

Comm. Stephen Shapiro

Yes, lots 13 and 14. There is a 28 foot difference in grade between the inaudible.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Earlier Steve had pointed out that those two lots were proposed to have blasted driveways which come straight down from the lot areas and enter onto Margarite Road at about a 10 percent grade.

Thomas Nigosanti

Yes, I have in my comments there is problem with the driveway on lot 14 which it enters Margarite Road as far as the sight distance. We have to do some discussion about moving that if possible or getting an easement onto the other property to come closer to that ridge so there is enough sight distance. As far as the grade of the driveway I don't know off hand I didn't calculate the grade of the driveway but it's very steep but I imagine it may need some blasting. (inaudible)

Comm. Stephen Shapiro

My final question Tom to you the development of 26 lots going in here, could comment and certainly you know just we just put forward a road bond that is going to go to the public to vote in August, could you comment on the condition of Margarite Road and how these 26 new homes in that area will affect it? And where it is in our priority if this happens to perhaps

Tom Nigosanti

The northern portion by Randolph Road I believe is (inaudible) size and is pretty standard width and then as you get further south of Prout Hill Road the width starts to vary again, there is no curbs. The condition is not that great. There may be some need for additional drainage in the area but we have not really studied it that closely. It's not on the new road bond.

Comm. Stephen Shapiro

I realize it's not on the new road bond. Is the road safe? Would it be safe for another 26 homes to be in that area? In your professional opinion?

Tom Nigosanti

You have to describe what safe is? (Laughter)

Comm. Stephen Shapiro

Does it meet the city requirements for an area that might need 26 more homes which you as the chief engineer for the city endorse that type of a road in its present condition? And if not say no and tell us approximately knowing the road as you do what it would cost us to bring it up to city standards?

Tom Nigosanti

Our city standards for new roads are 30 foot wide. That doesn't mean that any length any portion of the road. It costs considerable amount of money for a 30 foot wide road. I don't think anybody wants to do that. At least necessary at the same time as you heard earlier is parking on the road there are problems. It's something that maybe should be looked at but the addition of 20 some odd homes I don't know what kind of an impact that's going to make.

Comm. Ann Loffredo

On the Public Works comments, we have two pages. It's your last your latest supersede your others? Are all the concerns answered?

Tom Nigosanti

That's correct. Well, not all the concerns have been answered. This one supersedes it.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Anthony, a question?

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou

Yes, my question might have been just answered but. I have the July 1st 1993 memo here. These still pertain or did you gain answers to these questions? For instance on July 1st your memo says, "drainage calculations must be submitted for review." Do you have those drainage calculations?

Tom Nigosanti

Yes, they were submitted.

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou

So they have been submitted and these ten, are these all satisfactorily answered?

Tom Nigosanti

I don't have that with me. But some on them might be on my desk, but I don't think that they are all answered. Some of those item are still on my (inaudible).

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou
Which ones?

Tom Nigosanti

Okay, the ones that haven't been addressed are number 2, number 3, and number 10.

Chm W. Lee Osborne

Can we go on to the next speaker please? Thanks for your patience.

Comm. Anthony Vasiliou

Excuse me, there was a question raised about the slope of the

drive? Are there any do the regulations speak to or does your department have any regulations relative to the slope of the driveway? Minimum or maximum slopes for driveways in the City of Middletown?

Tom Nigosanti

There is maximum 12 percent grade on driveways.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Go ahead.

Harriet Kabel

My name is Harriet Kabel. I live at 97 Margarite Road. I have resided there for the last 25 years. I guess I'm one of the older residents on the street. I have seen a lot of progress in the last 25 years, a lot of changes. I guess my house has seen even more since it is one of the original if the original house on the street which used to be all dirt road and farm land. I am concerned about the increase in traffic. Years ago little children used to be able to play in the street because there aren't any sidewalks. We moved to Margarite Road because it was rural and beautiful and even though I don't live in the area that is going to be affected we will be affected by the traffic going past our house. I believe in progress I think it is important. We need to grow but I certainly don't think progress has to bring disaster which I feel it would bring to our neighborhood. And I just kind I feel if the wheel ain't broke, don't fix it. Thank you very much.

Chm W. Lee Osborne

Are there any other members of the public who wish to address this?

Unknown speaker

Can I speak a second time?

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

With new information. Yes.

William M. Simpson

It's new information. I'll answer this man's problem. My name is William M. Simpson, Sr. I live at 123 Margarite Road in the City of Middletown. At the north end of Margarite Road, that is between Randolph Road and Victoria Heights, if you, there is parking on both sides permitted. If you park a car on both sides, twelve inches from the curb, you cannot get a fire truck up Margarite Road. That has been presented to the City of Middletown Police Department more than once. And we never got anything about parking on one side. It front of my house at 123, tonight my wife had to take me to the hospital with a heart attack, we couldn't get out of our driveway because the people across the street had parked the car opposite our driveway. She had to drive over a lawn that's about a 40 degree pitch. That's the answer to your question.

Thank you. (Applause)

Patrick Hennessey

My name is Patrick Hennessey. I live at 338 Margarite Road. I've lived there all my life. My father lived there all his life and my grandfather owned all the property in question right now. Unfortunately he was poor and had to sell it to the farmer that Mr. Russo bought the property from. This to begin with I must say I agree with all my neighbors in fact everything they've said. One thing in particular I wanted to look at is the access he has going to lots thirteen and fourteen. They go part up a brook, it's border along my property. One of the houses he is going to built is directly behind my house. My house, the lot my house is on, is probably twenty thirty feet below the house he is going to build behind me. I certainly have concerns where I stand with drainage there and runoff and I also have a major problem with the sight view where he is going to put the road in. It is ridiculous. We've not numerous problems out there. You can see coming over that hill until your on top of the hill. I could just see a kid coming down there with a bicycle and somebody flying over that hill and somebody is going to get killed. I'm telling you right now. Furthermore, the it's just incredible. I've tried to build a garage and they don't even want to hear me. You've got a brook there that is fifty feet now, but obviously I'm no expert but these meetings come and go and nobody knows what goes on. Next thing I know you know I go up there today the planning office, he's got his permits. He's going to go right over top, right up along the brook and he is going to go right over a brook. Well, there is an existing culvert there I'm told. An existing culvert for, are you going to bring cement trucks up over this culvert that goes over this brook? There is pond up there and I don't think anybody knows about this that it is spring fed. Where is the runoff from the subdivision going to go? Is it going to go into this pond? And then is it going to come down on my driveway? Basically it's ridiculous, Margarite Road is a rural area. Obviously when Mr. Russo bought it we knew that was going to be development. We figured it was going to be sane development. That's all I got to say. Applause.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

See no other members of the public jumping to the microphone I will entertain a motion from the Commission. Ann

Comm. Ann Loffredo

Motion to continue the public hearing.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Motion is made. Would rather prepare that over a longer period of time and fresh ears.

Atty. Michael Dowley

Yes, probably both but I think some of people hear tonight might not be here the next time and they have asked some questions and I think what I would attempt to do.

Comm. Ann Loffredo
I withdraw my motion.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Go ahead.

Atty. Michael Dowley
First of all I made a short list myself as to some of the questions and concerning the sewerage issues you people were at a meeting that I was at earlier. Most of these people were at both meetings and so myself and them our probably more on top of that situation than you folks. In essence the developer has said that he will sewer it whatever way the Water and Sewer Departments want him to sewer it. As a layman let me tell you my understanding of the issue. In general if you could have a gravity fed system without any mechanical systems to it, it basically works on the force of gravity. In this area you cannot have a gravity fed system without a pump station. The gentleman who got up here earlier and talked about the pump station across the street from him malfunctioning and all the raw sewerage going into the street. The plan of the alternate plan of the Water and Sewer Department is put a pump station immediately adjacent to the wetlands. We have indicated to the Water and Sewer Department that we believe that alternative should not be acceptable because if there is failure we believe the wetland that is adjacent to that pumping station site is a significant wetland and it will suffer. We have already obtained from both this commission and the wetland commission previously the right to put six lots in so all we are asking for is additional 20 lots. This application is I think John said it earlier we had 6 before, we are asking for 20 more lots. This is an R-15 zone and we have submitted an application that we believe has satisfied all of the departments. What has been missed in the whole meeting is that if you people would read the last paragraph of Bill Warner's summary, I think somewhere is there he says that this could be the nicest subdivision in the City of Middletown. I think that is important for the public to know and I also think it is important for some of when a woman gets up and gets concerned about blasting in a driveway area we have said to the Water and Sewer Department to put in that green line of water with 25 foot cuts is going to require blasting all the way through. And it seems to me an Attorney sitting here please want to get up and say don't blast for a driveway but then there is a concern about well let's have a sewer system and blast out twenty five feet. I believe there is a lack of consistency. Now what the developer has done is I think attempted to do an environmentally sensitive subdivision. I think he has done it with the help of your staff and he done is with the help of the inland/wetland staff and I think he sat down with the

City of tried to work out with Public Works what would be the best way to develop the site. I think the development that is before you is a compromise of concerns from everyone is the city. From your perspective we're in an R-15 zone. We meet the requirements of the City and I think that it's not a special exception it's based simply you got to make sure that we meet them and I believe we do. With regard to the sewerage we will do whatever the Water and Sewer people want us to do unless you people tell us you don't want to go along with them. I think ultimately they will make a recommendation to you and you have to follow. You could I think you could turn down their application recommendation if you so chose. But I think we have to wait to the next meeting in order to do that. With regard to the sidewalks. Do you want to talk about the sidewalks?

Glen Russo

In regard to the sidewalk issue I think most of the neighbors had made as good an argument as I could make regarding the rule of the subdivision. You had someone who is the President of South Farms say I'm kind of on the fence on this. Now, so much of where the kids play. And I kind of said in my mind well, walk out that backyard and play in 200 hundred acres of open space and inaudible the city is evaluating at 1.5 million dollars. I mean that is the biggest playground you'll ever get in your backyard. Now, I grew up on Arbutus Street. We never had sidewalks. It was find. We were out in the country. The only reason that the Town is going with 35 foot width roads has nothing to do with traffic. They believe traffic wise 26 feet is fine, but I want the extra footage for parking and I want the extra footage in order for people to be able for people if people are parking in the street to get by without a problem. I think that if we were required to put up a boulevard for the first 400 hundred feet and run our 800 road that just doesn't fit in the area. But yet that would satisfy the 400 and 800. It just does not. The sidewalk issue I don't think is an issue based on the fact it is just not required due to ruralness of the area. Again there isn't a sidewalk anywhere on this map and everybody functions. I live here. I live in this neighborhood and I am an avid bicyclist and I take my kids out all the time and I would say that Margarite Road does not have a lot of traffic on it at all. I was talking to this gentleman right here whose property, I'm sure it will be made known this in the future, in order to go with the gravity system with the pressurize new line, the gravity system with the pumping system we are going to have to condemn a portion of this person's property right here in order for us to locate this pumping station here again within 50 feet of the wetlands. And he was commenting that how little traffic was on the road and he did not want it to change. So obviously there is differences of opinions. I do live in the neighborhood and I don't believe that there is a lot of traffic on that road. I really just don't.

Unknown speaker

Does your house face Margarite Road?

Glenn Russo

Mr. Chairman, I think there is

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Go ahead.

Atty. Michael Dowley

There was one question in regard to a corporate. Glenn's family are the stock holders of Cambridge homes and Glenn's good attorney told him to transfer title into a family corporation and that's why he's done that. He has already identified his brother and has built a house there and lives there, his other brother is moving there. In terms of other developers that come before you certainly this family has more attachment to this area than other developers that come before you.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Anthony did you have a question?

Anthony Vasiliou

Yes, I one thing that I would like to have you address is how would characterize the describe the impact on the development is terms of effect on some of the questions of safety and traffic in terms of preserving or actually enhancing the rural nature of the area and lastly what impact will it have on the question about sewerage and drainage with your request for 1200 foot cul-de-sac instead of it being only 800 feet? When you would not have to request a waiver? So what additional impact would it have by asking for a fifty percent increase in the length of the cul-de-sac?

Atty. Michael Dowley

Let me try first. Alright? Glenn just answered that in his last answer but maybe you were not listening to him. We could without any we could put a boulevard in the first 400 feet and then run 800 feet, but it doesn't fit the neighborhood. So we could have the same number of houses but it would not environmentally fit the neighborhood. So in attempting to sit down with staff and make it fit the neighborhood rather than do the boulevard and the 800 feet, we felt it was best to ask for a waiver. What other question did you have? The traffic, you asked about the traffic, the effect of the twenty, basically it's in effect not of 26 but of 20 houses. In fact, I had a development in Cromwell where people lived on a road, it was Hicksville Road in Cromwell and they had almost no traffic and the woman got up and basically I see six cars to by my house everyday and I know the driver of each house. And I know that the road is sufficient to meet it but I don't want all that traffic in there. I think basically that you people have to sit and reply upon your staff and basically what we are saying is

putting twenty new houses and all the departments have looked at it and said it is alright. We have a right to develop the property and you people have to rely on your departments and I think that's it.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Commissioner Robinson

Comm. John Robinson
Glenn, as good a developer as you are, every developer tries to get and use as much of the property as they can develop on. You're looking for a lot of waivers, the sidewalks, the open space, the cul-de-sac length. I have a concern about lot 13 and 14 in regard to the side line, the side line was mentioned, regard to the blasting in order to get that road in there. Is lot 13 and 14 necessary for your development?

Glenn Russo
I would like to start by saying that the two lots that access by the private driveways are already approved by this department under Phase II. So we are not talking about approving these two lots. We have a Phase II that has five lots in this area however the lot lines are slightly different but the driveways do access right there. It is already approved, approved by wetlands, approved by this commission. It was approved as a common driveway, five houses were going to use that driveway, share a common driveway, Phase II approved never appealed. In this development instead of having a common driveway we reduced it to only two houses from five houses down to two both of it being private. So this is an improvement.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Hold it, hold it, you just told us that you increased the driveways by a 100 percent?

Glenn Russo
I don't think I did say that.

Atty. Michael Dowley
No is the width?

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
You said you had one driveway for five houses and now you have two houses with two driveways so you increased the number of driveways and curb cuts by 100 percent.

Atty. Michael Dowley
Is it the same width?

Glenn Russo
No. It's the same width. If you look at Phase II

Atty. Michael Dowley

They put the title line in a different place.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Let me ask this question? Are you going to put two driveways in or can you work it into a common drive? Because I think that is an issue that we had seen that's failed in other communities and we are trying to avoid that kind of thing.

Glenn Russo

We have here proposed two separate driveways. We believe that is an improvement over what is already approved by this commission. This commission has already approved a common driveway with five people sitting there but with one driveway, two right-of-ways. So this proposal is better than the old one, better than Phase II because there are less cars using this private, this area right here. If in fact there is any type of sight distance.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

In fact you're telling him it's not your germane because it's already approved and now you're telling us that you're coming in with a change and asking our blessing on it the change.

Glenn Russo

I'm not saying it's not germane, I'm trying to say that this plan here as in reality an improvement over what was already approved by this commission. You got to assume that whenever you come in that you're going to come in on the same criteria. So if this was sufficient to have five houses you would think it would be sufficient to have two houses exit but we do not. This driveway here is at 10 percent, the city's maximum is 12. Our sight distance meet, we've followed all the regulations that require the access upon this piece of property over here. I go ahead.

Comm. John Robinson

Just for clarification, what lots are in Phase II that were already approved?

Glenn Russo

There is Phase II consisted of three lots along Margarite Road and two interior lots and five

Comm. John Robinson

Lot numbers? If you can give them to me.

Glenn Russo

John, Phase II was a five lot subdivision and the sixth lot was the remaining land, already approved. And inaudible was already in place. When we came in for Phase III we incorporated Phase II into it so our Phase III proposed incorporates the old Phase II, the new Phase III and we did so so we would not have a common driveway

here. Because we thought now with this road coming in here. We have to have people always sharing this driveway. That was a lot better than taking three houses off the kind of driveway and put them on the road. So Phase II is three lots that front on Margarite Road and two interior lots in this area right over here. When we came with Phase III which is what you are looking at, the lot lines were changed slightly. So if you deny us our application we would still have Phase II approval. A long time ago I could start construction tomorrow and we could put in a common driveway and five lots off that common driveway in this area right here. So this Phase III incorporates Phase II has done so that we would ultimately end up with a better subdivision.

Atty. Michael Dowley

I think Commissioner Osborne point that may be he has a commissioner might like only one driveway cut instead of may be two in certain circumstances.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Just to bring in my own personal preferences twice in the same evening. I guess is some classic cases I go by in my business where commissions have allowed this and it looks like ski slopes, they're separate driveways, they're paved, they're exactly the same width. They go up like 300 feet which is what I'm looking at here side by side on the hillside and they look terrible. When this came before the commission I know there wasn't a issue because we ended up with a common drive and there were a lot of reasons why a common drives can work but not always work and I think what we need here is some documentation so we can compare the two, that's all. My suspension I'm sure you're going to have a motion to continue the public hearing. Where at the very least to close the public hearing and have this voted on at another time. But I would like to see some documentation showing what is all new, what is the change from the existing layout of the approved lots so we know what we're looking at.

Glenn Russo

I think what you're looking at is the Phase III which incorporates the twenty-six lots. I think all you had to do is realize that this is Phase II and it was already approved.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

I just want to see what you had before.

Glenn Russo

I know it is on file in the Planning and Zoning Department. I think that is reasonable.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne

Commissioner Shapiro

Comm. Stephen Shapiro

I'd like to move to continue the public hearing and just before we close the meeting I'd like to with this continuation I would also like to express through the chair to staff that a request may be made to get an opinion from the City Attorney on the situation with the inland/wetlands permits. Because I think that has to be in place before we do anything. (applause) And I'd like it for the next meeting.

Comm. Ann Loffredo
Second

Chm W. Lee Osborne
Motion is made and seconded. Is there any discussion on the motion? Comm. Robinson.

Comm. John Robinson
Inaudible, not speaking in the microphone.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
The motion is to continue the public hearing.

Comm. John Robinson
Bill, the conditions as far as Phase II verses Phase III, just Phase II.

Inaudible, multiple speakers

Comm. John Robinson
Do you have a schematic layout?

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Any discussion the motion before us? All those in favor say aye.

Commission
Aye.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
Opposed say nay.

Chm. W. Lee Osborne
The public hearing is extended until the next regular meeting of the Commission. We just extended the public hearing which means that at our next regular meeting it will be a public hearing agenda item and will be the 28th of July at the same time.

Respectfully submitted,

Hope P. Kasper
Administrative Secretary

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING JULY 14, 1993, 7:00 P.M. PAGE 1 OF 8

Chm. W. Lee Osborne, Vice-Chm. John Robinson, Sec'y Stephen P. Shapiro, Ann Loffredo, Anthony J. Vasiliou, Jennifer Alexander, Stephen Gadowski

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT

Sebastian Passanesi, Sebastian Timbro, Philip Halibozek, Anton A. Petras, Mayor Stephen T. Gionfriddo, Ex-Officio, Dir. P.W. Salvatore Fazzino, Ex-Officio

MEMBERS ABSENT

Alternate Jennifer Alexander acted for absent Comm. Sebastian Passanesi. Alternate Comm. Stephen Gadowski acted for absent Comm. Sebastian Passanesi

ACTING MEMBER

William Warner, Director, Tom Nigosanti, Chief Engineer

STAFF

Reporters from the Middletown Press and Hartford Courant and approximately 25 members of the audience.

OTHERS

On motion and second by Comms. Ann Loffredo and Stephen Shapiro the Commission approved the minutes of the June 23, 1993 meeting. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 2.1
A P P R O V E D
MINUTES 6/23/93

The Commission acknowledged the ZEO Sign Report and the ZEO Monthly Report.

3.1 & 3.2
SIGN & MONTHLY
REPORT - ZEO

William Warner explained report. Comm. John Robinson indicated doesn't appear to be violation. Chm. W. Lee Osborne indicated should not pursue unless clear violations are identified. Both parties are taxpayers.

ITEM 3.3
STATUS OF 43
OLD MILL ROAD
Z O N I N G
COMPLAINTS

On motion and second by Comms. Ann Loffredo and John Robinson the Commission affirmed a minor amendment of condition of approval for the Meadow at Riverbend, Section III under section f) to read "Prior to the approval of the 151st Certificate of Occupancy in The Meadows at Riverbend Subdivision, Sections II,II, and III, Tuttle Road shall be a through road approved and accepted by the City between East and Newfield Streets at no cost to the City. Further, all site plans for building permits after the 150th building permit shall contain such condition and a note stating such condition shall be placed on all subsequent mylars filed int he Town Clerk's Office from the day of this approval". Applicant/agent Tuttle Road Associates/Conklin & Soroka, Inc. S93-3. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 4.1
AFFIRMED THE
MEADOWS AT
RIVERBEND
SUBDIVISION
SECTION III

On motion and second by Comms. Ann Loffredo and Stephen Gadomski the Commission gave an affirmative G.S. 8-24 report regarding the ordinance being proposed for a \$8,730,000 bond for road improvements. Proponent P & Z Comm. Vote was 5 to 0 with 2 members that abstained. Comm. Stephen Shapiro and Comm. John Robinson abstained.

ITEM 5.1
AFFIRMATIVE
G.S. 8-24
REPORT ROAD
BOND

On motion and second by Comms. Robinson and Shapiro the Commission scheduled a public hearing on July 28, 1993 to consider a proposed Zoning Code text amendment to modify Section 55.04.01, A-2 survey requirements. Proponent P & Z Comm. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 5.2
SCHEDULED P.H.
7/28/93 ZONING
CODE TEXT
AMENDMENT A-2
SURVEYS

On motion and second by Comms. Ann Loffredo and John Robinson the Commission scheduled a public hearing on July 28, 1993 to consider a Subdivision Regulation 5.18.05, Removal of Debris stump disposal. Proponent P & Z Comm. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 5.3
SCHEDULED P.H.
7 / 2 8 / 9 3
SUBDIVISION
REGULATION
AMENDMENT

On motion and second by Comms. Ann Loffredo and John Robinson the Commission scheduled a public hearing on 7/28/93 to consider a proposed 2 lot subdivision located on east side of Old Middle Street near Middle Street. Applicant/agent Peter Westerberg S93-13. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 5.4
SCHEDULED P.H.
7/28/93 2 LOT
SUBDIVISION OLD
MIDDLE STREET

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING JULY 14, 1993, 7:00
P.M. PAGE 3 OF 8

On motion and second by Comms. Ann Loffredo and Anthony Vasiliou the Commission scheduled a public hearing on July 28, 1993 to consider a proposed 6 lot subdivision located on 1111 Arbutus Street. Applicant/agent Angelo and Josephine Monarca/Greg Warren S93-14. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 5.5
SCHEDULED P.H.
7/28/93 6 LOT
SUBDIVISION 111
ARBUTUS STREET

On motion and second by Comms. Loffredo and Robinson the Commission accepted the withdrawal of a proposed exit stair addition located at 157 Church Street. Applicant/agent Wesleyan University/Mike Curtis/Timothy Brewer SPR93-68. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 5.6
SITE PLAN
REVIEW 157
CHURCH STREET

After explanation by William Warner on why the proposal was consistent with the Commission's plans for the area, the Commission on motion and second by Comms. Gadowski and Loffredo gave an affirmative G.S. 8-24 report for the abandonment of the southern portion of River Road in the vicinity of Aircraft Road in the I-3 zone. Applicant/agent David Fleischer/Michael Dowley. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 5.7
AFFIRMATIVE G.S
8-24 REPORT
ABANDONMENT
RIVER ROAD

William Warner explains a proposed Zoning Map amendment to rezone the lots on both the north and south side of Washington Street in the vicinity of the intersections of Old Mill Road, Boston Road, and Plaza Drive, west of the Coginchaug River and east of Washington Plaza currently zoned R-15 and MX to B-3, Business Office/Limited Retail zone. Proponent P & Z Comm. Z93-8. Comm. John Robinson questions traffic. Comm. Vasiliou questions D.O.T. and traffic analysis. John and Marsha Clark, passes out prepared statement and letter from T. Tine, reads statement into record, passes out maps. J. Clark clarifies traffic. Comm. Ann Loffredo questions curb cuts. C. Langer - family owns Haggerty property, supports proposal, area has become commercial, invites Commission to new area. Comm. Vasiliou questions B-2 verses B-3. F. Satler questions access from Barbara Road. T. Plato thinks majority should rule how many times do we have to deal with this. P. Fitzpatrick - lot 14 on Barbara Road 200 feet boarding proposed B-3 zone. Traffic concerns, problem with water runoff and increase into brook. M. Farrel - notes significant opposition at last meeting responds to comments from M. Clark. Questions repeated applications. Chm. Osborne responds to questions and clarifies. M. Hurlburt - comments on curb cuts and safety, need to focus on neighborhoods. Chm. Osborne reads Tine and Kasper letters into record. B. Baroni questions impacts. W. Warner clarifies permitted uses. Comm. Vasiliou and Comm. Shapiro questions permitted versus special exception use. Comm. Loffredo questions drainage issues. W. Warner, T. Nigosanti respond to drainage issues. P. Redford clarifies history of parcels he owns. Chm. Osborne asks for show of hand who is in favor and opposed. Majority opposed. Comm. Shapiro moves table. Comm Alexander seconds table. In favor - Commissioners Alexander, Shapiro. Comm. Robinson moves approval. Comm. Loffredo seconds. Comm. Robinson speaks to motion - not in favor. Chm. Osborne indicated he wants to poll commission. Comm. Gadomski indicates support and that he read through minutes and listened to tapes. Comm. Alexander points out pro and cons fear of

ITEM 6.1
MAP AMENDMENT
TO REZONE
WASHINGTON
STREET BETWEEN
OLD MILL ROAD
AND PLAZA DRIVE

strip development B-3 will avoid strip development, will change of zone affect neighborhood negatively. Comm. Shapiro why he moved to table, opposed traffic concerns, water problems, important neighborhood need to protect them. Comm. Loffredo agrees with Comm. Gadowski is in favor. Commissioners Gadowski, Loffredo, Osborne in favor. Commissioners Alexander, Vasiliou, Robinson and Shapiro opposed. Motion is denied.

B. Bascom makes a presentation for a proposed 2 lot subdivision located on the west side of Brown Street, just south of Baldwin Drive, explains Zoning Board of Appeals' application and approval references plan to explain proposal. Comm. Robinson reviews Health comments. B. Bascom agrees to comments. Comm. Vasiliou questions water and sewer depts. comments. B. Bascom agrees with comments. Comm. Loffredo questions non-conformities. Comm. Robinson questions ZBA issue. S. Harris questions frontages, potential for a third lot would be opposed to third lot. On motion and second by Comms. Loffredo and Shapiro the Commission closed the public hearing. Vote was unanimous. On motion and second by Comms. Shapiro and Loffredo the Commission granted preliminary approval of a 2 lot subdivision as depicted on a map entitled, "Property of Carol Ford and Margaret T. Moorhead latest revision dated 4/19/93" located on Brown Street south of Baldwin Drive with the condition it meet departmental requirements. Applicant/agent Carol Ford/Robert A. Bascom S93-11. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 6.2
G R A N T E D
P R E L I M I N A R Y
A P P R O V A L 2 L O T
S U B D I V I S I O N
B R O W N S T R E E T

T. Catenzero and David Mylchreest explained a proposed 3 lot subdivision located at 244-280 East Main Street and submitted revised plan addressing the Public Works' comments. Indicated no physical changes. No questions from Commission. On motion and second by Comms. Loffredo and Shapiro the Commission closed the public hearing. Vote was unanimous. On motion and second by Comms. Loffredo and Shapiro the Commission granted final approval of a 3 lot subdivision located at 244-280 East Main Street as depicted on a map entitled, "Property of Cat's Realty Corp. latest revision dated 6/10/93" with the condition it meet departmental requirements. Applicant/agent Cat's Realty, Inc./David B. Mylchreest S93-10. Vote was unanimous.

ITEM 6.3
GRANTED FINAL
APPROVAL 3 LOT
SUBDIVISION
EAST MAIN
STREET CAT'S
REALTY

Attorney Michael Dowley and Glenn Russo explained their proposal for a 27 lot resubdivision to be known as Country View Estates, Phase III located off the east side of Margarite Road south of Kelsey Street. Applicant/agent Cambridge Homes, Inc./Glenn Russo S93-12. Jim Hopkins was the Court Reporter. Glenn Russo explained plans overall plan of area, history of property, addressed departmental comments, water and sewer issues, names contractors that company works with and employees. Comm. Loffredo questions WPCA approvals and waivers. Glenn Russo responds. S. Anderson, resident, reads statement representing property owners in Margarite Road area. Water/Sewer issues, environmental impacts, other physical improvement issues. T. Salafia, President of SMA, sidewalks, cul-de-sacs, open space, filing procedure, sewers. Comm. Vasiliou questions cul-de-sac length and sprinkler systems and sidewalks. D. Pritchard was not aware of wetland application water quality issues. B. Batt explains family history in area and other families in area, submits petition, 40 signatures. D.B. Pashwitz traffic concerns density concerns zoning R-15 vs R-30. S. Russo in favor of application wants to move to area. T. Salafia opposed to application and numbers of houses. P. Robley in favor. A. Pritchard safety concerns sidewalk issues traffic speed on Margarite Road. B. Simpson sewer system concerns grinder pumps feels gravity flow should be required. L. Pyulraiz homeowner in Phase I has grinder pump had many problems with grinder pumps. M. Stras resident surprised and opposed. Questions number of homes proposed. Post zoning issues. J. Busick traffic issue speeding cases parking on Margarite Road. Developer sold home why? Zoning issue why R-15, types of homes, 2 rear lots and driveways blasting impacts sewers. G. Souto wetlands issue, open space cul-de-sac issues, need waiver to conform. Comm. Loffredo questions open space. William Warner responds no waiver needed. D. Davis concerns with pump station on McDowell Road and previous problems. H. Stern when he moved to Margaritrie Road, traffic, rezoning of area, property values. Comm. Loffredo questions improving of roads at other subdivisions.

ITEM 6.4
PROPOSED 27 LOT
RESUBDIVISION
COUNTRY VIEW
ESTATES, PHASE
III

Comm. Shapiro questions waivers and drainage road safety. T. Nigosanti responds. Comm. Vasiliou questioned Public Works comments. T. Nigosanti responds. H. Kabel concerns about area. B. Simpson width of Margarite Road. P. Hennessey history of area, lots 13 - 14 concerns drainage site distance at driveway. Attorney Michael Dowley responds to concerns. Glenn Russo addresses sidewalks where kids play traffic sewers. Comm. Vasiliou impacts of development on safety. Attorney Michael Dowley responds. Comm. Robinson questions waivers is lot 13 and 14 necessary for development. Glenn Russo responds. Chm. Osborne discusses common drive wants documentation of approved and proposed. On motion and second by Comms. Shapiro and Loffredo the Commission continued the public hearing until 7/28/93. Vote was unanimous.

S. DeCarlo Hubbard Estates uncompleted work. No more extensions.

DISCUSSION WITH PUBLIC

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted,

William Warner
Planning Director

Approved at the meeting of _____.