home, for your information, is presently serviced by city water and sewer. This division would not be a subdivision, would not be a division, excuse me, requiring subdivision approval and is graphically set forth on the boundary survey map of David B. Mylchreest, dated June 4, 1986, previously submitted to the Commission office. The parcel to be developed is shown at this Lot A. This area lies within the multi-family dwelling unit zone which, by this Commission's recent enactment, would allow 8 two-bedroom units per acre. The applicant's proposal would be in compliance with this aspect to the Zoning Code and, I might add at this juncture, that the applicant meets or exceeds every applicable requirement of the Zoning Code for the proposal he is submitting. Moreover, I believe George(Reif) will share with you later that no department, in reviewing this submission, has registered any adverse comment. That would also include the Traffic Commission. The applicant proposes to construct 4 buildings. One building

Continued from Page 37

Atty Borkowski

will contain 12 units with garages, another building will contain 12 with no garages, a third building will have 5 units with no garages and lastly, there will be a building which will serve as a community meeting room and storage facility. All units shall be two bedroom units. It is anticipated that the units with garages will be marketed at approximately \$135,000. In units without garages will be marketed at \$115,000. The applicant's financing is in place and he does not require any governmental subsidy. If the approval is granted, construction should commence in September or October of this year and the buildings should be enclosed by winter. This Commission has always asked what the exterior treatment is and in this case it will be stained wood clapboard. The applicant, if allowed to develop this area, will, asided from providing Middletown some quality housing in the zone that this Commission has set aside for multifamily use, he will also be conferring upon the city two additional

benefits. Namely, the developer will be installing storm drainage for some 700 feet to service Butternut Street and the developer will be upgrading the water main servicing this area to bring it up to standard. I suppose, however, that no matter how good the plans look it is always the individual involved who makes the difference between an attractive asset to Middletown and a project that should never have been built or started. Here we are very fortunate in having this evening a most competent, respected and well-known developer to Middletown. Michael A. Interbartolo, Jr., is the man who without concession or subsidy by the City of Middletown turned old Middletown High School into the showplace it is today. That rehabilitation project certainly demonstrates the capabilities of this developer. Additionally, if that national registered building is not proof enough than we only have to look to Central School and his marvelous rehabilitation efforts in turning that into condominiums which were conventionally financed. At this point, I am going to turn the microphone over to Michael in order that he can share with you his ideas and plans in greater depth. Thank you.

Michael Interbartolo

Good evening. I'll try and do it as quickly as possible because I'm sure you have many on the Agenda and if there are any questions along the way just ask them or we can go through the whole presentation. This is the rendering of the units that would have the garage and those would be the units that you would see as you came into the site. To give you some orientation above and beyond. This is the site here. This is Butternut Street here, West Street, Cross Street and Long Lane, north arrow. On the overall city map this is the Connecticut River. Again, the north arrow. The site is located here, this being Washington Street here and, of course, Main Street is there. This gives you an idea of the overall site, the building location as well as the roadway and the buffer zone and the uses around it. This is Mr. Greco's site that he would retain. His entire site would be this 4.4 acres. His house is presently located almost dead center of this site and there is a residential property on the corner of Cross and Butternut Street here and there is residential along here fronting on Cross Street and there are several residential properties fronting on Long Lane that abut the property down to this point. Along the south and westerly border is vacant land commonly owned by the State of Connecticut. The shaded area would be the 10 foot buffer area that would be required and it is carved out with new solid wooden fence and existing - it is a heavily treed site and there are heavy trees along

Continued from Page 38

Mr. Interbartolo

the perimeter of the site and we would maintain much of those trees. You can see by the configuration we tried to keep the units away from the borders and the tree line as much as possible. There is a heavy row of trees along the easterly and this portion, this whole portion of southerly as well as the westerly border. What we are proposing is that in here, where needed, we would weed out all of the low shrubs and replant additional shrubs to maintain the proper buffer, plant new shrubs along in here and then a wooden fence and existing trees in there. The rendered site plan is to give you an idea of what type of uses there are, how much of it is green, not so much that the trees reflect a 4 inch caliber tree or a 12 inch caliber tree but to give you an idea of how much is landscaped versus how much is building, how much is open, private open space and how much is common space. The entrance to the site will be off of Cross Street as well as the exit and going back to the location plan, if you are familiar with the site and you have had an opportunity to go to the site, Cross Street is a dogleg and at this point, as it is addressed in the traffic study, at this point this is probably the most opportune location for a driveway as far as visual access. Both up Cross Street and down Cross Street you can see the intersection of Sunset Terrace and Butternut Street and Cross Street to the north and to the west you can see the ridge at Long Lane and Cross Street from sitting in a parked car at that proposed driveway location. Coming into the site from Cross Street, again, Mr. Greco's property will be here, there will be a driveway here, here's one block of 12 units here which would have a garage under. The land slopes heavily from this point down Butternut Street. Two weeks ago, one of the Commissioners asked about coming in from Butternut Street and if you - refer to you on the engineering plan and the topography you will see the elevation of Butternut Street is about 80 and the elevation of where the units are is about 115 to 120, so in the space of about 60 or 70 feet you are going up a grade of 40 feet and it was - and the traffic engineer made a reference to it in his report - because we did look at coming in from Butternut Street and the safety concerns that it would cause. So, you come in from Cross Street, there is a block of 11 units that would be tucked into the hill with the garages under and at the back side would be on grade private terraces, then there is a block of five units here which would have on grade parking. You would come into the units at the living room level, there would be a full basement and the basement would come out at grade in the back. Off of the kitchen area would be a private deck that would be up above, one story above grade. Then there is a block of twelve units here, again, that would have on grade parking that would be able to - you would come into the living room level at grade on the front side and the basement level is at grade at the back side. In the center we propose to build a community building that would be an accessory use and only for the use of the property owners in the development and it would house lawnmowers and the equipment needed to maintain the site. Although the roadway system is designed as a 20 foot roadway, it would be maintained as a private roadway owned and maintained by the condominium association and the city would have no responsibility for the plowing or the utilities beyond the property line. These are typical floor plans, this is the unit with the garage. The units are two bedroom units, 1½ baths, eat-in kitchen and living and dining room. They have laundries in the bathrooms, there would be a dressing area off of the master bedroom that would open onto the bathroom as well. The units range in size, the ones with the garages would be approximately 1330 square feet, not including the garage, basement level, that is strictly

Continued from Page 39

Mr. Interbartolo

the two living levels. The ones with the garages would be approximately 1365 square feet, again, not including the basement level or the private open space. So, if you were walking to the unit and your neighbor was walking to the unit, you would come up  $\frac{1}{2}$  a level into the unit, a vestibule and then up another  $\frac{1}{2}$  level to the living room, dining room, there would be an eat-in kitchen,  $\frac{1}{2}$  bath, closet and an access to the terrace. Those owners that were driving, they would come into the garage under the front part of the unit and then a basement in the back that would house the laundry and storage and the stairs up to the living, dining area. The second floor would be a master bedroom, closets, the dressing area with another closet, a full bath opening off of the dressing area, a linen closet off the stairs and then a second bedroom area in the back. The units without the garage would have a full basement which would open on the back side, out to grade, on the living room level, the entry to the unit which would be on grade. On the front side you would come in and it is pretty much the same layout except that there is a bay window in the front and back of these units and they are a little bigger. There would be a living, dining area, you don't lose the space for the stairwell and the vestibule in this living room so it is bigger in that respect as well. The second is pretty much the same layout. It would be an option for those, which is becoming more and more common up in the Boston area, to, instead of the dressing area providing the laundry up in the second floor, women are getting, and men, are getting tired of carrying laundry up and down from the basement to the bedrooms - the dirty laundry is generated up in the bedroom, the clean laundry needs to go to the bedrooms, so we found that that is an option that people are requesting more and more. In that respect, the dressing area would become the bathroom and there would be access right from the master bedroom and then the laundry room would be where the bathroom is. This shows - this would be the front of the units without the garage. So you'd - from the on grade parking you would be entering the units here, this would be the bay window in the living room, then this would be the back of the units with the private decks and then the full basement underneath. This would be a section through this unit, you can see on grade parking and then the deck, 1 level above with the basement at grade in back. This is a section through the garage unit that shows you coming in at grade into the garage, then the private deck off the back, which would be on grade. From the standpoint of the technical aspects and engineering aspects of the utilities there is commonly water and sewer servicing the area. The water service is both inadequate in that area for what is there, as well as for the proposal. We have agreed to bring - replace - existing the four inch line with an eight inch line from Long Lane to our driveway. In addition to that, we have worked out an agreement with Water & Sewer Department whereby they, the City, will supply the materials and we will install a replacement 8 inch line for the 4 inch line from our driveway down to Sunset Terrace so that there would be an 8 inch route that covers that whole area, which would increase the water pressure for the whole area. On the storm drainage we showed a storm drainage obviously following the contours of the land and coming out to Butternut Street and that point we've agreed with the Public Works Department, we were proposing to put in a storm drainage line that would take care of the water coming off of our site but I think we are in agreement that the City, again, will supply the materials and we will install the line, that 700 feet. Instead of an 18 inch line which would be adequate for our drainage system, it would be a 30 inch line. I think Mr. Fazzino is working up the numbers to see which is the most advantageous. I think that we are in agreement that we can work out an agreement to provide not only storm drainage for our site but also help

Continued from Page 40

Mr. Interbartolo

the storm drainage needs of Butternut Street. To give you an idea of the total coverage, both paved areas and building areas and decks, it comes out to be less than 40% of the site being covered with walkways, paved areas, buildings and decks. To give you - just to go back to the site plan and talk about the community building, but the open space, what we show on this rendered site plan is half of a basketball court, picnic tables and barbecue, taught raw apparatus here and my ethnic background determined that there should be a bocci court there. See, George(Reif), there weren't many people that realized what that was. There was a question over the first hearing you had by some of the abutters were asking questions and we were just going over the - one of the questions, 'were we gearing it towards any particular age or income group?', and I think that if I found out anything in the development field, you could gear it to one group but that doesn't mean that that is the group that is going to go there. I think on Central School and the condominiums we expected that a large percentage of the units would be Wesleyan people and probably 25% were Wesleyan people. We've got a mix there of elderly, empty nesters, we even have some families there with children. I think that that is what we tried to accommodate here was an integrated type of use which could accommodate all these groups and whether it be empty nesters, elderly or starting families or ....

Change of tape

....if you would like him to just summarize it, we would be glad to. Okay, Jim Ford from Storch Associates.

Jim Ford

For the record my name is James Ford, I'm Senior Traffic Engineer and Associate with the firm of Storch Engineers in Whethersfield. By way of professional experience, I know you have received a resume, I have a Bachelor's and Master's in Engineering from University of Connecticut, I have over 18 years experience in the field of Engineering. I'd like to review the proposed construction of the 29 units condominiums, Butternut Knoll. We have detailed in our report the studies which were undertaken and I won't repeat that in great detail here, just summarize the results. Our work included taking traffic counts on Cross Street where the driveway to the facility will be located. We found roughly that Cross Street carries approximately 500 vehicles trips a day. The trip is a one way movement in one direction or the other. Now that, therefore, could be translated, coming and going, 1700 vehicles. The proposed project would involve the construction of 29 units, condominium,(inaudible) transportation engineers gives us some guidelines to trip generation for this type of development, we have included in the report the trip generation summaries, roughly, we can estimate that this particular project would generate 150 trips on a daily basis. A trip is a one way movement either into or out of the site. More important are the peak hours and on the average developments of this nature will generate roughly .4 trips per unit during the evening or the morning peak hours. That would translate into roughly 12 trips or one vehicle entering or exiting this site every 5 minutes. Those are not large numbers and can easily be accommodated by Cross Street. More serious concern in this particular size of development is the safety aspects of the driveway. On sight distance is adequate. We have a street that we are entering that has approximately a 5% to 7% grade so we want to make sure that traffic approaching that driveway on the street, or traffic

Continued from Page 41

Jim Ford

in driveway exiting, can see other vehicles. There is a sharp curve in the road right where the driveway is to come in, this is perhaps the most opportune place for a driveway to be located for this type of facility. Vehicles entering Cross Street from Butternut Knoll have more than adequate sight distance in each direction, this is based on parking the vehicle approximately where the driveway would be and measuring the sight distance to vehicles in each direction. Therefore, there will be more than adequate ability of anyone exiting onto Cross Street to see oncoming traffic. Also, the traffic on Cross Street can observe the driveway location in view of someone attempting to enter. Therefore, we would not see that there would be a major safety problem and in reviewing the accident map of the Police Department we find that there have been no accidents documented at this location this year according to the map that was on file at the Police Department. It is not a high accident location and the driveway does meet all standards for sight distance. In summary, I have found that this particular development appears to be able to be adequately handled on the street system. The driveway can be constructed along with adequate sight distance which is the major concern for low traffic (inaudible) generator such as this. We were asked to review the possibility of a one way circulation plan with a driveway to Butternut being the entering driveway off of Butternut. Because of the grades involved and because of conditions which are apt to occur during a major portion of the winter in limited sight distances because of a need to construct retaining walls to build up the driveway, we recommended very seriously to the developer that they abandon any effort to attempt to put a driveway into Butternut Street. I'm free to answer any questions.

Chm Gionfriddo

Any questions? Commissioner Leinwand

Comm Leinwand

On the issue of the driveway coming out on Cross Street. When I intended on coming out, there is no question but I can see traffic to the right and the left and if I am driving on Cross Street I can see cars that want to get in and out. The question I have is, if I am coming down, you know, downhill, if I am coming from the Fire Station and I want to come down Cross Street and make a left turn into this driveway, isn't my car far enough around the bend at that point that it is not well seen? Isn't that the only place that there is a concern with sight?

Mr. Ford

The grading adjacent to the new house that was just constructed across the street as you came down to make the left turn to go in would allow you to see across the front road and down Cross Street so that you should also have adequate sight distance.

Comm Leinwand

I'm talking about the car that is coming behind me. I'd have to stop if there was oncoming traffic....

Mr. Ford

Okay

Comm Leinwand

....in order to make the left turn, I just want to know where my tail

Continued from Page 42

Comm Leinwand  
lights are going to be seen.

Jim Ford  
The tail lights for the car behind you should be - your tail lights should be able to be observed two or three hundred feet behind you. There is no serious problem with the vertical alignment that I could see. You can see from the driveway up the hill, therefore, if you are coming down the hill a car behind you at a reasonable distance would be able to observe your stopping maneuver.

Chm Gionfriddo  
Any other questions? Joe(Borkowski), do you have anything else?

Atty Borkowski  
Not at this time, however, I would like to commend to you the comments from the various departments which I think you will find have no significant comment to include the Traffic Department and I believe Mr. Fazzino, who is sitting here tonight, even concurred that the sight line which is the issue you brought up is adequately addressed in the proposal. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo  
Thank you, if there are no further questions by members of the Commission, are there any members of the public wishing to speak in favor of this proposal? Are there any members wishing to speak in opposition or raise concerns, questions?

Rita D'Apice  
Members of the Commission, for the record, my name is Rita D'Apice Gould(sic) and I own property at 268 Cross Street. A few years ago, I represented 27 families in the area of Long Lane, Cross, Butternut and West Streets who were opposed to the building of a six family dwelling at the west end of Cross Street. At that time, I introduced overwhelming evidence that such a dwelling placed in a high traffic area on a deadly "s" curve could potentially endanger the lives of many citizens. Photographs of the curve submitted to Mr. Leinwand and Lt. Aresco depicted stone walls and telephone poles damaged by a variety of accidents there. A petition signed by more than 100 Middletown residents in opposition to the dwelling was also submitted and several citizens voiced their concern to the Middletown Press. The Commission subsequently denied the request for the Special Exception which (inaudible) to the building of the multi-family dwelling. That is why I read - when I read the news of the proposed condominiums to be located off Cross Street, I was in utter disbelief. Especially since Mr. and Mrs. Greco were violently opposed to the building of the six family dwelling. None of the road conditions in the area has changed, the "s" curve is as dangerous to pedestrians and motorists as it was before. In attempts to maneuver in and out of their blind driveways Cross Street residents continue to put their lives in danger because of the high traffic pattern and the speeding cars. The West Street bridge is a continuous bottleneck and getting onto Washington Street from Butternut is almost impossible. Is it fair to these residents to have an already bad traffic situation compounded? I would also like to add here, with all due respect to the developer's meticulous plan and the traffic reports, he doesn't live on Cross Street and he only has to live there to know the truth, especially about the accidents - which I

Continued from Page 43

Rita D'Apice

really don't know whatever happens to those reports. Just a few weeks ago, there were three fire trucks parked in front 264 Cross and an ambulance because a woman went out of control coming around the curve. When I moved into the house ten years ago, there was a telephone pole across the street, directly across the street from me, that had been - an accident had occurred there - it was split in two. When a house at 277, I believe, Cross Street was recently built the telephone pole was purposely moved back because it was on the curve, directly on the curve, to avoid someone coming around that curve and hitting it. Another point in question, children frequently congregate at the nearby Butternut Park. How safe will it be for them to walk to or play in an area with more traffic than already exists? No one is disputing the need for affordable housing and additional tax revenue. Condominiums seem to be sprouting up all over Middletown, Wesleyan Hills, off Washington Street, just to name a few. Building more cluster housing, especially in the area where Pond View and High View Apartments and Wesleyan Intown houses already exist and especially the proposed condo exiting onto the most dangerous part of Cross Street would be a travesty. It is time to put the question of multi-family dwellings in the Butternut Hollow area to bed once and for all. The Commission saw fit to deny a request for a six family dwelling in the same area a few years ago and, on behalf of many area residents, I sincerely urge the Commission to deny this Special Exception to prevent the building of these condominiums. Anything else would be a disservice to our community.

Chm Gionfriddo

Anyone else?

John Philbrick

Good evening, my name is John Philbrick, I live at 27 Long Lane. I live approximately a quarter of a mile from this proposed site. I have been a resident there for approximately seven years. I feel that this proposal should be denied due to safety hazards on the street as has already been said, the street is very steep, it has a very sharp "s" curve and there are some certain additional road hazards in that particular area which increase the likelihood of accidents. Those would be: 1. the radius of several of these curves on this street are decreasing radius curves, so if you enter a curve at a certain radius, the road suddenly becomes sharper - a sharper bend. In addition to this, one particular curve has a very strong negative camber which has a tendency of pushing a vehicle into the center lane. An example of this would be a speedway having a bank curve, helps a race car stay on a track. Well, this road has a curve - camber - which is away from the center of the curve and tends to push the traffic towards the center lane. Also, there is an abrupt change of grade at one point of the road, a very severe bump and it is right near an obstruction (inaudible) that telephone directly, right off, the street. This street is hazardous as it is and in addition to this, with all the conditions of the road, there is merging traffic at the bottom so anyone coming up the street has to watch, turn to the left, and watch for traffic which is coming down from a higher pitch. I am very surprised that someone has proposed this because I think this, I think the site with that much traffic in this area is absolutely ridiculous. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo

Thank you. Anyone else?

Continued from page 44

Dale Lee

Good Evening, my name is Dale Lee, I live at 17 Long Lane. First off, I have a petition I'd like to present to the Commission. It is signed by 39 residents of Cross Street, Long Lane, Fairview Avenue and Sunset Terrace. The petition reads as follows: 'We, the undersigned, urge the Middletown Planning & Zoning Commission to reject the application of Michael Interbartolo for Special Exception to construct a 29 unit Condominium complex on Cross Street. We are particularly concerned about: 1 the restricted visibility along the steeply banked and curved section of Cross Street, 2. the danger to both families in the area and through traffic, particularly in winter and 3. the fact that Cross Street receives considerable traffic and may become more heavily used if congestion on Route 66 increases'. As I mentioned, this is signed by 39 residents in the area, only 2 of the residents that we approached declined to sign the petition. I would also like to make a few remarks about what I feel the impact of the development on the neighborhood. These condominiums that have been mentioned are going to be constructed on a property that borders directly on the backyard of people who live on Long Lane and lower Cross Street. I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that these things are going up in our backyards. Further, on this plot of land, surrounded primarily by single family homes and undeveloped state property, the developer has proposed a concentration of housing that I feel is all out of proportion to the existing density of the neighborhood. This is a long existing neighborhood that I think has a sense of stability and continuity about it. I can't speak authoritatively about property values but it is hard for me to believe that a house with condos in its' backyard could be worth more than a - or the same - would not be worth less - than a house with undeveloped woodlands behind it. I think, talking about property values, there is also an aspect of the quality of life for the residents there. As I said, this is a long existing neighborhood that has a sense of stability and continuity about it. This is a neighborhood where several generations of people have raised their families. I have an infant daughter who is the fourth generation of my family to live at 17 Long Lane. I feel very strongly about her having her backyard disrupted in the same area where her parents and her grandparents have played for years. Finally, I feel that the integrity and cohesiveness of this neighborhood will be seriously compromised by this development and I ask that the Planning & Zoning Commission turn down this proposal. Who should I present the petition to?

Chm Gionfriddo

To me. Thank you. Anyone else?

Elizabeth Holder

My name is Elizabeth Holder, I live at 29 Long Lane. I drive down Cross Street several - down and up - several times every week and I am very familiar with the fact that this road is not only curvy and narrow, as has been described, it is also very steeply banked so that if there is any kind of accident situation there is no way to get off the road. If there are bicyclists on the road there is very little room to maneuver. All you have to do is walk up and down the street collecting signatures to get a sense of how exceedingly dangerous it is to walk on the road. This has been recognized by the City which has a sign at the bottom saying blind driveways. If this development is to go through we would automatically, in one stroke, have 29 additional blind driveway in an

Continued from Page 45

Elizabeth Holder

already dangerous section of street. I parked my car in the driveway, I looked up and down the hill, I did not see that you could see a great deal in either direction. While it is true you can see up toward the top of the hill, I was not convinced that you could get a good view of cars coming down the hill on the right hand side. Also, cars coming - when you can see down Butternut Street - in the direction towards Route 66, but the direction that goes out toward West Street, which is where most of the people using the shortcut would go, is not a very clear line of sight, especially people coming from West Street, up the hill, would come around that corner and not be seen immediately. I looked at this under ideal conditions in the middle of the day, walking down the street and I feel that at night, under conditions of rain, rush hour, snow, if there are pedestrians, bicyclists, anything else on the road these ideal conditions obviously will not be met and, as has been said already tonight, there have been accidents there and I would hate to see us create a situation where more would occur. I live very close to the corner of Long Lane and I am used to going out of the house and attending to accidents that occur there and I hope this Commission will not create another such situation. Thank you.

Chm Gionfriddo

Thank you. Is there anyone else?

Bill Holder

My name is Bill Holder, I am a resident of 29 Long Lane. I think it is obvious from some of the remarks that have been made previously and to anybody who makes just the most casual inspection of that road, that if you were looking for a place to put a driveway to a condominium, you would never pick that site along Cross Street. It's an undesirable site. The question is, 'is it actually a hazardous site?' I believe it is a hazardous site, but I want to urge the Commission to seek some independent measurements along that road. I want to particularly emphasize the point that Steve Leinwand raised earlier. It appears to me that perhaps the blindest aspect of that curve will be to people who are coming down and have somebody stopped ahead of them making a left turn into the development. It is not at all clear to me that you will be able to see a car until you are right on top of it. I also think it worth pointing out that what might be an adequate line of sight in a different situation where the road is level and there is an adequate shoulder, might not be an adequate line of sight in this situation where the road, as Elizabeth said, is steeply banked, curving and there is virtually no shoulder, whatsoever. If the Commission sees fit to approve this application, then I hope it will also specify that the developer make every effort to preserve as much of the woodland area as possible. I was encouraged by the remarks that Mr. Interbartolo made earlier. I am particularly concerned that a buffer of trees be maintained between properties on Long Lane and the proposed development, not just that a few of the major trees be left standing but that the heavy and dense nature of the woodland area in that area be preserved to the extent possible. I also would urge the Commission to satisfy themselves that the condominiums are of sufficient quality and attractiveness to preserve property values in the area and examine the question of whether the possibility of having a somewhat less dense development with fewer condominiums would create a more attractive environment and at the same time help to mitigate, somewhat, the traffic problems that are bound to ensue from this development. I also, tonight,

Continued from page 46

Bill Holder

haven't heard much about the proposed maintenance plans for the development and here again I would urge the Commission to satisfy themselves that whatever maintenance conditions that exist are satisfactory for the long term upkeep. Thank you very much.

Chm Gionfriddo

Thank you, Bill(Holder). Anyone else? If not, we are going to close the Public Hearing. Is there a motion to make this item 6.7 for New Business?

Comm Leinwand

So moved

Chm Gionfriddo

Is there a second? Any discussion? If not, all those in favor? Any opposed? It will be Item 6.7 and that closes the Public Hearing and we move to Item #3 which is discussion with public concerning topics which aren't or have not been the subject of Public Hearings.

ADJOURNMENT 10:08 P.M.

Transcribed by

Dorothy Wilson