

**MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING HELD ON MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2014, AT 7:30 P.M. IN COUNCIL CHAMBERS, TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410**

Present

Earl Kurtz, Chairman; Lelah Campo, Secretary; Edward Gaudio, Gil Linder, Vincent Lentini, John Kardaras, Louis Todisco.

Absent: Sean Strollo, S. Woody Dawson

Alternates: Diane Visconti and Jon Fischer; Absent: Leslie Marinaro

Staff: William Voelker, Town Planner

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Kurtz called the public hearing to order at 7:31 p.m.

Mr. Kurtz read the fire safety announcement.

**II. ROLL CALL**

Ms. Campo called the roll.

**III. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM**

Following roll call a quorum was determined to be present.

**IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

**V. BUSINESS**

1. **Zone Text Change Amendment** PH 2/24/14  
**Town of Cheshire** PH 3/10/14  
**To amend Section 23, Definitions** PH 3/24/14  
**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.**  
**PUBLIC HEARING CONTINUED TO APRIL 14, 2014**
  
2. **Special Permit Application** PH 3/24/14  
**Core Development LLC** MAD 5/28/14  
**589 South Main Street**  
**13 Unit Planned Residential Infill Development**

Attorney Anthony Fazzone represented Core Development for an application for a planned residential infill development, property at 589 South Main Street. The regulation which authorizes this application was adopted in July 2013, and this is the

first site proposed under the new regulation. The prior application before the Commission for this development was withdrawn to give the applicant time to address comments from residents and commission. An exhibit was submitted with the prior application, and was re-submitted with the subject application. The project, as proposed, meets the regulation requirements and rationale behind their adoption.

John Milone, P.E. Milone and MacBroom, stated the site is 1.3 acres in size, located on the northwest corner of South Main Street; is abutted on the north by existing office; on the south by Elmwood Drive and the funeral home; on the east by vacant land and Bartlem Park; and the west by a residential neighborhood. The R 20A zone allows, by special permit, certain uses such as professional offices, personal services, medical offices, etc. The site is flat with little grades. There is an existing home on the property that is used partially as both a residence and offices. The home was constructed in 1746, is generally historic, and the property has a small parking area and large mature trees.

During the prior application submission Mr. Milone noted there were concerns raised by the Commission and neighbors about the proposed access, traffic issues, size of the buildings being larger than desired, and sense that the development was larger than neighbors and the Commission expected.

The proposed site plan was displayed by Mr. Milone, which gives a realistic indication of the size of the structure and intensity of the development and relationship to the surrounding area.

Changes to the plan before the Commission include access to South Main Street changing the existing driveway saving the three large drives on the south side of the access drive. There are 3 buildings with 4 units in each building, and they are smaller than the original proposal. They are laid out in village style, with 13 attached garages without spaces behind the garages. There is a strong buffer to the west recognizing that this is a transition between Route 10 and residential uses, 15 feet of vegetation and 6 foot fence along the property line. A sidewalk is proposed along Elmwood Drive to South Main Street.

Residential lighting is proposed, traditional style, 14 feet high, no illumination at property line. The applicant will retain the benefits of the original plan with the historic house remaining, maintenance of existing trees along Route 10, extensive landscaping, details of cobblestone curb, driveway aprons, walks. The parking is for 31 vehicles, 2.5 per unit, 26 spaces are required; 13 garage spaces, and 18 additional surface spaces, about 1.5 per unit.

Landscaping – large trees and perimeter vegetation will be saved; extensive new trees around units; central courtyard for units not fronting on the streets; buffer vegetation on west side of the property. The landscaping has been modified based on recommendations of The Beautification Committee.

Utilities/Storm water Management Plan – there will be underground storage/infiltration; surface storage/infiltration; no increase in runoff; connection to sewers on Elmwood Drive; and public water from Elmwood Drive.

The base of the building along Elmwood Drive is 70 feet down; the original proposal was 150 feet.

The application has been reviewed by WPCA for feasibility, The Beautification Committee, Town Engineer, Fire and Police departments, RWA.

Commission comments and questions

Ms. Visconti commented on the driveway looking to be too close to Elmwood Drive.

Mr. Milone said this will be addressed during the traffic study presentation.

Mr. Todisco asked how the garage placement improves the buffer between this project and the neighborhood. He asked if there is lighting by the garage, and if the 14 foot lights will be by the garage.

It's a low, one story structure and Mr. Milone said there is no lighting in the back by the garage. He pointed out the lamp posts on the site, which are not by the garage.

Mr. Linder asked about the driveway and the trees, and if there was failure to protect these trees.

Mr. Milone pointed out the trees on the plans, and said the driveway was cut off a little to the north to save these trees.

Mark Forenza, Core Development, gave an overview of the architecture of the revised project. All comments and concerns have been reviewed over the past few months. He said that the townhouses were too large, and buildings on Elmwood were too high. The revised architecture of the buildings was developed and displayed for the Commission. The new architecture has 3 buildings with 4 townhouse units for a total of 12 units, and the 13<sup>th</sup> is the house which will require extensive renovation. The style is more colonial; front doors face Elmwood Drive; buildings are accessed from the front and the side. The plans show the typical elevation; the front elevation is similar to the rear elevation; there is a colonial feel to the buildings. The average size of each townhouse is 1400 sq.ft. compared to 1800 sq.ft. in the last application, and this is a 20% reduction in size. The height and length of the buildings has been revised and decreased with average height of a building facing Elmwood about 9 feet less. The units will have patios. The old building will be a one unit condo. The price per unit will be less than the original application, and some units will, possibly, have basements.

Traffic Engineer David Sullivan, Milone and MacBroom, stated that a study was done on October 16, 2013. The study report shows that the amount of traffic from the development will be small, ½ trip per unit during peak hours, and traffic operations in the

area will not be affected. There is very low traffic change. The findings of the traffic assessment are essentially the same as presented for the former application. The difference with the subject application is that the access will not be directly onto Route 10. After listening to comments, there was reevaluation and it is determined the traffic generated will be light and it will have little impact. Sight lines are good, and the same conditions will exist with the school opening and closing each day. We are looking at a status quo situation.

Mr. Milone stated this development is a low traffic generator. The traffic engineer has reported the access is safe, reasonable, and the new application is much more limited for the R20A zone. It is a perfect application for the site, is a good use of the property, is a more modest use, and the applicant worked hard to make it fit the site.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

(speakers 1 and 2 - comments/questions are inaudible on the tape)

Ken Smoil, 30 Elmwood Drive, sees improvements in the plans, changes were made, and his concerns relate to the dumpster location, pickup, and units not occupied by the owner. He said these units would not be taken care of properly.

Attorney Fazzone pointed out that at the last public hearing, people were adamant that the property not exit on Elmwood Drive, and the change was made to address this.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CONTINUED TO APRIL 14, 2014.

- 3. Special Permit Application**  
**Edward Williams**  
**1701 Highland Avenue Unit #3**  
**Health & Exercise Facility**  
**Section 30, Sch. A. Para. 37**

**PH 3/24/14**  
**MAD 5/28/14**

Edward Williams, applicant, presented his application for a health and exercise facility at 1701 Highland Avenue to provide physical therapy and exercise programs. He moved his family to Connecticut. There is sufficient parking on the site. Hours of operation are planned from 5:30 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Mr. Voelker stated this is a straight forward application. Comments from the Engineering Department dated 3/12/14 were read by Mr. Voelker.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

- 4. Special Permit Application**  
**WJH3, LLC Douglas H. Israel**  
**93 Main Street**  
**Redevelopment of a property from**

**PH 3/24/14**  
**MAD 5/28/14**

**Residential Use to a Commercial Office  
Use. Section 30, Sch. A. #49  
And Section 40**

Mr. Voelker explained that this application was approved in December 2007; the permit expired; and the owners are returning to again obtain permission to convert to professional offices.

Ryan McEvoy, P.E. Milone and MacBroom, stated this is a request for re-approval for a special permit granted in 2007 for conversion of a family home into a professional office. The property is zoned R20A, is served by public water and sewer. This property is located on Main Street, across from the Cheshire Library, with residential properties on the north and south sides, St. Peter's Cemetery to the rear. The site is about one half acre in size; topography is generally flat except for a small rise in elevation in the front; and there is a small gravel parking area to be eliminated. The applicant plans to construct a 16 space parking lot in the rear of the building, and this is shown on the plan. Concerns from neighbors cited in 2007 have been addressed. There is zero increase in storm water runoff.

Mr. Voelker read the December 21, 2007 letter (attached) into the record.

(comments/questions are inaudible on the tape)

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Mr. Lentini; seconded by Mr. Todisco

MOVED to adjourn the public hearing at 9:00 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

---

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk  
(transcribed from tapes)