

# MINUTES

## WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING

WATERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY CENTER  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 2, 2008 - 7:30 P.M.

**PRESENT:** Jeff Franson  
Carl Mancini  
Gary Martin  
Michael Masayda, Secretary  
David Minnich, Chairman  
Ron Russ  
Judy Wick, Vice Chairman

**ABSENT:** None

**ALTERNATES PRESENT:** Ken Demirs  
Duane George  
Ray Rondeau

**ALTERNATES ABSENT:** None

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Chuck Berger, Town Engineer  
Ruth Mulcahy, Zoning Enforcement Officer

**1. Call Meeting To Order**

Mr. Minnich, Chairman, Called the Special Meeting to Order at about 9:05 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Ms. Allen, Clerk, executed the Roll Call.

**3. Public Participation**

None

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 2**

**4. Communication and Bills**

- A. New Urban News, September, 2007
- B. New Urban News, November, 2007
- C. New Urban News, December, 2007
- D. State of Connecticut Letter dated December 6, 2007, Re: Petition No. 834 Watertown Renewable Power
- E. State of Connecticut Letter dated December 7, 2007, Re: Connecticut Siting Council Energy/Telecommunications Meeting

**Mr. Minnich:** Is there any objection to placing those communications and bills on file? Hearing no objection, they're so ordered.

**5. Meeting Minutes**

- A. July 25, 2007 Subcommittee Meeting Plan of Conservation and Development.
- B. Regular Meeting, August 1, 2007.
- C. Continuation of Public Hearing, August 15, 2007, Proposed Affordable Housing Development to be known as Town View on north side of Echo Lake Road in an R-10F District.
- D. Continuation of Public Hearing, August 15, 2007, Proposed 50 lot subdivision of approximately 102 acres of land located at Lovley Drive, Kimberly Lane, and PondView Drive, Watertown, CT to be known as Highview Estates located in an R-30 and R-12.5 Residential Zoning District.
- E. Continuation of Public Hearing, August 15, 2007, Plan of Conservation and Development for the Town of Watertown.
- F. Special Meeting, August, 15, 2007.
- G. Regular Meeting, September 5, 2007.
- H. Public Hearing, Special Meeting, September 19, 2007, Text Amendment to the Zoning Regulations to Article I, Section 5.2, Definitions and Article I, Section 7.25 Wind Turbines.
- I. Special Meeting, September 19, 2007.
- J. October 3, 2007, Proposed Affordable Housing Development with 29 Condominium units to be known as Town View.
- K. October 3, 2007, Watertown Credit Union site Plan Modification for Removal of an Existing Building and Additional parking located at Woodruff Avenue.
- L. Regular Meeting, October 3, 2007.
- M. Public Hearing Special Meeting, October 17, 2007, an Amendment to Delete Section 83.65 titled Watertown Planning and Zoning Fire District Fees from the Watertown Zoning Regulations.
- N. Public Hearing Special Meeting, October 17, 2007 for Sandy Alves zone change from an I-80 to a BS.
- O. Public Hearing Special meeting October 17, 2007 for GT Holdings for a Site Plan Approval.
- P. Public Hearing, Special Meeting, October 17, 2007, for James P. Rizk for a Proposed Affordable Housing Development.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 3**

- Q. Special Meeting, October 25, 2007, Baillie Company for Site Plan Approval.
- R. Public Hearing, November 7, 2007, Special Permit #232 Site Plan and Special Permit Rev., James Lilley.
- S. Regular Meeting November 7, 2007.
- T. Motion Sheet, Special Meeting December 5, 2007.
- U. Motion Sheet, Continuation of Public Hearing, December 5, 2007, Special Permit Rev. James Lilley.
- V. Motion Sheet, Public Hearing, December 5, 2007, an application for an amendment to Article IV to add Section 42AS of the Zoning Regulations and zone change located on Route 262 to PCD Planned Commercial District.
- W. Motion Sheet, Public Hearing, December 5, 2007, Plan of Development.
- X. Motion Sheet, Regular Meeting, December 5, 2007.
- Y. Motion Sheet, Public Hearing, Special Meeting, December 19, 2007, Special Permit #236, Upper Nonnewaug Reserve for wildlife sanctuary.
- Z. Motion Sheet, Public Hearing, Special Meeting, December 19, 2007, Special Permit #237, Wind Turbine located at 60 Farm Circle, Watertown, CT.
- AA. Motion Sheet, Special Meeting, December 19, 2007.

**Mr. Minnich:** For purposes of unanimous consent, is there any objection to approving Items 5A and 5B?

**Ms. Wick:** There is a correction, in the Subcommittee Meeting, Frank Fish was referred to as Frank Witch. I think that should be corrected.

**Mr. Minnich:** For purposes of unanimous consent, with the correction on the July 25 2007 Subcommittee Meeting, Page 2 that the correction be made to refer to the gentleman as Frank Fish. Is there any objection to approving Items 5A and 5B with that correction? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Is there any objection, for purposes of unanimous consent, for Tabling Items 5C through 5Q? Hearing no objection, it's so approved.

Is there any objection, for purposes of unanimous consent, for Approving the minutes for Items 5R and 5S? Hearing no objection, it's so approved.

Is there any objection, for purposes of unanimous consent, for Tabling Item 5T? Hearing no objection, it's so approved.

Is there any objection, for purposes of unanimous consent, for Approving Item 5U? Hearing no objection, it's so approved.

Is there any objection, for purposes of unanimous consent, for Tabling Items 5V through 5AA? Hearing no objection, it's so approved.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 4**

**6. Staff Report**

**Ms. Mulcahy:** On the handout tonight you received a memo that was addressed to me just to keep everybody in the loop, this is about the Tamarack Renewable Power and this was the traffic impact study that was reviewed. The bottom line here, it goes through what the facility would generate, so this is from Chuck Berger so he can answer any questions, but just to let you know that I had received this from Chuck and that the study recommends a 4 way stop controlled intersection to be provided at the intersection of the site access and Echo Lake Road Extension so that everyone is aware of it. As you know this is not something that is going to be coming to the Planning and Zoning, this went to Inland/Wetlands because they wanted to determine whether there was an environmental impact for the siting council. The presentation, the gentleman came here and then they held that open house, but it will to be coming to Planning and Zoning for any review, so I just wanted to have people be aware.

**Mr. Masayda:** Why can't it be achieved, the site distance?

**Mr. Berger:** I believe it's significant grading off of their property.

**Mr. Masayda:** Roadside grading off the property?

**Mr. Berger:** Yes.

**Mr. Masayda:** Was there anything investigated whether they could work with the adjacent property owner to achieve the site distance? It's not typical that we provide a stop control at an intersection to a business off a Town road. To me it's, (inaudible) two intersecting roads than a driveway and a Town road.

**Ms. Wick:** Wouldn't it be a 3 way stop?

**Mr. Berger:** 4 lanes on all.

**Ms. Wick:** It's 3, right?

**Mr. Berger:** Yea, a full 3 way stop, maybe that's the correct words to use there.

**Mr. Russ:** I think that's something that the Police Commission should consider. That's not something that we normally consider, stop signs, it's a traffic issue.

**Mr. Masayda:** Where else in Town do you have a stop sign coming out of a business?

**Mr. Russ:** Never seen it.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 5**

**Mr. Masayda:** That's right, so why do we want to start? A lot of times other commissions take the recommendation from like engineering or other Town staff where I guess it was a recommendation by the consultant? I'm not sure, is our engineering going to endorse this stop control or are we going to try and achieve the site distance instead? I would prefer to try and achieve the site distance by other means than by trying to put a stop sign coming out of a business, for a business.

**Mr. Minnich:** I also concur with you, but the larger question, I understand the limited role that Planning and Zoning has, but I also, in talking with those individuals from Tamarack, I understand that they were coming to Planning and Zoning for the limited role that we had. This is the first time I'm hearing, and maybe you have newer information than I, but that you mentioned, if I heard you correctly, that they are not coming to Planning and Zoning. I understood that they were coming to Planning and Zoning.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Maybe you know something I don't know then.

**Mr. Minnich:** Given our limited role in this project. You don't know any more than what you said then?

**Ms. Mulcahy:** No, because when I investigated the process and spoke to Tamarack Energy back when we had them come to the Commission, the whole idea was we could file as an intervener, we had several ways to file to be part of the application, and then the Commission voted at that time, after they studied it, not to become part of the application. It was a specific process by which you became part of it through the siting council because this is a petitioning application, so at that point you had voted not to become a part of it, and from talking to the gentleman at Tamarack, he was very willing to come and give a presentation and he was very willing to come and answer questions, but he was following the procedure of the public hearing, the local public hearing and then going to petition to the siting council and the only thing on the local level that he had approved was the environmental impacts.

**Mr. Minnich:** Well my understanding, and I was involved in it to the extent as to whether this Commission wanted to be an intervener, and we came to the conclusion that we didn't, but my understanding always is and has been that they were required to hold a formal public hearing in (inaudible) town and you can make comment at that hearing with the siting council that will be in our community, not as a formal intervener, but just as a member of the public and we can do that as a Planning and Zoning Commission. My understanding also was to repeat what I said before, that they were also going to come to us to get our limited approval on this and quite frankly I had thought that one of these things was exactly where the topic we had discussed this evening was on site line and so forth, that was one of the things we were going to be involved with. I guess we need to confirm that because if that's not the case, then we need to make sure that we're taking a position as a commission when they hold a public hearing in our community, and it's the Commission's position if they're not planning on coming before the siting council. If they are planning on coming, I have every comfort level waiting until they come and ask them to take our comments into consideration.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 6**

**Ms. Wick:** But it should be before the siting council has adjourned because I think there should be, I think whatever we, if they do come, whatever we decide, the siting council should have that information.

**Mr. Minnich:** In any event, given what I'm now understanding, we'll put this back on the agenda for next meeting, and I looked just today on the calendar, not that the calendar of the siting council was up to date, but it did not have a date for the public hearing yet scheduled. That doesn't mean they won't put it on tomorrow, so we probably have time, but we'll follow through and confirm that and then decide to take our positions on this, and perhaps it may be a good thing to invite informally Tamarack to come back again which they said they would and they can speak more clearly on some of the issues that we have a concern with. I mean I didn't, I'm sure you didn't focus on such things as the traffic, I thought we were going to get to it later, and some other issues (inaudible).

**Mr. Martin:** There are a lot of issues, Dave. One of them which I had brought up and I'm actually organizing with at last 1, if not more people, to go up to their plant, their existing plant to view the smoke emission, the smell, what effect it's having. The thing that stick in my mind mostly is the view I had from the picture that they showed of the existing plant they have, and it's in the middle of nowhere.

**Mr. Minnich:** Up north, you mean?

**Mr. Martin:** Yes, it's up north and from the pictures I see, I don't see a single home within where it looks like it could be miles. Everybody is jumping and embracing this thing and I have a real concern with this thing that there is a lot of information that has to be gained and acquired about what this thing is before we bring this thing into our community. I don't know, I'm sorry I had a couple of phone calls to make so I didn't hear the beginning of your conversation, but have we lost some of our ability to ask the proper questions and to solicit information with what you were just talking about?

**Mr. Minnich:** Well that's what I'm not understanding now from what Ruth just said, and I believe what she said is probably correct, but I was told by them that they would come back to us. I know our role is limited, but if that's not the case, I'll put on the agenda next time and I'll talk with Ruth to come back and go through some of these issues we have with this site as we would normally review any site plan.

**Mr. Martin:** Could you clarify our role, though?

**Mr. Minnich:** Our roles is real limited.

**Mr. Martin:** As in what?

**Mr. Minnich:** As to whether it's going to occur or not, as to where it's going to go on the property, but we do have some input and some comments relating to what Mike has been talking about, a site line and traffic so we do have some . . . .

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 7**

**Mr. Martin:** So you're telling me this is a done deal, we can't do a thing about it?

**Mr. Franson:** To help address your concern specifically, the Department of Public Utility, on their web site you can see when they hold public hearings and I know as an individual you can go up and ask specific questions and ask for clarifications. My gut feeling is you have more rights doing that as an individual than we would try as a commission.

**Mr. Martin:** Yea, but that's like the chicken watching the hen house or the fox watching the hen house. I mean CL&P has . . . .

**Mr. Franson:** No, this is not CL&P, this is the Department of Public Utilities, the D.P.U.C. and they hold . . . .

**Mr. Martin:** I don't have much faith in that either.

**Mr. Franson:** But they will hold hearings in Watertown, the D.P.U.C. will . . . .

**Mr. Martin:** How did we get here already?

**Ms. Wick:** In a way it's like the cell towers. The Siting Council has ultimate authority, we don't have that ultimate authority.

**Mr. Minnich:** The Legislature took that away from us but if you Google Connecticut siting council, you'll get to their main web page. Under pending applications, Tamarack is docket #834. If you double click on #834, you will get many of the things that have been submitted to them already and the siting council does a real nice job, they've got the aerial views, they've got their application, they have letters from our Water & Sewer Department, etc., and there are probably at least 20 documents on there that you can access. They also have a schedule as to when their next meeting is on it and that is, as I mentioned before, that isn't there, so you can get a world of information. One needs to remember though at the public hearing that comes, I mean it is a public hearing and it's always best to be prepared before the public hearing in order to make an impact. If one is going to come to a public hearing and ask questions, well that's not going to be very effective, so anyway I think at our next meeting discuss this, where we want to be, ask them to come back, which they said they would, and talk about some of these issues that we have, and they've been cooperative with every Town agency before so I don't foresee this as a problem.

**Mr. Martin:** Every time I think of this thing, I think of a 95 degree, 80% humidity day, middle of Summer, and that thing is pumping up all that smoke. I don't know.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 8**

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Also on Town View Development, there was a petition submitted on letters from 3 people about the removal of the 30 inch oak tree and so there is a public hearing scheduled, or will be scheduled for the tree removal. I have been contacted by the Town View Attorney Dentz and he has asked possibility to come back before the Planning and Zoning Commission but he hasn't finalized that yet until he continues his work with the Department of Public Works.

Just to give you a brief update on a lot of other things:

- Heritage Development is coming in for their final map review, conditions and bonding and there is going to be another meeting on that.
- The Credit Union Mylar was reviewed, signed, and filed on the land records.
- Watertown Library final Mylar has been reviewed, signed, and filed on the land records.
- Blasé Subdivision final maps are here, we're waiting for legal documents and the final bond documents.
- Pelegano Subdivision, the final maps have been reviewed, but again, no legal documents and we're waiting for bonding estimates on that.
- Watertown Land Trust submitted a Mylar today for review.
- Waters of Winnemaug is in the review process. Again there are no legal documents.
- Highview Estates is in the final review process and there are documents.
- Town View is in a public hearing for the tree.

**Ms. Wick:** What was decided on the Peligano for the road, where are we for that? The road, driveway, abandoning, what?

**Ms. Mulcahy:** I'll let the lawyers duke that out with Public Works and everybody else.

**Mr. Berger:** We had a meeting Friday with the attorney for the applicant.

**Mr. Minnich:** We've taken a position on it so . . . .

**Ms. Wick:** We said it should be abandoned.

**Mr. Minnich:** Right, that's our position. I understand in talking with you today that you've been working on reviewing those, editing, or commenting and reading those zoning regulations that the Town Manager's Office was so gracious to get typed for us and as you recall last time when we received them, we had asked if anyone from our staff had reviewed them, obviously it's easy to skip a couple of lines when you type and we refer to them and you're in the process of doing that so I thank you, and I guess that will be done shortly. My last question was the status of Loretta. Where is she, what is her status?

**Ms. Allen:** I have not heard anything.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 9**

**Ms. Mulcahy:** I just asked Carol about that today because we got so far behind not knowing, not being informed as to her status, but right now Robin has taken over that for us, and Lynn is finishing up some, and Carol is finishing up some, and it looks like Robin will be our main person.

**Mr. Minnich:** I hope Loretta comes back, but we'll see where that goes. Anyone else have any questions? Hearing none, let's go on.

**7. Articles on the Agenda**

- A.     Applicant:                     Board of Education  
       Agent:                         Joe DiCarlo, Kaestle Boos  
       Re:                             Special Permit #233 for site plan modifications for  
  educational use.  
  Additions and Renovations to  
  Watertown High School  
       At:                             324 French Street, Watertown  
       Zone:                         R-12.5
  
- B.     Applicant:                     Board of Education  
       Agent:                         Joe DiCarlo, Kaestle Boos  
       Re:                             Special Permit #234 for site plan modifications for  
  educational use.  
  Additions and Renovations to  
  Judson Elementary School  
       At:                             124 Hamilton Lane, Watertown  
       Zone:                         R-30
  
- C.     Applicant:                     Board of Education  
       Agent:                         Joe DiCarlo, Kaestle Boos  
       Re:                             Special Permit #235 for site plan modifications for  
  educational use.  
  Additions and Renovations to  
  Polk School  
       At:                             435 Buckingham Street, Oakville  
       Zone:                         R-12.5

**Mr. Minnich:** A, B, and C, Board of Education, Permits #233, #234, and #235 relating to modifications of our schools. My understanding is you've made formal application for a review of this?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 10**

**Mr. DiCarlo:** That's correct and the formal application was submitted in December. We have followed up tonight with the documentation, 6 sets of plans and calculations, storm water quality analysis, traffic reports and catalog cuts of the lighting fixtures are all in this submission this evening, As part of this I thought I'd give you a brief overview of what the projects would entail, if that is acceptable.

This plan is a graphic representation that the end product that the Board of Education is hoping to achieve. This is the high school where it presently sits and this shaded area in the front is the major portion of the addition. The project would entail, essentially from a demolition point of view, removal of almost all of the existing pavement on the site; to the extent possible we are intending to crush and recycle the existing bituminous pavement and pave directly over it. This is particularly true in the rear portions of the parking area. This is French Street, this is the entrance road in, the entrance road will be widened to 3 lanes with a 3 foot wide, 6 inch high raised island, this will, according to the traffic study, alleviate some of the congestion of traffic, particularly exiting the site. Also, because we are now providing left and right turn lanes at the exit, the need or the warrant for a traffic light at that intersection.

The biggest changes will be again with the addition of the school going towards the front, if you can visualize the new front of the building is going to be out about where the island is in the bus loop now so we've had to move the bus loop slightly closer to the stadium, but we were also being able now to have a distinct bus loop and bus drop-off and a separate turn and a parent drop-off at this area with equal access to the main front entrance. The practice fields that are up here will be removed and that area will be used for expanded parking. This will give us parking all through here, and again we're going to reuse the parking back here and include an additional event or athletic parking at the lower end of the building, down where the abandoned tennis court is right now. The new addition is about 28,900 square feet. There is one other minor structure and that is the bus loop, because it's shifting over, is going to end up going right through the storage building that's out in the stadium right now so that will have to be reconstructed a little further in. As far as the athletic facilities go, let me back up a minute, there will be some removal of vegetation obviously, it's going to be a very selective removal, we want to retain as much as possible.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 11**

Part of the new improvements, which I'll explain in a little more detail, will be at the rear of the school where the open lawn area is now and we're going to try and improve the recreational facilities back there. To do that we will do some extensive filling which actually will cross over the property line onto Fire District land and we are in the process of seeking a grading easement onto their land so there will be some vegetation in this area. Initially we were looking at increasing the recreational facilities by trying to create athletic fields in the wooded area, rather steeply sloping wooded area, however our investigations have found with surveys and soil scientists that there are 2, and they look sort of cloudy, but there are 2 very large wetlands in this area, manmade wetlands, and the disturbance would be so great that we would end up having to go to D.E.P. and do a lot more expensive work, so that was decided that we would not enter into that area so there is no work, although there are wetlands on site, there is no work in any of the wetlands or in the upland review area.

The improvements are going to include as I said additional parking, approximately 70 additional cars over what we have now. Inside the existing track, a brand new synthetic turf surfaced field, rectangular field, soccer, football, hockey, lacrosse. Doing that then causes us to have to move certain field events, you can't throw things onto a synthetic turf field so discus and shot putt and javelin have to get relocated. The attempt is going to be to improve the athletic fields, and here as I mentioned, a full sized soccer field, a field hockey field, a new women's varsity softball field, and the relocated discus and javelin and shot putt will be located in this area. (Tape #3, Side A ended – may have missed some.) immediately adjacent to the school. As far as recreation goes, there will also be a bid alternate in the bidding process cause we're not sure of the budget just yet, that this field could possibly be a second synthetic turf field, we'll get a number from bidders so that there would be two, which would increase the recreational opportunities without constructing a new field since we will to be able to go down in this area.

The existing entrances in this area, and I know there is concern by residents in that area, are going to remain as they are. They will be gated and again we're told by the traffic people that by increasing the size of the road we would alleviate a lot of congestion, particularly exiting the site in that area so there will be no changes to that. The lighting complies with the Zoning Regulations, that is the site lighting will be on poles that are 25 foot high, below the 30 foot maximum, and there will be no other changes in lighting, the stadium lighting is going to stay as it is right now.

**Mr. Minnich:** Does anyone have any questions on this?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 12**

**Ms. Wick:** Well I recall when the lighting was approved for the football field, it was very specifically going to be limited. Now if you're throwing all that other stuff on that field, you're going to have those lights on a lot more than was originally approved with that lighting and I would like to go back to see exactly what the original approval was on that lighting because I remember very specifically, oh it's just going to be for Friday night football games and a few practices, so it's not going to be a problem, so that's one thing that I would like to find out about. The other thing is it looks like that parking that you're adding is taking away a lot of the places where Little League plays and all of that; what's going to happen to them?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** This area right now the activity there is going to have to relocate to these fields down there, that's the only other open space available at this point.

**Ms. Wick:** But it's going to be in competition then with other high school activities and things so I would think it would exacerbate the problem with recreational fields.

**Mr. Mancini:** That was the question I had because in other words there would be another (inaudible) field that (inaudible) Town Council. There is another proposed ball field down low, and now I'm hearing something new altogether about wetlands and the elimination of that field.

**Mr. Masayda:** That's the question I had, you talk about the expense of going to D.E.P., what is the expense of going to D.E.P. as trying to make those fields?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** There are two issues, one is going to D.E.P. is less of an expense than the physical construction of fields in this area. The change in grade from here to here is about 80 feet, so to put a flat field in there we were getting into retaining walls that were going 30 to 40 foot high to get a level spot. That was the expense part. The D.E.P. part is, they are based on recent submissions to D.E.P., first of all it will take 6 to 8 months to give you an approval which will significantly impact the project, we're kind of on a tight track here, and secondly because of the quantity of wetlands here, they have started getting into asking people who are going to disturb wetlands to replicate them somewhere on site and our own engineer had been one recently, they asked him to replicate 4 times the amount of wetlands they were removing. The problem is the wetlands here are about an acre in size, so we would have to come up with about 4 acres of wetlands on this site to replicate, which is impossible on this site, so the thought was then, the Board of Education said maybe we should avoid doing work in this area, and again they were the ones who said well how about if we increase the recreational opportunities by putting another synthetic field, and again the budget is such that we said well that will have to be an alternate.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 13**

**Mr. Masayda:** I don't know, maybe you should have discussions with D.E.P., but I don't think they, well they could require you to do a 4 to 1 ratio on loss of wetlands or creating new wetlands. I mean have you had any discussions with them relative to the proposal, if you could create anything, or is it just you've taken the assumption that you need to mitigate 4 to 1?

**Ms. Wick:** But usually when you mitigate you're destroying a natural wetlands, and a manmade wetland has to be larger to be able to accomplish the same thing. What you're saying here is that this wasn't a natural wetland to begin with, it was manmade, so it may not be the same situation. Has anybody been listening to the stuff they're saying, the questions that are being raised about some of these synthetic fields, and the chemicals and whatever that are in this?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Yes, at the present time the State Department of Health has said there is no reason for synthetic turf fields not to be built.

**Ms. Wick:** That's this week.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** My own personal experience, I believe as most others do, that (inaudible) increase in the amount of studies that are being done, but I can tell you that Europe has had these field for 30 years, and all of the most prestigious institutes in Europe have been researching this for many, many years beyond what has been done in the United States and they have found no significant impact from it, but again that doesn't mean there isn't or they haven't found something later, but at this point there is no regulation, rule, or guideline saying don't do it.

**Mr. Minnich:** On this field in the back, is this proposed to be lighted?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** No, at the present time these fields are natural grass, no lighting, they would be irrigated if they were built as natural grass fields.

**Mr. Minnich:** The referendum, that wording, and I haven't read it in awhile and perhaps you haven't read it at all cause you just get the project, but was it specific enough to allow another surface of that field? Again I think that's a question you won't be able to answer tonight.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Yea, I wouldn't be able to answer that and again the recommendation that came from the Board of Education to us.

**Mr. Minnich:** I'll look into that, I'm kind of curious as to that. I share my colleagues' view on the synthetic turf, that perhaps it's a good thing to have, but we all realize that there is a life cycle to that, and now we're essentially going to have 3 synthetic fields, 2 here that you're possibly talking 2 here, and 1 at Swift, all becoming aged at the same time and that's another topic. The height of the new addition at the high school, does that conform to our regulations?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 14**

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Yes, in the submission here, the last page is the elevations of the building and yes, they do conform to the present regulations.

**Mr. Minnich:** It's got the right grading around any of the . . . .

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Correct screening of any rooftop units as shown on those drawings also.

**Mr. Minnich:** And the parking is adequate for the size of the building or is that . . . .

**Mr. DiCarlo:** In our opinion, but of course your own regulations say that this Commission determines what is adequate for parking required for schools so we have submitted some square footage and room occupancy loads to the land use administrator for her calculations. There are presently about 309 spaces on the property and we're proposing at this point about 379 spaces.

**Mr. Minnich:** Ruth, can you help us when it comes time for this discussion later on to, I'd like to know how many, what the staffing is at the high school and what the present number of student parking is at the high school so I can get some feel as to the size of the adequacy of the parking.

**Mr. Martin:** What's the gross size of the building square footage-wise?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** It's increasing by 28,900 square feet.

**Mr. Martin:** Do you know what it is now?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Not without looking, it 's on the application form.

**Ms. Wick:** Generally speaking we don't see an increase in student population particularly. I mean this is more size to do more things, but you're not necessarily going to have more students. I don't think the student population in the high school has changed in years.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** And again the original application had from the ed spec, the increase that was proposed, and I'm just guessing here, I thought it was somewhere around 930 now and they were proposing about another 70 students projected to attend.

**Mr. Minnich:** Essentially the same number.

**Mr. Martin:** With all the construction going on in Town, that's all they're projecting?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 15**

**Ms. Wick:** Well the number of people who send their children to private school is way higher than it used to be and I'm thinking 20 years ago the high school class was 225, 250, and it hasn't really changed.

**Mr. Franson:** The only comment I would make is when you're taking into consideration the artificial turf, whenever there is graduation or theater or whatever, it's very difficult to park and I know the overflow currently goes onto the ball fields.

**Mr. Martin:** Can't do that on synthetic.

**Mr. Franson:** That's my point, Gary, is we need to, for every day, day to day students and faculty we'll probably be okay, but for the parent/teacher conferences, the plays that go on in the auditorium and all that stuff, I think we're going to need the natural turf in the back for the overflow parking and all that and if I remember correctly, when we were talking about the artificial turf at Swift and I think you suggested it, was bussing opportunities from here to bus them down to Swift, so now if we put too much artificial turf we've tied our hands with that opportunity of moving people, so if you could communicate back that I'm concerned that we're taking up too much of our reserved parking for the residents.

**Mr. Mancini:** I still have a concern about the losing of that lower field. The Board of Education, everyone, especially you guys knew the slope of the land back then, it was proposed to the Town Council that way, it was proposed to the people, it went out to a vote, they approved it thinking they were going to get another field. All of a sudden you're saying it's not going to be cost effective to put a field in there. I think we want, I want a field in there, I do.

**Unidentified Voice:** Just above the new parking lot, yea you're going to take the field out above there and you're going to put in new parking, right up in there?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Yes.

**Unidentified Voice:** I would propose to leave that as a field and instead of putting parking there, you may not have adequate, it might be too steep, but you could put terracing, and you could put parking down in that area (inaudible) field where it is.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** We didn't look at parking down there. Just from what I've heard here is it's kind of far away for anything. The problem is if you're on grade with stadium up here, by the time you get down here you're down 40 or 50 feet, the only way to get even level parking at a terrace are enormous retaining walls. We looked at it here, we looked at 2 fields here, we looked at putting a field in here, and again the grading went down on the Town's sewer line, where we're disturbing the wetlands, and there seemed to be a lot of issues that were going to cost quite a bit of money and take a lot of time.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 16**

**Unidentified Voice:** Did you consider the parking stretch?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** That was not considered. Actually someone out in the hallway said the same thing, they ought to start looking at a parking structure.

**Unidentified Voice:** I mean there's only so much land. It's like you're stealing from Peter to pay Paul.

**Unidentified Voice:** Parking garage, put the field back and put in a parking garage.

**Unidentified Voice:** I don't think it's a good idea to be taking away ball fields. I think, I understand the parking is necessary too, because if you have a couple of events, where are they going to park, but you have to decide at some point, you're trying to do too much with the space you have.

**Mr. Minnich:** If I may suggest to you, when we discuss this again at the public hearing, if you could make an effort to the Superintendent to invite some members of the Board of Education to help us understand how they came to their conclusion, I think that would be helpful. Also, I would hope, this is my suggestion, that there would be an invitation like we had with other subdivisions anyway, this isn't a subdivision, to inform the people on Tower Road about this project in terms of how the parking is, and if I also may suggest, which will probably take a little bit of time, an hour or so, is if you could put a narrative together on how the parking is going to be arranged as it relates to Tower Road, so that people can come to the office and we can give them what that couple of paragraphs is, I think that will take away lot of the frustrations when people come here at a public hearing and hear it for the first time, and before they come they're already ramped up to make their comments and this may very well calm some of that, I would hope, but anyway I would hope that a special effort would be made particularly for the Tower Road people who have for years quite frankly taken the brunt of this high school on their road and they need to understand, and quite frankly our purpose is to listen to them, and if we want to have a condition we can do that.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** So you know, the Board of Education has scheduled some public meetings, what they're calling neighborhood get together meetings for each school that we're proposing here so there is one scheduled for here within the next two weeks, I believe for the neighbors to be invited.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 17**

**Mr. Minnich:** But the important part to remember, as you know, we have some authority to apply conditions of approval to this site, so whereas this Board of Education no doubt will listen carefully to them and do what it is that they want them to do, another Board of Education can change their mind, but if we put a condition of approval on this project, it doesn't get changed, so there is more clout for the neighbors here than is with the current Board of Education, although they will obviously listen.

My last comment just now is I wanted at the public hearing to get some understanding of what the outside security lighting is going to be. I know there will be lights left on and I just needed to understand that in terms of the lighting impact to the residents what is going to be left on.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** There was a photometric plan of the lighting in here. There are also drawings showing the location of area lights, parking lot lights, walk lights, as well as the building lights that will be mounted on the building wall are in those sets of drawings.

**Mr. Minnich:** I hope you'll take that back to the Board and ask them to attend our meeting?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Most definitely.

**Mr. Martin:** Tennis courts where they are marked off now, isn't that going to be disruptive to the educational process that goes on during the day when classes are out there hitting tennis balls and there's people in the educational arena trying to teach?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** That's a possibility. I can tell you that the initial design had the tennis courts down here and the Board of Education asked for them to come up there for security reasons, that the tennis court that was down there now was vandalized because it was so remote and they wanted it as close to the building as we could so we're about 20 to 25 feet off the building with screened fences and wind screens.

**Ms. Wick:** Could I ask if you could just look at the possibility of creating some kind of parking down in that lower area, I don't know how many spaces are up in that field that are going to be taken away but . . .

**Mr. DiCarlo:** That's probably the bulk of the parking that we have right now is probably right here.

**Ms. Wick:** Even if we consider it kind of an overflow parking, it seems to me that that would be less expensive than to do it for parking than to try and create a field there and maybe that would enable us to save that other field up at the top.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 18**

**Mr. DiCarlo:** And certainly we can take that into consideration and look at it. And there are certain other issues that are going to come into play which is such that the State Board of Education will have handicapped accessibility requirements for anything that's down a slope, which came into play with the field too.

**Ms. Wick:** Even if there is other parking? I mean if you have handicapped parking you have to have handicapped parking on a less accessible?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** And we ganged it up here, but in my past experience with them is that they want to be able to see people be able to get to anywhere on the site and if you start getting too steep, we get into skateboard park ramps to get people down to the parking lot. We can certainly look at it. Even if it was a field down there, it would have to be accessible also.

**Ms. Wick:** The green space in the center of the building, is there anything planned to make that . . . .

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Yes there is, right now and I'm not the building architect, but apparently people moving from this side of the school to this side of the school tend to drift through the cafeteria while people are eating, so part of the additions and renovations, they're going to take about 8 feet out of the court yard now to create a corridor so that people don't have to cut through the cafeteria to get from one side to the other. The greenhouse that's in there and there's a shed in there will be removed and it will be completely re-graded and some new outdoor terraces here and art display garden over here.

**Ms. Wick:** Okay, cause it really looked disgraceful.

**Mr. Minnich:** All right, let's move on to the next one.

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Polk School is the next one. This is Buckingham Street and French Street. The building as it exists today is going to consist of a very small addition in this area to expand the cafeteria and resource center, I believe it's referred to. It's a 4,300 square foot addition. And again, there is a significant amount of changing inside the building which again as the site person I'm not that familiar with all the details. The one I know that impacts the site is at the present entrance when you come up, you have to step down about 3 stairs to get in the door under a canopy. That whole area of the building is going to be raised so that it's an on-grade entrance and that canopy will be closed in with brick and glass and doors so that you will have an on-grade entrance into the building at that point and again the changes in grade will be taken care of internally on the building. This one was an extreme challenge because the site is very tight, very steep, again we get into this equal access throughout the site challenges along with some other issues. The present attempt will be again to remove most of the pavement, but attempting to crush and recycle the pavement.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 19**

The area that you see the bus drop off now and the visitor parking will remain pretty much as they are now, again grind up the pavement and use it as a base for overlaying the pavement. A certain amount of overlay pavement will take place here, but what we're attempting to do is create a new parent drop-off in this area here to try and get people away from using French Street where I guess the traffic backs up pretty heavily. The school people have said that children arriving will now be directed into this new cafeteria area and media center area so therefore there will be more encouragement for parents to bring their kids here instead of trying to get them in the front door over here. The paved play areas which are used for overflow parking again will remain pretty much the same, again recycling the pavement and paving over them, some new play equipment and play structures. Presently the access for the bus here and use the same drive for people coming here, we're separating that and have been, this is a State highway and we've been to the State and they have no objections to what we are proposing at this point.

Again the alternate because of the budget, the athletic field at the top of the hill up here is going to remain as is under the base bid, but we will have an alternate to see pricing to have it redone, but simply upgraded, some under drainage put in and new sod, and baseball backstops and things like.

**Mr. Minnich:** No synthetic turf?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** No. That's pretty much it from a site perspective on Polk School.

**Ms. Wick:** Are there wetland issues here?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** There are no wetlands on site.

**Ms. Wick:** My understanding is there was some kind of an underground stream or drainage issues?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** Before the original buildings were built which was in 1953 to 1955 there was actually a stream that ran right through here, and I'm still not sure why someone built a school this way but they were built as 4 separate buildings, so there was a building here, a building here, a building here, and a building here, and in 1968 the Town undertook additions and renovations and obviously built what we have now by connecting them altogether. At the time that the buildings were built, connected together

Many people talking at once (inaudible).

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 20**

**Mr. DiCarlo:** They told me 68, the stream was intercepted on a large pipe that brings it around here, down here and out over here, and so that has been that way since 86. In addition part of the additions had under drainage. Prior to the very first building built here this was apparently a swampy area, so there are a lot of foundation drains. About 3 or 4 years ago a problem developed where water started backing up into the basement here, so we did some investigation, the Town did some investigation, Mr. Cavanaugh and The Drain Doctor came out and found that in fact there is a foundation drain that empties into a structure here that runs down, I'm assuming ultimately into the brook, that had collapsed, the pipe broke and it collapsed and the water started backing up. As it backed up it also silted up the structures so we removed all the silt and got the pipe flowing again but it is still a broken pipe, they ran a camera down it, so as part of this renovation that pipe will be restored so that the drainage will continue. At the present time it's dry.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Now isn't that the part you're going to Wetlands to determine whether or not you need a wetlands permit for that? It's dumping into a brook and they also redirected what was in the basement into this catch basin and now there's a, flow might be different and I don't know what they're putting at the end of it. It's an old pipe that was broken. The Wetlands Commission needs to say you don't need (inaudible).

**Ms. Wick:** If you're putting water into a brook, then you should (inaudible).

**Mr. DiCarlo:** But the water has been going into the brook, it was interrupted about 3 years ago.

**Mr. Martin:** It's not changed, it's what it was.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** It hasn't gone in since when?

**Mr. DiCarlo:** 3 years ago, 2004. (Tape #3, Side B ended – may have missed some.)

**Ms. Mulcahy:** It's piping a brook.

**Mr. Masayda:** But very little.

**Mr. DeCarlo:** You're not piping the brook, the brook is already piped.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** This isn't the purview of this Commission and so all they need to do is get a determination from Wetlands to say that they don't need a permit, and they're already on the agenda anyway for Judson.

**Mr. DeCarlo:** I mentioned both these other schools to them and they said they didn't feel, actually the enforcement officer said he didn't feel there was any . . . .

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 21**

**Ms. Mulcahy:** I asked him today and he said that you had not discussed this one with him or any changes so I said I just want to be clear about it before tonight's meeting.

**Mr. DeCarlo:** And I'll certainly get back to him.

**Mr. Minnich:** Anything else on Polk? Okay. Do you have one more?

**Mr. DeCarlo:** The final project is the renovations and improvements to Judson School. This is Hamilton Avenue and Hamilton Lane. On this site there are wetlands mapped by a soil scientist, they are in this area right here, this again cloudy area represents the upland review area also around the wetlands. As part of this project which is a 7,840 square foot addition to the existing building, we will be doing some maintenance repair of an existing parking lot right here which is already in the upland review area and again our intent is to grind the pavement and simply overlap the pavement, however because of the code upgrades to bring in some new utilities, we'll be bringing in a couple of utility lines also in this area again in the upland buffer zone so we have applied to the Conservation Commission. There is a site tour this Saturday at 10:00 a.m. to look at this area. The rest of the area is outside of the buffer zone.

The big issue at this school was parking, there is very limited parking right now. People are parking in the streets and on the tree belts and around the trees so we've increased the parking to a point of about 94 spaces right now. We're also proposing a separate bus loop at the new front entrance to the building and a separate parent drop-off over here. Again the staff and event parking, there will be new play equipment and security surveillance dry widened walk around the building now because no one can get in the back right now, renovation of the courtyard also. Once again the budget, part of the base bid will not touch the athletic fields at all, but if the budget allows we have an alternate for a natural grass restoration of it with some under drainage.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Are there currently now fields where there is parking?

**Mr. DeCarlo:** No.

**Mr. Rondeau:** Soccer fields or ball fields?

**Mr. DeCarlo:** No, they are all over here. This an open lawn with 1 or 2 trees in it. This is play equipment and a basketball court right now.

**Mr. Martin:** What's the existing parking you have at Judson now?

**Mr. DeCarlo:** They have this parking lot right here and then there is some visitor parking right here.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 22**

**Mr. Martin:** Do you know how many spaces they have? We're going to 96, right?

**Mr. DeCarlo:** 94 and I think it's something like 30 or 35 right now, I'm guessing.

**Mr. Minnich:** Any other questions? Is there a motion then to accept these applications for view and establish a public hearing at a date determined by the Chairman for application Special Permits #233, #234, and #235.

**MOTION:** (Mr. Martin, sec. Mr. Russ) to accept these applications for view and establish a public hearing at a date determined by the Chairman for application Special Permits #233, #234, and #235.

**Discussion:** **Ms. Wick:** I'd like to be sure that everybody, that staff has enough time to review this so that the public hearing time isn't set too soon. It looks to me like there is a lot to review.

**Mr. Minnich:** Yea, I understand with Kaestle Boos and Bob Porter and the Public Buildings Committee and Todd LoFrese have been working pretty hard together and applying quite a bit of pressure to Kaestle Boos to get this done. The school, but ultimately us as a Town, has some pressure to get this project reviewed because there is a deadline in February for the State cause they review this as well in order for this to be constructed in accordance with the scheduled, they have to get their reviews in by February so there are those kind of, otherwise the State won't guarantee that the project will be able to start on time and they have a lot of projects around the State so they scheduled Watertown's project, and if not done, it will have to fit into another slot.

**Mr. DeCarlo:** You would move down about another year, and with inflation at 6% and the project somewhere around \$60,000,000, the Town would lose a significant amount of money in reimbursement.

**Mr. Minnich:** Staff will certainly work with you, however they want to, however is necessary. I certainly thank you, I know you've accommodated staff quite a bit in terms of coming to them and being very open about this process and I thank you very much for that.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** I just wanted to let Gary know that on the application form for Judson it says there are existing 53 spaces and proposed 98.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 23**

**Mr. DeCarlo:** Initially we failed to stop lines of cars at 12 so we had to insert some islands in between the parking spaces.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

D. Applicant: Joseph Masi and Margaret Raymond  
Agent: Stuart Somers Company  
Re: 15 Lot Subdivision to be known as  
French Hill Estates  
At: French Street, Oakville  
Zone: R-12.5

**Mr. Minnich:** Is there a Motion to Table Item 7D?

Mr. Martin recused himself from this vote.

**Mr. Minnich:** Ray will you sit in for this vote?

MOTION: (Mr. Russ, sec. Mr. Mancini) to Table.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

E. Applicant: Garwin Hardisty  
Agent: Ron Wolff  
Re: 3 lot subdivision to be known as  
Cider Hill Subdivision  
At: Woodbury and Old Baird Road  
Zone:

**Mr. Minnich:** Gary is back. Is there a Motion to Table Item 7E?

MOTION: (Mr. Mancini, sec. Mr. Russ) to Table.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 24**

G.     Applicant:                     Koster Keunen  
       Agent:                         Emily Jones, Civil One  
       Re:                             Addition to building  
       At:                             1021 Echo Lake Road, Watertown  
       Zone:                         IR-200

**Mr. Minnich:** We have a letter of withdrawal. Is there a motion to accept the withdrawal of this application?

MOTION:     (Mr. Russ, sec. Mr. Martin) accept the withdrawal of this application.

Discussion:   **Ms. Wick:** Is there a request to waive the fee for resubmission?

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Yes.

**Ms. Wick:** I would add to that motion that if the application is submitted within a year, the new resubmit fee be waived.

**Mr. Minnich:** Is that acceptable to the maker of the motion?

**Mr. Russ:** So moved.

**Mr. Martin:** Second.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

H.     Applicant:                     Lorenson Enterprises  
       Agent:                         Ted Hart, Milone & MacBroom  
       Re:                             Site Plan Modification for exterior lighting  
       At:                             816 Straits Turnpike, Watertown  
       Zone:                         B-SC

**Mr. Minnich:** Ted, is this a formal review or ?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 25**

**Ted Hart, Professional Engineer, Milone & MacBroom**

**Mr. Hart:** Yes. I'm here on behalf of Sorensen Enterprises for the Honda of Watertown project. It received site plan approval for additions back in July of 2006 and it was an addition that they are working on now, you may have seen it, to expand the service area. As part of the condition of approval, there were some conditions set on the outdoor lighting and there's been changes to the lighting regulations we will also be talking about. We had to put in full cutoff light fixtures and the lighting was to be no more foot candles than what exists out there today. The first thing we did was we went out and took some measurements of the existing foot candles. I believe staff has seen this but I will hand out a copy to everyone. The original lighting plan was put in probably back in the 70's when Honda sold one car, the Civic. It was before Honda really took off and basically it's a somewhat antiquated lighting system. There are large lights on 35 foot high poles, the lights are tilted up to basically shine out and broadcast the light over the entire site. As you can see on the upper, this would be the upper corner in front of the building, there 's one light reading of 17 and 13.9 and then as you go down the site there are some fairly significant lighting right in front of the building, you see 14.9 foot candles, 7.5, 6.4, there's no lighting in the southern corner, there's no lighting along the southern portion of the building, so we would like to update the lighting for this facility. We've put together a plan and I will talk about that in just a minute.

First I'd like to go back, when they originally started the plans for updating the facility, let me just hand these out, Honda America put together a design program for this facility and many of their others to basically have them somewhat similar. I believe on Page 6 of the plan they talk about lighting (a) is dark surrounding areas where they're recommending 30 foot candles, average maintained minimum with maximum ratio 4:1 at a distance of 30 feet from the pole and then (b) for light surrounding areas they are recommending 60 foot candles, average maintain within a minimum maximum ratio of 4:1 at a distance of 30 feet from the poles so that is what Honda was recommending or lighting the facility. We did another, the last dealership that we worked on was an Audi dealership down in New London where they had a plan for 50 foot candles for there maximum lighting. Now the lighting regulation that's been put together, the outdoor lighting regulations, specifically appendix A14 talks about the level of activity for an automobile dealership is high and then you go back to the high activity . . . .

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Ted, just to let everyone know, we handed out that tonight, yes, the appendix and the outdoor lighting, it was in with the withdrawal letter, the little packets that everybody got tonight so that you can follow along with what he is referring to.

**Mr. Hart:** I'm assuming this has been adopted, this has . . . .

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Yes, that was adopted by the Commission with the appendix.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 26**

**Mr. Hart:** This is the outdoor lighting regulation and I'm looking specifically at the table appendix A14 for parking lot levels of activity, you see down on the left hand side, high, medium, and low, and this would be considered a high activity as specified on the next page for automobile dealerships. One thing that is important to note here is if you look down at the note at the bottom of the page, it says this recommendation is based on the requirement to maintain to security any time in the areas where there is low level of night time activity. I believe this is from the Illumination Engineering Society of North America and it's basically of parking lot lighting for security purposes so when we look at the average for general parking and pedestrian, it says 3.6 foot candles average with a minimum of .9 and a uniformity ratio of 4:1. This doesn't specifically specify a maximum light intensity in foot candles. I mean it does when you start working out averages and minimum and the uniformity ratio it does get at your maximum, but if you increase the size of your site and you have a half a foot candle over say 2 acres, you could probably get a light intensity of 50 or 100 along your frontage with Straits Turnpike. When I first started working on the lighting program I had the beginning of the regulations but I didn't have the appendix so I didn't have these tables and I wasn't sure about all these requirements in this table, but I talked to the lighting representative that I'm working with on the lighting and he said that we have a light intensity of 3.4 foot candles but we don't meet the uniformity requirement because we have basically some areas, they are 0.1, .2 so we have some very low intensity lighting in the background and when you couple that with the average, you're going to be up 100 or something like that for the uniformity ratio. What the average, the minimum and the uniformity ratio are really for are for parking lot for security reasons, where you want to have a secure parking lot when you're coming out of a ball game or coming out of a Stop & Shop or something like that. This is a little bit different since there is car storage in the back that they're not looking to have brightly lit and where in the front it's just the opposite, you want to have, basically it's an outdoor showroom for the new cars along Straits Turnpike, so Honda would like to have 30 foot candles along the frontage, at a minimum, they would probably like to have more if they could get it so I guess the question is there isn't a specified maximum light intensity in foot candles, so I'm not sure exactly what we should be designing for for the front of this site, and I guess I'd like to ask that question of the Commission since this is based on, the regulations is based on averages, the minimum and the uniformity ratio.

**Mr. Minnich:** If I recall our real concern when we did this was making sure that the light stayed on the property and also making sure that the lights were going downward and not upward into the sky. I don't recall having a conversation about the maximum lighting that was available and I guess in terms of what could be there, I just assumed that it would be done practically and why would one want to spend a lot of money is illuminating a piece of property because that's obviously money going out the door and away from the profit margin.

**Ms. Wick:** We did say maximum because it said no more than what was there.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 27**

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Right, you had a maximum on the conditions of approval.

**Mr. Minnich:** But not at a specific area of the property.

**Ms. Wick:** That's right. They can take what's there and move it around any way they want.

**Mr. Minnich:** Exactly.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** And those were some of the options that I discussed with Ted earlier today, that he could take those and go with the existing condition, he could apply for a variance to the current regulations because he can't meet the regulations, and again this is not something the Commission gave themselves the ability to waive on, so right now the current plan that he has doesn't meet your new outdoor lighting regulations but he can go back to his original condition and rework the lighting plan to fit with, as Judy said, moving the intensities around so you come up with the same amount of lighting as you have there now.

**Ms. Wick:** Because the way I read this appendix, it says the following chart of maintained horizontal illuminants recommendations as set forth by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North American as amended shall be observed, so again that's a requirement that you have, that we have and so you would need a variance if you were not going to observe what is required here. It seems to me that your better option might be to stick with what you've got and rework with.

**Mr. Hart:** Just one other thing that I want to bring up and see what the Commission's interpretation of this, under (B) of the regulations 6.1.4, it says to maintain horizontal illuminants recommendations set by the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America . . . .

**Mr. Minnich:** Where are you reading from?

**Mr. Hart:** I think it's #1, section B, General Requirements. Page 2. It shall be observed, see appendix A14, unless approved by 4 concurring votes of the Commission. So I believe the Commission has the ability to modify or approve something that is different than is in what A14?

**Mr. Minnich:** I agree that's what we did, I agree with that, yes.

**Mr. hart:** I wasn't sure if that was what it was.

**Unidentified Voice:** That addresses horizontal illuminants.

**Ms. Wick:** It doesn't address the amount of lights.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 28**

**Mr. Hart:** Well that's what this is, if you look on appendix A14, on the right hand side of the chart it says IES, maintain horizontal illuminants recommendations and foot candles, and one of the other things I found in looking at the IES regulations or recommendations, these are minimum recommendations for security purposes so when they're recommending what the foot candles should be for a parking lot, they're not saying you can't have a brighter, more secure parking lot, they are basically saying these are minimums that we are recommending.

**Ms. Wick:** Do you understand that if you come in under these regulations that your poles, that you have to meet all of these requirements of these regulations, you can't just pick and choose? In other words the way I understand it, you have the option to go along with your approval and not have your lighting any greater than the lighting that was there, even though you could move it around, or if you go to come in under this, you must meet all the requirements of these regulations. If you have 35 foot poles they have to be reduced to 30 foot poles. So I just want you to be clear that you've got it this way or this way, it's not a smorgasbord.

**Mr. Hart:** We have reduced the height of all the poles; we're looking at 20 foot poles on this plan and the maximum of 25.6 foot candles is what we proposed. We didn't go to the full 30 that was being recommended by Honda, we tried to reduce it. We also put in lights on the building, they're 16 feet high (inaudible). One thing that is shown on our plan is we do have some lights spilling at each corner, we will be putting house side shields on those to eliminate that, to cut it off. To see what the lighting is along the front property line, you can see we have a very sharp cutoff, there are about 6 foot candles right at the property line and about 20 feet over we're at about half a foot candle, so we put in all of the requirements that were intended as far as the cutoff and light spillage and glare from the lighting and we've reduced the height. Originally I thought we might just keep the same pole height and just put the full cutoff fixtures on but it's very expensive to change a light bulb or ballast at 35 feet high, they need more than just a regular cheery picker to get at it so they want to lower the light poles and provide a (inaudible) lighting plan for their site.

**Ms. Wick:** Am I correct in assuming, and I obviously haven't gone through this, that you are asking to modify that condition and to allow yourselves to come in under these new regulations to meet the requirements of these new regulations?

**Mr. Hart:** I guess what I'm saying is we do want to update the lighting plan, I don't believe we can meet all of the requirement as specified in this appendix A14 with a 3.6. I mean that is the way I read this regulations, a 3.6 average is really for just the parking lot, it's not for a dealership, outdoor show area of the cars.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 29**

**Mr. Minnich:** Well I view what you just said, my recollection is that when it comes to that table A14 that we have given ourselves the authority to take, on a case by case basis, what is appropriate there, that's the guideline for A14, but we've given ourselves some leeway and we had the discussion over this over a long period of time. I mean it was months in between but in the earlier stages when the former administrator was here, that was one of the conversations, I'm losing track of whether we had it at our meeting or whether I had it with her, was how were we going to have this uniformity of the lighting on a particular piece of property when it doesn't make sense, cause why would you need to have the same light intensity in the back of a property as you would have in the front of the property, on larger property, so I recall us putting this language in here in terms of the intensity of the lights and those things relate to table A14 with 4 votes of the Commission to take on a case by case basis on that so obviously that's what is written there too, so you are going to then be complying with the regulations that you don't necessarily need a variance, but the things that you are needing to have some consideration are already in the Commission's discretion. I'm asking this as a question, with the Commission's discretion under (B) 1.

**Mr. Hart:** I believe so. Yes. And I just want to add one more thing. I think I said this before, I had the regulation, and it referred to an appendix, it didn't say appendix A14 in the regulation I received probably a month and half to two months ago and I just received this appendix A14 this morning so I guess what I would like to ask for right now is to have a continuance and I would like to go back to my lighting expert, lighting representative that put this together and take another pass at it and see if we can get a little closer to the requirement here for the average, the minimum, and the uniformity ratio.

**Mr. Minnich:** And then you'll let us know what doesn't conform and then we, I read that we've given ourselves the authority to modify those . . . . the case may be. Okay. Any other questions? There is no public hearing necessary on this, correct, no one wants to have that, so is there a motion then to table this?

**MOTION:** (Mr. Russ, sec. Mr. Mancini) to Table.

**Discussion:** None

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**

(Tape #4, Side A ended – may have missed some.)

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 30**

- I.      Applicant:                      Echo Lake Brownfield, LLC  
          Agent:                            Ted Crawford, Milone & MacBroom  
          Re:                                    Site Plan Approval and Associated  
    Site Plans for the filling of land under Section  
    65 and Site Plan approval under Section 51  
    Of the Watertown Zoning Regulations  
  
          At:                                    22 acre parcel located in the eastern portion  
    Of Watertown on the north side of Echo Lake  
    Road, Watertown  
  
          Zone:                                IR-80

**Ted Crawford, Professional Engineer, Milone & MacBroom**

**Mr. Crawford:** To give you a brief overview of this project, it's a 22 acre parcel located on the north side of Echo Lake Road adjacent to the existing transfer station at the bottom of the hill. There is a car, I believe an auto storage area directly across the street as well. The site essentially slopes down from the roadway system to an existing wetland corridor that runs essentially west to east through the site towards this transfer station and that's represented in yellow here and then slopes back up very steeply again to the north toward the Mattatuck State Forest and the existing electric transmission lines that run through the property.

This project is proposing the remediation and cleanup of a portion of the site per a remediation action plan that has been put together by the applicant. This is Phase I of the site plan and it will disturb approximately 2.5 acres. As part of the plan we will be removing approximately 2,000 to 5,000 cubic yards of material from the site, the material varies from old tires to construction debris because previously this site had been approved as a landfill for those items. I do have some pictures that I'd like to give the Commission of that material that's on the site.

**Ms. Wick:** When was it approved for a landfill?

**Mr. Crawford:** I believe back in the 70's. I do have representatives from the applicant if they have any questions.

**Ms. Wick:** 1972?

**Unidentified Voice:** 1972.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 31**

**Mr. Crawford:** Those pictures represent construction materials and tires that are primarily in the Phase I of the area. The majority of the actual materials to be removed are located farther down into the site, more adjacent to the wetlands corridor, however as part of this first application we have maintained all of our activities greater than 100 feet away from the designated wetlands on the site in anticipation for pare, essentially a staging area to move further into the site. We will be removing the contaminated material and the debris on the site and then bringing in clean fill, about 30,000 cubic yards placed and compacted to support future development. This is in the IR-80 zone and the final goal would be to remediate the site further and then prepare essentially a padded area for industrial development to come when appropriate utilities are available, sewer and water we understand will be coming into this area at some time in the future.

This plan represents essentially the erosion control plan, as you can see all of our activities are again outside of the wetland area by more than 100 feet. We are circling the entire site with filter fence and hay bales as well as diversion berms at the toe of all the slopes and capturing all of that runoff and temporary sediment traps in 2 locations, down here, these basins have been oversized by twice the amount per the guidelines and the D.E.P. Erosion Control Manual.

There will also be a temporary scale house and scale on the site located here off of Echo Lake Road and access will be taken approximately in this location. Point of reference, that's about across the street from the existing driveway of that auto dealership on the south side of Echo Lake Road. This will be here to not only know what's going onto the site but what's coming off as well and those tickets can be provided to Town staff for review and confirmation of the material coming on and off the site.

We believe there are some comments we have to set up a meeting with Chuck Berger and Ruth on Monday to review additional comments and we'll be back before the Commission on the 16<sup>th</sup> but we wanted to see if the Commission had any comments at this time.

**Mr. Minnich:** Is this an informal application?

**Mr. Crawford:** This is a formal application?

**Mr. Mancini:** What do you consider clean fill? Is it a native soil from another area or is it concrete and asphalt that's been ground up and being brought it? This is kind of a sensitive item with this Town right now.

**Mike Mahan, Echo Lake Brownfield, LLC**

**Mr. Mahon:** All of the material will be free of asphalt, concrete, there won't be any material. It will be basically soils coming in from other sites and it will be free of debris and concrete, metal, free of all those.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 32**

**Mr. Franson:** You're going to remediate a number of cubic yards out and 30,000 or something being brought in. What's the elevation change now versus what it will end up to be when you're done with this project? Right now it's off the road, it's below the road.

**Mr. Crawford:** Essentially the highest grade change on the site will be 20 feet and that's only for the small area up where the scale will be, but the actual grade change from the road will essentially be tied in when we go down there will be some grade change from the central part of the location will be at roughly 490 and 500 and it will be up to 520 at the highest point here and it will slope down at 4:1, it's a very gentle slope. The maximum steepness the regulations for filling allowed is 3:1 so we've gone beyond that to provide a 4:1 slope going down there.

**Ms. Wick:** Going down in the back?

**Mr. Crawford:** Going down in the back and going down in the front to tie into our grades.

**Ms. Wick:** Creating a plateau?

**Mr. Crawford:** That's right.

**Mr. Martin:** Is this going to require clearing of all the trees that are there, that we're seeing on these pictures?

**Mr. Crawford:** Yes, they'll be removing the trees to remediate and to bring in the material. Just for an example, some of the material has been there so long the trees have actually grown through the tires on the site.

**Mr. Minnich:** What is your future intent for use of this property?

**Mr. Crawford:** Future intent would be to provide a level property that we could put some industrial buildings on. It will depend on how fast the utilities are available in that area and I know it's a shifting date of when they may be available but we would like to eventually develop it as an industrial parcel.

**Ms. Wick:** Is there any intent to combine this property or have it used by your neighbor to the north, which is CRRA?

**Mr. Crawford:** No, no intent.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 33**

**Mr. Minnich:** That is a relief to hear. So then would you be willing, my understanding and I have to look at this again, but my understanding is an IR zone landfill is not a permitted use but probably is a special use, we'll have to confirm that, assuming that's the case, and we'll confirm that, would you be as a condition of this application be willing to revoke what zoning approvals you have as a landfill for this property?

**Mr. Crawford:** So that it couldn't be used as a landfill?

**Mr. Minnich:** Well you'd have to come back, if you wanted to use it in the future as a landfill you'd have to come back to us and get whatever permitting is necessary but I don't believe it's a of right to have a landfill in an IR-80, I can confirm that, but assuming that my recollection is correct, then if you were to have a landfill you'd have to do it by another means so I guess the simple question here is would you be willing to revoke whatever approvals you've gotten through zoning to have that as a landfill cause you don't intend to use it as a landfill?

**Mr. Crawford:** We have no intent to use it as a landfill. Our intent is to, the landfill has an open permit with it right now and with an open permit there's the requirement to close the landfill in accordance with the D.E.P. guidance and our intent is to close the landfill which is going to require bringing in fill material and then developing the property as an industrial piece and ceasing operations as a landfill.

**Mr. Minnich:** I certainly support that and that would also, what my intent of all this is that would then make it harder for the property that you adjoin making that a landfill cause that's what they are in the business to do and if it's not a permitted landfill that makes another hurdle that one has to go through later on.

**Mr. Crawford:** Yea, it's mere coincidence that these two are side by side. We've had no discussions and no intent of . . . . .

**Mr. Minnich:** So you have no problems if we make that a condition to revoke whatever zoning approvals you've gotten for a landfill?

**Mr. Crawford:** No problem at all.

**Ms. Wick:** Are you removing soil as well?

**Mr. Crawford:** Yea, right now there's approximately anywhere from 2,000 to 5,000 cubic yards of PCB impacted soil on the site. That PCB soil has been delineated, some of it is leaching down gradient and into the wetlands; all of that will have to be removed and transported off site.

**Ms. Wick:** Who gets it?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 34**

**Mr. Crawford:** That will probably go to Model City or a site up in Canada called Stablex, one of those sites can accept that type of material.

**Mr. Minnich:** That's an expense?

**Mr. Crawford:** It's expensive, yes.

**Mr. Martin:** Who monitors the final approval that says everything is gone? Is that the State?

**Mr. Crawford:** Yea. The way this will happen is we will enter into an agreement with the State to close this site out at the time we purchase the property. With that there will be constant monitoring by the State of different thresholds that we have to meet and different milestones that we have to meet. The first milestone will be to file our plan that shows what we're going to remove, what we're going to bring in, what we're going to sample for, we will do the removal of the PCB impacted soil, the tires, any debris, metals will be separated, all of the debris, steel and stuff will be separated and shipped off site. The landfill portion of this site, it's not 22 acres of a landfill, probably 5 acres of it has been dumped on. All of that needs to be pulled back into what was originally permitted as a landfill. 22 acres wasn't originally permitted, so that will have to be brought back in and then covered. The sampling that we have to do will have to show that we've removed all of the contamination to a level that is below the remediation standards that the State establishes. At that point once all of the removal is done and the site is filled to the designed grade, we will put in monitoring wells and we'll monitor the groundwater for 3 years. At the conclusion of the successful groundwater monitoring we have to show clean results for 3 years. A licensed environmental professional that's licensed by the State of Connecticut will sign what's called a verification of the site, that it meets the remediation standards. That will be submitted to D.E.P, D.E.P will review it, and at that time if D.E.P. feels that they agree with the L.E.P. the D.E.P will issue a no further action letter. If they do not agree with the L.E.P. at that point, they will tell the L.E.P. that more work needs to be done. Typically you're so far along in the process, D.E.P. is not brought in right at the end to review it and sign off on it, they're brought along for the whole thing because we don't want to get to the point where they have a different idea than we had and we wanted to take 5 samples and they wanted to take 6, we don't wait until the 11<sup>th</sup> hour to determine that, and so the final verification of this site is 3 to 4 years down the road from the time we start this project.

**Mr. Minnich:** Did I hear earlier in your response to Gary that you're going to purchase this property?

**Mr. Crawford:** Yes.

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 35**

**Mr. Minnich:** So you're not the applicant, you don't own the land, so who is the applicant that owns the land that's before us?

**Mr. Crawford:** We are the applicant, the owner is Industrial Development Group.

**Mr. Minnich:** So it's their application that is before us, they're the owners?

**Mr. Crawford:** But we're the applicant.

**Ms. Wick:** You can give a letter of Agency. Have you given Ruth a letter of Agency or something?

**Mr. Crawford:** They signed the application, the owner signed as well as the applicant.

**Mr. Minnich:** I understand now. Anybody else have any questions?

**Ms. Wick:** I was looking, Dave, under the section 42, the IR-80 and IR-200 and I don't see landfill facilities at all.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Well these were updated in 93 so I don't think this, it's either pre-existing non-conforming . . . .

**Ms. Wick:** That's what I'm saying, so it would be non-conforming under any circumstance, right, but I'm wondering how is CRRA (inaudible)?

**Mr. Minnich:** I know, I guess that issue is behind us, that you don't have a comfort level, if whatever approvals (inaudible).

**Mr. Crawford:** Yea, we have no problems with waiving our right.

**Ms. Wick:** I wouldn't think you'd go through all of this and then turn it into a landfill.

**Mr. Crawford:** Yea, no.

**Mr. Martin:** It wouldn't make much sense, I'll tell you that.

**Mr. Minnich:** Unless you're going to not be able to sell the property and need to sell it to CRRA. That's my concern. Any other comments? Do we have enough for this meeting or do we do this at the next meeting, January 16<sup>th</sup>.

**Ms. Mulcahy:** Right, we're meeting on Monday.

**Mr. Minnich:** Okay. Anything else? Is there a Motion to Table?

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
JANUARY 2, 2008  
Page 36**

MOTION: (Mr. Mancini, sec. Mr. Russ) to Table.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

J. Applicant: Rock Aronheim  
Re: Sit down fast food restaurant  
At: Former Kia Buildings  
Straits Turnpike, Watertown  
Zone: B-SC

**Mr. Minnich:** They have sent a letter of withdrawal. Is there a motion to accept the withdrawal for Rock Aronheim?

MOTION: (Mr. Mancini, sec. Mr. Russ) to accept the withdrawal letter.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**8. Old Business**

None

**9. New Business**

None

**10. Chairman's Report**

**Mr. Minnich:** Ron, are you okay with Oak Drive or that issue we had last time?

**Mr. Russ:** No, I'm all set.

None

**WATERTOWN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**JANUARY 2, 2008**

**Page 37**

**11. Adjournment**

MOTION: (Mr. Mancini, sec. Mr. Russ) to Adjourn the Regular Meeting at 10:45 p.m.

Discussion: None

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Regular Meeting Adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David E Minnich, Chairman  
Planning and Zoning Commission

---

Lynn M. LaForme, Minutes Secretary