

**MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING HELD IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE 7:30 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING HELD ON MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2014, IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410**

Present

Sean Stollo, Vice Chairman; Lelah Campo, S. Woody Dawson, John Kardaras, Gil Linder, Louis Todisco

Absent – Earl J. Kurtz, Edward Gaudio and Vincent Lentini.

Alternates: Jon Fischer, Leslie Marinaro and Diane Visconti.

Staff: William Voelker, Town Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Stollo called the special meeting to order at 7:42 p.m.

Mr. Stollo read the fire safety announcement.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Mr. Stollo called the roll.

**IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

**V. ACCEPTANCE OF MINUTES – Regular Meeting, 1/27/14.**

MOTION by Ms. Campo; seconded by Mr. Linder.

MOVED to accept and approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of 1/27/14 subject to corrections, additions, deletions.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

**VI. COMMUNICATIONS**

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- 1. Waiver request of Section 11.1 of the Subdivision Regulations**  
Karen A. Reims  
27 East Ridge Court  
Requesting waiver of Section 5.6 CUL-DE-SAC STREET OR DEAD END STREET LIMITATIONS  
Subsection 5.6.1  
APPLICATION WITHDRAWN

PH 12/9/13  
PH 01/13/14  
MAD 03/19/14

2. **Special Permit Application**  
**Karen A. Reims**  
**27 East Ridge Court**  
**Two dwelling units in one dwelling**  
**APPLICATION WITHDRAWN**  
**PH 12/9/13**  
**PH 01/13/14**  
**MAD 03/19/14**
  
3. **Site Plan Application**  
**Cheshire Route 10 LLC**  
**1953, 1973, 1989, 2037, and 2061 Highland Avenue**  
**Dickerman Road and I-691**  
**Final Development Plan for the Outlets at Cheshire**  
**I-C S.D.D. and Interchange Special Development**  
**Project.**  
**MAD 02/24/14**

Attorney Anthony Fazzone represented the applicant, and he gave a brief review of the original presentation and the process for the site plan application pursuant to the special regulations which apply to an I-C.S.D.D. He said the applicant will show the final development plan which conforms to the preliminary approved plan of July 2013 with some modifications of the overall layout. This plan included doing the project in phases. Phase #1 will be the commercial/retail district (near the Ten Mile River) and Mr. Fazzone pointed out this area on the displayed site plan.

At the last meeting, Mr. Fazzone noted that Darin Overton P.E. reviewed the site plan details. The final plan of development is essentially the same as the preliminary plan of development. The final plan is in greater detail with no “significant” changes to what was approved by the Commission. Section 49.B.9.1 (c) lays out the role of the Commission to determine whether or not this subsection applies to what was previously approved.

Mr. Fazzone advised that the applicant has brought the architect to this meeting to review the architectural details of the project.

Ross Adams, Architect, Adams & Associates, North Carolina, informed the Commission that he has visited Cheshire over the last few years of this application, and has met with Town Planner Voelker. At this time, Mr. Adams is pleased to deliver a center with local vernacular, is a more timeless project, and the center stays modern looking.

Four exterior views were displayed by Mr. Adams, who explained details of each view to the Commission.

View #1 – shows the gateway at the main entrance/circle, with vehicular and pedestrian entrance. The roof line moves up and down; a key feature of the center is color and materials – stone, brick at lower levels, clapboard siding and trim at higher levels; more detail and color have been added, with moving roof line elevations; doors are functional as way finder areas and for certain tenants. The Cheshire outlet center is a single story design, but will have a story and a half elevation to give height and interest.

Over the years there has been refinement of the shopping center outlet developments, and Mr. Adams noted that people come to the center as a destination.

View #2 – shows the site view from the north looking south to the center vehicular boulevard; there are features with landscaping; and the landscaping and design work will celebrate Cheshire as the Bedding Capital of the World. This will be combined with pedestrian activities, soft seating, benches, outdoor dining. The entrance will pull people away from the parking lot into the center, and will encourage pedestrian activity. Everywhere you walk there is a feature pulling people to the next node of the center.

View #4 – shows the southeast corner, power features, tenant signage, open area, covered roofs; each tenant store will be about 4,000 sq. ft.

Layout Plan – shows the walkways, tenant stores, pedestrian areas, RT 10 elevation, multiple plazas; there will be some minor adjustment of some of the interior features based on the location of the outlet stores. Ten Mile River is part of the development with walking to the area of the river (view #2) over the two bridges and Great Fall. The culvert repair is part of the improvements.

Lou Masiello, W.S. Development, explained that the buildings in the first phase are all commercial/retail buildings, and there are more site improvements with this phase of the project. The first phase will have many amenities, repair of the culvert, two crossings over the river, a vehicular bridge and the Great Fill, and over the by pass channel will be a 2<sup>nd</sup> pedestrian bridge. The roadway out to Dickerman Road will have improvements in the first phase, along with habitat renovation, and storm water improvements.

A question was raised by Ms. Marinaro about the circle with the flag being inside the planting area, inside the rotary, and she asked if this was visible from RT 10.

Mr. Masciello said view #3 is from RT 10, seeing the façade of the buildings. The circle would be visible from RT 10, and there are buffers along RT 10.

The issue of the sign was raised by Mr. Dawson who asked if it would be inside the circle.

There are a total of 4 signs proposed, and Mr. Masiello 3 of the signs will be on the commercial property, with one large sign along I-691 to identify the center from RT 10. The signs have two different heights – on RT 10 (2 signs) 35 feet high; I-691 sign is 55 feet high; and the landscaped circle there is no sign proposed. The I-691 sign will be about 15 feet wide, and the images of the signs are on the elevation sheets in the packets. Locations of the signs have been noted on the site plan.

Mr. Dawson asked about the properties acquired by W.S. Development.

Mr. Masiello stated there are two properties with two different owners. One lot is about 3 acres with 2 houses at the northern edge of the RT 10 frontage; and one is more

central to the frontage. The landscaped frontage and parking fields on the RT 10 approach are part of these properties,.

With regard to incorporation of Cheshire vernacular into this project, Ms. Campo said the plans remind her of other outlet centers. She asked what is saying Cheshire or New England.

According to Mr. Masiello the materials chosen are important. Roof material is shingle style, gables dispersed throughout the center; extensive use of clapboard which his not a traditional construction material for an outlet center; Tuscan feel, with smooth masonry product throughout the construction; gabled structures and interspersing them in unique and discreet locations.

Ms. Campo said she recalls a two story building with more elevation changes in the original proposal.

In reply, Mr. Masiello said there was a structure, a theater with parking, which was planned to be a two story building and elevation changes. However, the predominant design was always one story/level.

On view #1, Ms. Campo questioned the roof elevation changes, and said it was not what she envisioned. She expected more elevation changes and sight interest.

Stating he was pleased with the design presented by Mr. Adams, the architect.

Mr. Adams commented on view #1 as being a small piece of the overall plan. He pointed out the single store on the plan, with a wall having a different treatment and color, and going through the area you see 12+ elevation changes etc. with stores and entrances.

Ms. Campo asked about features to draw people into the site, such as water fountains, flower beds, etc.

Mr. Adams said there will be features belonging to particular key stores...with 6 to 10 "must shop" stores in the center and other smaller stores, outdoor dining areas, benches, the river and nature areas.

The construction materials were questioned by Mr. Linder who said a pharmacy in Cheshire has two sites, and one is painted beige. He has noticed this pharmacy has different levels of construction quality with the one in Cheshire of lesser quality than the one in Enfield. He asked how this shopping center compares to others that have been built...medium, high or low quality.

Ms. Marinaro explained that pharmacies have a standard used all the time, and Cheshire got some additional amenities for the pharmacy built in Town, but the standard used is for consistency.

For this outlet center, Mr. Adams said they are using very durable, long life cycle materials of top quality. The center will not be granite or imported Italian stone construction.

Mr. Masiello stated that Mr. Adams and his architectural firm have worked for shopping outlet centers for W.S. Development and other developers throughout the country. W.S. does life style shopping center development with a high level of quality, finish, materials. From a cost perspective, the Cheshire development is on the higher end of the cost range from a construction standpoint in the buildings, and more significantly in the common areas. Public walkways and property features, outside of the buildings, are much higher from cost perspective and quality. There is more land area to be built out as plazas, seating areas, sidewalks, etc.

The legal commitment from the rendering was raised by Mr. Linder who asked about design changes being made without Commission knowledge, i.e. painting all buildings red.

Mr. Masiello noted that the presentation focused on the perspectives, with elevations included, black and white drawings. W. S. does not have the right to unilaterally make changes to design submitted after the fact. He pointed out on the plans a sign that says "tenant"...which will have the store names when the properties are leased. It is not expected W.S. must come back to the Commission for these changes. Changing a color to red is a significant design change, and would require further review. There could be some levels of change which do not require formal review.

With regard to W.S. plans for the community, Ms. Visconti asked if something like a skating rink or community room is planned for the project. She is pleased about the Ten Mile River plans for the project.

Mr. Masiello stated that in some of W.S. centers there are temporary skating rinks put up for public enjoyment, but there are no permanent rinks. A community room is not in the plans for the center. Mr. Masiello informed the Commission that there are things done at a center such as performances, holiday caroling events, and community groups/events have been housed in center offices and in public spaces.

Stating she likes the circle entrance, (views 1 and 3) Ms. Marinaro asked about RT 10 with parking lots, snow, ice, etc.

Mr. Masiello pointed out that view #3 is the best representation from RT 10, and along RT 10 there is significant berm which will have heavy plantings. So, in the winter there will not be a sea of asphalt seen from RT 10.

Christopher Weston, P.E. stated there were two outstanding issues. First, was the review of the storm water management portion, and he advised that everything has been answered satisfactorily by Milone and MacBroom. The answer was also good

with more detail on the construction of the retaining wall, which will be detailed at the time of construction. When the wall was designed it took into account some key elements, and Mr. Weston will review these drawings. Second issue was recharge of the storm water under the parking lots, and there are areas where testing cannot be done due to being lower than ground surface. When the site is constructed, soil samples will be taken and tested, with review of results to insure they are in line with the drainage.

With the extensive filling to be done Mr. Dawson asked where the parking lots will end up.

Darin Overton, P.E. Milone and MacBroom, noted the rendering does not have grades on it, but starting from RT 10, there is a rise and a drop down towards the river. He looked at a balance for the operation; a lot of material is being taken off site; and pad heights for the buildings has been set where there is a balance. There is a cut; it could be to 20 feet cut; the retaining wall along the river could be 20 foot fill; and cuts and fills vary throughout the site. The parking lots will have gentle grade of 2% to 4% towards the retaining walls; in the back parking lots will slope away from the building pads. Grades are balanced; cuts and fills are minimized; handicapped parking accessibility is at 2% which is code.

Attorney Fazzone pointed out the prior issue with the storm water running off the facilities within the system to remove pollutants to keep them from going into the river. The 2013 plans include all the same facilities and devices to remove pollutants. The current plan and final design plan address the environmental issues as in the previous portions of the application.

Mr. Fazzone noted there is a letter on file from the Traffic Engineer, Mr. Burbaris.

Jim Burbaris, Traffic Engineer, stated he reviewed the traffic study prepared for the development, and noted the prior development was to be larger than what is now proposed. The applicant did not remove all the improvements proposed, and the traffic generation was on the high side as were background volumes. The State of Connecticut wants the developer to keep the higher volumes. Mr. Burbaris stated that the traffic study is a very conservative analysis; methodology was right on – the way it should be done; off site improvements are on the money (i.e. Dickerman Road); and ramps off RT 10 will have appropriate configuration. The application is before the State Office of Traffic Administration at this time. The site is near I-691; all the data submitted is correct; and there is a high degree of evidence showing the project will work well.

Mr. Burbaris said he would have shown more traffic coming from the south, but this evaluation would not have made much difference in the study. What is being done to accommodate RT 10 traffic is more than needs to be done. Dickerman Road will be improved. With more major traffic generation, he said the State looks at everything, and contacts municipalities with concerns and review of proposed improvements.

Mr. Dawson commented on the material for the sidewalks, colors of store fronts, entrance way, improvements such as a big clock, more traffic when the homes are built...and he said he hopes the project works well.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CONTINUED TO FEBRUARY 28, 2014.

Attorney Fazzone stated there was a letter regarding the archway and Great Fill submitted to the Commission, and everything in the letter is being addressed by the applicant. If the writer, Mr. DeLuca, can provide more information about the site, it would be welcomed.

Ms. Campo suggested there be a rendering for the heritage spot and gazebo.

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>4. Special Permit Application</b><br><b><u>David G. Blakesle/Doreen Blakeslee</u></b><br><b>350 Fenn Road</b><br><b>In-Law apartment</b><br><b>Section 30, Sch. A. Para #5.</b><br><b>POSTPONED UNTIL MARCH 10, 2014</b> | <b>PH 2/10/14</b><br><b>MAD 4/16/14</b> |
| <b>5. Special Permit Application</b><br><b><u>Janice Jentzen</u></b><br><b>384 Hayledge Court</b><br><b>In-law apartment</b><br><b>Section 30, Sch. A. Para #5.</b>   | <b>PH 2/10/14</b><br><b>MAD 4/16/14</b> |

MOTION by Mr. Dawson; seconded by Ms. Marinaro

MOVED that the Planning and Zoning Commission approve the special permit application of Janice Jentzen for an in-law apartment, property located at 384 Hayledge Court, as generally shown on Assessor's Map No. 72, Lot No. 122, in an R-40 zone.

With the following stipulations:

1. This approval shall expire on February 10, 2019.
2. The applicant may request an extension of the permit by providing the Commission with a notarized statement verifying that the use of the in-law apartment complies with the regulations.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>6. Earth Removal, Filling or Regrading Permit</b><br><b><u>Krista Ostuno</u></b><br><b>Sindall Road</b><br><b>POSTPONED TO FEBRUARY 24, 2014.</b> | <b>PH 2/10/14</b><br><b>MAD 4/16/14</b> |
|--|---|

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Zone Text Change Amendment**  
**Town of Cheshire**  
**To amend Section 23, Definitions**  
**Add: Recreation Active and Recreation,**  
**Passive**  
**To amend Section 30 Schedule A, Permitted**  
**Uses, Item 29A**  
**To amend and add to Section 32, Schedule B,**  
**Item 7.**  
**SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2014**
  
2. **Special Permit Application**  
**William C. Sherman**  
**10 Willowbrook Drive**  
**In-Home Professional Business Office**  
**Section 30, Sch. A. #18B**  
**SET FOR PUBLIC HEARING ON FEBRUARY 24, 2014**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Ms. Campo; seconded by Mr. Kardaras.

MOVED to adjourn the special meeting at 9:00 p.m.

VOTE           The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

---

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk