

Town of Watertown  
The Planning and Zoning Commission  
Public Hearing  
Public Works Department/Indoor Recreational Facility  
September 3, 2008

Time: 7:00PM

Date: September 3, 2008

Place: **John Trumbull Primary School Library**

779 Buckingham Street

Oakville, CT

Minnich: I am calling this meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission to order.

Present: D. Minnich, R. Russ, M. Masayda, G. Martin, C. Mancini, J. Blais, K. Demirs

Absent: G. Dupliese, D. George, R. Rondeau

Others Present: Ruth Mulcahy, Land Use Administrator  
Chuck Berger, Town Engineer

K. Demirs sat in for G. Dupliese

R. Rondeau arrive at 7:20

J. Blais has returned to the meeting.

Minnich: Next item on the agenda is a Site plan/Special Permit #251 of the Town of Watertown Public Works Department for the construction of a 20,000 square foot indoor recreation facility located at Veteran's Memorial Park, Nova Scotia Park Road, Watertown in an R-90 Residence Zoning District.

**Chuck Berger – Town Engineer**

I am here on behalf of the Department of Public Works with me tonight is Lisa Carew, Director of the Recreation Department and you do have a packet. She will be assisting me with the presentation. Since is the first night of the public hearing, I will give a brief overview of the history of the project and I apologize it may be repetitive for some of you that have been at other meetings or at site walks with

us. But this notice said for indoor recreation facility reconstruction of a 100 by 200 foot metal building at Veterans Memorial Park. The history and overview of Veteran's Park it is located in an R-90 zoning district by special permit section 21.3.9 allows for buildings uses and facilities for the town, state and federal government and the fire district. The total parcel is little over 96 acres and it is has shown generally in the green outline on the master plan map that is on top of the easel that is over there. It is generally bounded by Nova Scotia Hill Road small portion of Jericho Road as well as Park Road. In the mid 1990's the park significantly developed in accordance with the master plan that is the base map up on the easel and that is essentially how the parcel exists today. The purple on the map is the interior road system, the blue is the pond, and the dotted blue is the inland and wetlands. In December and January of this past year a local business man offered the town of Watertown a 100 by 200 foot metal building that had been previously used for a horse riding stable and he was planning on dismantling it and storing it for the town for use as an indoor recreation facility. The staff met informally and discussed options for it and decided it was something that the staff would support and Veterans Park was the place for it to go. In January of 08 the metal building was offered to the town we came before this Commission in January or February in preliminary nature to talk about our plans and what the building consisted of and we talked a little bit about alternative locations within the park, whether it would be nearer to the pond in the north central part of the park or up near Park Road. We talked about the pros and cons of both locations and came to the agreement that the location within the park was a better location for park activities for a number of reasons. In February of 2008 the town council after listening to at least two different proposals approved the town applying for a state grant to assist with the reconstruction effort. By the end of February we have applied for that grant to assist us with the reconstruction of the building. We were successful obtaining that grant and began working on the project in late spring and early summer. One of the first things we did was we had a wetland scientist go and verify that the wetlands were previously flagged is part of this development are still accurately depicted as wetlands in the vicinity of the proposed buildings. Cynthia Robinowitz the certified soil scientist was hired to do that work and conform that the wetlands shown on this plan accurately reflected what is out there today. We made an application for the Inland and Wetland Agency on July 10, 2008 and on August 6<sup>th</sup> we applied for a site plan/special permit application for this Commission. The Inland and Wetland Commission had scheduled a site walk for August 9<sup>th</sup> and we invited the Planning and Zoning Commission to that site walk as well as the town council and the Park and

Recreation Department that site walk was held on August 9<sup>th</sup>. What you received in your packet this week was the building and parking location as we saw it the smaller maps are the parking location as we saw as the day we were out in the field. Since that time based on discussions and some of the concerns about the overhead lines, for the public there is a 400 foot CL&P easement on the property. Which is shown in faint yellow lines on the master plan over there our original plan had the building approximately 25 feet from the edge of the easement, we had a number of concerns during the site walk and we have subsequently the large scale plan you received with your packet shows the building and it is consistent with the plan that is on the bottom. It moved the building an additional 30 feet away from the power line easement to the south. We tried to minimize the impacts on the wetlands. We have impacted about 500 square feet of wetlands as a result of that move, direct impact as well as some impact in the buffer area which we will be before the Inland and Wetland Commission next week after the first night of the public hearing. What Lisa handed out to you tonight was a project narrative and on the right hand side is a repeat of a small version of the site location map it shows where the building is proposed and the narrative in the packet covers some of the issues that you had raised in the past and talked about in the past. If you would like I can review it briefly with you, I realize you are just getting it tonight and then realize the public hearing will have to be continued because you do not have wetlands approval yet. We do have a section one of the big concerns with the site walk anyway, the coordination with Northeast Utilities we had provided guidance that is available from Northeast Utilities relative to what they allow or will not allow within their easement areas. We have included a letter that I sent off to them with the conceptual site plan after their review and input as to our project. As well we have included the actual deed that has the easement language in there. A little difficult to read but basically the old language and I seen before in other areas of town where basically allows us to cultivate the land under the power lines and that is all about it allows us to do. The big section will be the building uses and I will let Lisa jump in here and talk a little about that, where we are looking for some active recreation within the building such soccer lacrosse, little league, softball field, hockey, pop Warner football, cheerleading, indoor Frisbee, just to name a few of them. We see it as a valuable asset to allow people to practice during inclement weather and bad weather. Included are some letters of support in the package as well from the recreational groups. We included some information specifying that it will not be used for equipment storage other than equipment associated with recreation league bats and balls and other things. They had some concern that we are going to be using it

for maintenance equipment, lawn mowers and tractors, and the like there is some information in the packet that it will not be used for that. The hours of activity, all youth activities are proposed to end by 9 with adult activities ending by 10.

Carew: That is with the current recreational policy.

Berger: We have also hired a structural engineer to assist us with the foundation design and he has provided in the very last page of that packet conceptual rendering, architectural rendering of what the building will look like. We are anticipating verifying foundations conditions within the next couple of weeks. We met out there this week with the contractor he will be doing borings for the building corners. We should get the foundation design finalized. I will talk quickly about parking; the current site plan shows spaces for 100 cars. That began quite honestly as somewhat of an estimate; I believe that the parking is to be determined by the Commission. This type of use is not specifically covered by the Zoning regulations. I did find something close to this type of use in 63.5.2m it talks about amusement or entertainment facilities. Enclosed but without fixed seats which is not exact match but it's close to what we are doing enclosed without fixed seats and that one for 200 square foot which would get us to the 100 that we proposed. We have talked about the occupancy of the building we envisioned it being used by possibility of two teams at once for a total of 60 kids with parent pickup and overlap we think that 100 is a good number at this point but will be happy to listen to any comments or questions that Commission might have for input. That completes the presentation; if Lisa wants to add anything I will be happy to entertain any questions?

Minnich: Any questions from members of the Commission? I have several if I may? The placement of this building is within a 500 foot bumper of wetland and a part of the zoning is in the wetland, and obviously you are going to Inland and Wetlands for that. My question to you is that my understanding of where the parking area is, is not a wetland why was the decision to put the building's location in wetland rather than a parking lot in the wetland?

Berger: I think primarily because of the grading activities and in footprint of the parking as currently designed, I believe is slightly larger than the building. So we moved that we flipped the two of them around. We would have a bigger footprint of impact in the wetland and buffer area than the building is now. I believe that is the case, I will verify that.

Minnich: The height of this building is how high?

Berger: 32 feet to the peak.

Minnich: The building is a metal faced.

Berger: Yes.

Minnich: What is the color of the facades?

Carew: Off white. It is being stored right now in Oakville the building.

Minnich: What are you planning as a roof for this?

Carew: The entire building is metal; the roof will be brand new because we did not salvage the roof when it was taken apart. It is going to be a metal roof.

Minnich: How is the storm water drainage being handled from this building is it going to have leaders, how are you handling the storm water drainage?

Berger: The storm water drainage remains under design and we do have not a final drainage report this evening. It will be handled through a series of rain gardens and distension to provide not only the water quality treatment that we require of all applicants consistent with 2004 DEP water quality but it will also result will be detention designed so there will be no increase for the 200 year storm event. Roof leaders and parking lot drainage will all be directed through that system.

Minnich: The flooring of this building is what material?

Berger: It will be gravel with artificial turf.

Minnich: If the building is going to be flush to the ground and there is no cement slab as we are used to seeing how are you keeping the water out of the building?

Berger: I have not seen any design plans from the foundation engineer but there will be a curt drain around the entire structure to prevent any ground infiltration to the inside.

Carew: The turf is responsible for a lot of that too. They have the requirements when they put the turf down, they have already been in contact with us, so that would be one of the things that there is to be certain compaction before they can put the artificial turf in.

Minnich: Could you describe for us the landscaping plan for both around this building and around the parking lot is proposed to be?

Berger: Our current plan is to leave as much of the current vegetation there as possible. From the purple access road in the lower left hand corner, the lower middle section of the lower map here to the building is a wooded buffer that we intent to keep almost intact up to limits of grading. We will have some I want to say natural landscaping I am sure there will be some ornamental around the building but along the back side where we have the concern about access to the power lines I envision to the easement area a chain link fence set back along the easement line with a row of new vegetation landscaping to screen the chain link fence from the edge of the parking lot in the more westerly south easterly direction all along the easement line there. Not only providing a solid buffer to keep people from going over the easement area but all well as some landscaping screening and that will be shown on the final plans.

Minnich: And the landscaping for the parking lot?

Berger: Along the north easterly side on the easement area is what I described will have trees; we will replant trees and other landscaping in the islands. We minimize the amount of impact to the existing forest that is out there other than the footprint necessary for grading.

Minnich: As you are well aware of the requirements of this Commission when there are buildings that there are water and sewer facilities, could you explain your access to water and sewer, sanitary services?

Berger: There is existing water and sewer at the current bathroom facilities at the park, handled by the Watertown Water and Sewer Authority. I had met with Frank Jurdidis and he has indicated that there will be plenty of water pressure there. The sanitary sewer system from the current bathrooms is a force main and we will be required to put a force main here to pump to tanks of the existing bathrooms and

pump it to the system. Mr. Jurdidis did not see any problem with that. No technical obstacles to doing that.

Minnich: So they will be providing us a statement letter and the bathrooms are going to be interior to this building?

Berger: Yes

Minnich: One of the issues that we have encountered and I would like at the next public hearing if I may ask of you Chuck. We have had on some occasions the issues of the easement description and the plans that we received are now always in line. I know what you provided I have not had a chance to review but these are high powered power lines behind this building and not too far from it and I just want to be assured in some form the easement line that is shown on the plans is accurate in accordance with the documents to which are on the land records for and the contract from CL&P and Northeast Utilities are correct. So that we are assured that we are looking at the right things.

Berger: We will certainly do that. I will tell you that we contacted CL&P on these issues there is survey did come out provide us with some survey control and they did stake the location of the easement area in the field area that we walked. There is a stake there that is consistent with the location and we thought it was and we will verify all that.

Minnich: Other than the standards to which I am glancing through you provided us for CL&P's regulations or guidelines regarding structures near high powered lines. Because this is going to be a public building, it is metal it is near high power tension lines the likelihood for all of us how safe is that? Is there some addition to the guidelines is there some letter that could come from CL&P or yourself for our file and record regarding the safety which is obviously one of our concerns as a Zoning Commission of this metal facility nears those lines?

Berger: I expect to get a letter back from CL&P based on the letter that I sent to them. And I don't want to say it's going to say exactly that, I think what it is going to say is that your building is well away from our easement area and we have no jurisdiction over it. I don't think that they will tell us safe or not safe. You can take that letter and use their guidelines and write a memo to us stating I am asking. I put something in writing based on my conversation with CL&P

engineers that there is not an issue especially that we moved it an additional 30 feet away. We are now 50 to 70 feet away from the line now.

Masayda: Easement is a restricted area, you can go up to the easement line, put the structure right up to the easement line you could do that. Easement is defined as an area of restriction where you cannot build onto it. You do not have any setbacks or anything like that.

Minnich: I am well aware of that. The issue that we have talked about at previous meeting had to with the roadway, my understanding that it is a 24 foot access roadway from the circular roadway that is currently exists there. Is that 24 feet consistent throughout the both the parking lot on the northwest side of the building, the other parking lot that is on the southwest side of the parking lot, is it 24 feet standard throughout?

Berger: I don't believe so I will have to look at that. I will get back to you on that. I don't believe we are 24 on the north easterly side of the building is but I will check on that.

Minnich: The issue was that some time ago I guess it has been 20 years when the Veterans Park was there and this Commission and this Commission was mostly helpful in getting that park and the Park and Recreation Commission and the town was instrumental in getting a consultant to help design the park, one of the issues back then was the issue of lighting of the roads and the decision that was made back then was made and quite frankly has worked very well from then until now was that because the park is closed at dusk there is no need for the lighting on the roads to the neighborhood and that was fine. However I need to understand a little more as I think I do that this building is going to be open year around not just in the summer time and is going to be at times there when it is dusk so what is the lighting that is proposed if any for the outdoor lighting for this facility and including its driveways and parking lots?

Berger: At this point in time there is no plan to light the entire perimeter road, there will be some lights on the building as well as the parking area but the parks perimeter road, I will call the loop road we do not have plans as this point to light that.

Carew: One of the things we are looking at though are to keep it as green as possible. So one of the things we have been looking at is they are very costly but solar lighting down lighting possibly because when our Park Director got estimates on brining electricity to the back, everything right now is under ground, there is no over head wire to go out in the park. Just to bring power back to the back field and this is a few years ago were going to be over 2,500.00. So one of the things we are looking at is possibly solar down lighting possibility. The one thing I know the Commission will not want to do is make that access road two way traffic. The only place would be two ways is in the very front of the park and in and out of that parking lot, because right now if you are familiar with the park the roadway has a walkway next to it and it's a potential that people there drive too fast.

Minnich: By the next public hearing you will need if I may ask of you to address that issue. I know Chuck you are quite familiar with the regulations, the outdoor lighting regulations and lighting is a requirement both for safety of the vehicles and obviously safety for the pedestrians that are going to be traveling or walking from the building and park. As you well know kind of lighting that use to be on the buildings, flood lights to light the parking lot. So you will need to address the outdoor lighting. My question that I have at this point is if you could provide, I don't see it in the file a letter from the fire marshal stating their review and approval of this particularly in the prior access around the building. I do have two more if you could so I could understand you are going to be putting in bathrooms to this facility I would ask so we can understand the sanitary sewer and water issues if you could give to us a letter from the building inspector stating that the plan for the bathrooms are in compliance with code. And lastly and which is one you have proposed a 100 park parking lot and I know I am not the only one, so the Commission as well as many others in the community have grinned over the course of years about this community's parking situation, just about every public facility we have in terms of it not being adequate for the events that are going to occur there and some of the instances particular at some school's there is when there are uses of the larger facilities or from the gym or auditorium they even have plans to bus people so they offsite to bring them there because there is just not enough parking, so having said that about parking I would like to understand the most intensive use that plan on having for this facility in terms of what is going to be in it. Understanding the occupants that are there and I then and others on the Commission in their minds help themselves to justify which is this Commission decision the number of parking spaces you have. The hundred parking spaces maybe right and it may turn out as whether it be St. John's School

or just about many other facilities we come across the fact that what should be there is not possible, that may be the case here but I think we need to go through the exercise for you to tell us what is the maximum use. I understand there has been bleachers that are interior to this facility are that correct?

Carew: Correct

Minnich: So that cuts down on the number of people. So if you could help us to tell us what the uses are going to be. I don't care about other than the most intense periods, the parking issue on.

Carew: We are trying to judge not having any kind of facility around here and currently all the groups that probably using this after rent space it's kind of hard, the only thing close to this would be like the field house over at Taft School. Try to go with the maximum number of kids we could have on the floor anyone time and figuring out that at least one adult would be there. So that is where we came up with the numbers but being involved with the Parks is pretty much since 1987 there was a few things why there was x amount of parking spaces in the park initially. Malone and McBroom were the landscape architects that designed the park, there were some issues that we wanted to make sure there were x amount of dollars in the town of Watertown we know how it works. We had to make sure we were not getting to separators for oil separators for drainage and different things like that and that is how the park was built the way it was. The only time if there is a special event going on or if there cross over time when teams on the field and you're leaving and the other team is already there, that is your biggest amount of people are going to be there. Five o'clock any day of the week you are going to see a lot of traffic up there between the high school getting off the fields and the youth sports starting. So there are certain peak times when it could, then there are certain times during the day there is going to be 10 people in the whole park.

Masayda: It is typical like a mall, if you were going to design a mall your are not going to design a mall with parking for Christmas holiday shopping so again it is going to be used for what your typical normal use is going to be. Not for your maximum peak use.

Minnich: In order for one review of this in order to determine what the amount of parking is going to be needed we would then need to vote to see what going to be your peak use of the facility and it's from that where you start the issue as to whether the

parking spaces that you need. We are going to obviously have to, I will leave it there, I think you need to help us to understand rather talking in generality, the specific kind of programs you see there, how many people are going to be there, and we need as we talked before we need to understand what you are talking about in terms the age group there because we also know that not all of those people and kids are going to be driving so bottom line here is real simple it is that I and others on the Commission would like to understand the relationship to the use of that facility, that 20,000 square foot facility at its peak use and comparing that for understanding the adequacies that you are proposing of 100 parking spaces. So that is the task if you could help us to understand that.

Masayda: I am up there every day of the week and during practice weeks they split the fields. And usually the parents drop the kids off and leave and during the games you have half the amount of kids.

Carew: The reason that I was using that for an example was because it is an indoor facility. I used soccer has an example, that is our biggest organization in town. And I went high on the number, I said 15 to a team because some of the younger kids they have a lot of kids on the team so I said okay the maximum you could have in their practicing at one time would be 4 teams. So that would be 60 kids plus the adults watching them plus any other adults hanging around to watch them. That is the number that I came up with it is very difficult to come up with us, this is unknown to us. I can't tell you recreation is from birth to death, we try to handle every age group in between.

Minnich: The actual task if you could put the details of what you just said or whatever else you are going to tell us and with your help we can come to the same conclusion and the same judgment, but I guess the point I am trying to make is we need to determine the adequacy of the parking spaces and I and the rest of the Commission fully appreciate that the number of people that are in the facility are not necessarily related to the number of parking spaces that are needed because of the age group of the people that are there. So with your written assumptions and statement of fact if you could help us through that we would appreciate it. Is there any other questions?

- Blais: Because of its elevation probably one of the highest places in town and the high tension wires around metal, and the metal building are you concerned about lightening at all in the metal building? I would have second thoughts about being in a metal building during a thunder storm?
- Berger: I will investigate that and get back to you that sounds like a building inspector get an answer for that the next time.
- Martin: Having seen facilities like this you use for things other than sports is your intent to strictly have this as sports in other words this is not being a location where a group of antique dealers come in and say we want to hold an antique show.
- Carew: At this point it is not just for active recreation it would also be for passive recreation use during the day. During the day you probably when the kids are in school there is a possibility there is other things we could hold in there. There are certain things we want to stay away from like the bleachers and certain things. We still have to get to the information as far some of these.
- Martin: Because they do become sources of income for the community, you could hold fairs, you can hold things like that but if you do you are also now taxing the parking area. I think that was what Dave was getting to if that is going to be debt free uses to the facility those questions is very good and you have to look at that.
- Rondeau: Regarding the parking also has I don't know the number of other spaces there are but I think that we should maintain an open mind about the fact that there is an overflow of parking at this particular facility there other parking lots within the Veterans Park that people could park at and the fact that they have to walk, 150 feet or 500 feet or whatever it is to get to a building I think those other parking spots.
- Minnich: We certainly should do that the issue though is the observation that is made that when this park is used particularly in the warmer months the issue that is come to us all the time is the adequacy of parking, I know people that use those facilities up there they purpose plan a car pool because they know the issues related to parking.
- Carew: At certain peak times.

Rondeau: I guess what I am getting at is that I hate to see Veterans Park paved over parking. It is a park and we want to keep accordingly. I guess what I am saying is the extent that you want to provide adequate amount of parking you don't want to have to over tow on this.

Masayda: And it works very well with the grass along the edges because people park along the grass with no issues.

Minnich: Whatever your plans are show us, tell us the math of what you are doing and details so we can appreciate the same assumptions that you are making and we made our points clear. Is there anybody else on the Commission who has any comments or questions? If I could ask then, if you could leave the podium. Is there anyone else from the public who would like to make a comment on this project?

**Peter Scalzone – Practice Law at 2 Sunny hill Road – Bethel, Ct**

I have been hired here tonight by a couple of neighbors who live on Nova Scotia Hill Road. I first of all want to point out how the public notice that was sent out to the abounding land owners I don't know if they turned in their green cards tonight the town has. It references the fact that a copy of the application is on file in the Planning and Zoning office. I went to the Planning and Zoning office yesterday and I retrieved a copy of the application. This is what was there, a single page with uses indoor recreational facility and a building drawing on a topographical map. My comments tonight won't be as prepared as they should because I did not have any of this information. Moosa is a very helpful individual in the Planning and Zoning Office but he did not have any information to give me. Any information that they presented tonight was not there. I would like to point you to your regulations which specifically point out what applications for a site plan shall include and failure to comply with application submission requirements shall be grounds for the Commission to deny such application. I am going to go through these step by step and I will try not to be lengthy but it says all site plan applications shall be prepared in accordance with the following general requirements. It shall be prepared on a scale not less than 1 inch equals a hundred feet and include an accurate and up to date class A2 survey. I don't see a class A2 survey here. I don't see any map that has been specifically prepared by a surveyor and stamped with A2 stamp. I am not seeing the title of the development the date, the revisions date, off course there haven't probably been any revisions yet, I am

not sure. I haven't seen a written description of the proposed use or uses of although they have mentioned tonight but there is nothing on file for me to see. One key aspect for my clients an estimate of the amount and type of vehicular traffic to be generated on daily basis in the peak hours. The Commission may require a traffic study evaluating the impact of the proposal on streets. Serving and or effected by the developed prepared by a qualified traffic engineer or transportation planner. I believe that is a critical study for this proposal tonight. I traveled for the first time on Nova Scotia Hill Road yesterday it is in an R-90 zone. According to your plan of development this active recreational facility should not be there or if it is there its main artery should not be the narrow street known as Nova Scotia Hill Road. But I think that at the least this Commission should demand a traffic study. They have not complied with the estimate of the amount and type of vehicular traffic. They have not given a table or chart indicating the proposed number or amount of types of uses, building height coverage, floor area, landscaping, and all the stuff that you folks have mentioned that is not part of the application. I don't see an accurate scale map at scale of one inch equals 1000 feet shall be submitted. As far as the proposed building and uses again there is no landscape plan that has been submitted there is nothing that I could review, this talks about the location site size, orientation of any outdoor lighting I am baffled by a structure like with 100 hundred space parking lot without outdoor lighting. I don't understand how people would leave the facility at 10 in the evening when they say that is close and have safe passage way to the vehicles. You are suppose to have a topographic map illustrating the existing and proposed conditions of the property all the contours with intervals of two feet that you do not have tonight. The design of any proposed (inaudible) shall include a storm water management plan for 25 design year storm. I have no idea if that is actually submitted tonight it may be within your packet I have no idea. Standards for site plan approval shall take into consideration the health, safety and welfare of the public in general the immediate neighborhood in particular meaning the Nova Scotia Hill Road and the traffic that is there by the way. I don't understand the evolution of this park because it is my client's understanding that it started out as a wildlife park and then some time in the ninety's active recreational uses were introduced to this park. I asked for a zoning file in the Planning and Zoning Office just so I could track the history of what has been passed. I am not sure if an active recreational use requires a site plan approval from this body. I could not find that in these regulations but I just trying to track and see the zoning evolution of this park and there is no records for me to review in the Planning and Zoning Office. I am astounded that this park and all the active recreational uses has evolved to the

place it is with only Nova Scotia Hill Road being the only main access road for it, and that is a narrow residential street. It is my understanding that this park abuts an industrial road called Park Road and that there could be an access through Park Road and I don't know why that has not been explored. I think as you know you are asking questions about metal buildings lightening it is your job, your charge to protect the public health, safety and general welfare including the neighborhood. Now that's just the site plan requirement that have not been complied with tonight. Then there are special permit uses and you have 52.4a you have special permit uses involving high traffic generators it says all applications for special permit involving the construction of 20,000 square foot of gross area building which in the Commission's judgment would generate high levels of traffic, well I think it is obvious that it would shall be accompanied by a traffic study submitted prior to the beginning of the public hearing. Evaluating the impact of the proposal of the street serving and or effected by the development. I have not heard anything about the impact on Nova Scotia Hill Road here tonight and the traffic impact and what those individuals have to live with. The other thing is that all applications for special permits shall include environmental information for the purpose of compiling a complete environmental impact analysis. The statement shall address at least the following: the Commission may modify this for waiving but the applicant has to ask in writing. And it starts off the likely impact of the proposed development on the characteristics of the surrounding neighborhood addressing such issues as congestion on public streets, harmony with surrounding developments and effect on property values and overall neighborhood stability. Just that there and then it goes through how the proposed development has been consistent with objectives of the town's plan of development. I have read your plan of development and this type of development is not consisted with your plan of development in the R90 zone. It talks about having more active recreational areas but in more densely populated areas not in the R90 zone. So it is not consistent with your plan of development and adverse impacts analysis of vehicular and pedestrian traffic impact on the street system. You have to consider with a special permit the impact use again on traffic safety and circulation on a major street. So at the very least this body would demand that an intensive traffic study be done. I would argue that the applications tonight the site plan and special permit application is actually deficient and should be denied. I don't know what the practice of this body is; I practice mainly down in Danbury and Bethel area and they will not even accept an application unless it is complete. And so I would just recommend to this body that they advice the applicant that they have an incomplete application here and if they continue forward with this incomplete

applications then I would urge you to deny it because it does not conform to your site plan requirements and your special permit requirements in your regulations. The other thing outside of your regulations I think just practically speaking your squeezing a building in between wetlands and CL&P easement and I don't think it is a good land use plan. I don't think you have enough room for this structure in that area. I was thankful that here a discussion about analysis the parking lot from a peak use, I think anywhere I practice you analysis the parking lots from a peak use you plan on what is the worst case scenario, if it doesn't happen great but you plan on the worst case scenario. I did go and drove around within the park yesterday also, it is a gorgeous park but I think that if you construct this facility within this park you are going to have a traffic congestion nightmare within that park if you have events going on at the same time. But I am glad that you are going to continue the hearing because I am going to have even more comments and I am hopeful that this application what it is will be on file in the Planning and Zoning office so that we can review it. Okay thank you very much.

Minnich: Is there anyone else who has public comments on this?

**Roberta Baker – 518 Nova Scotia Hill Road**

What I have given to you is what I am going to say tonight and also photographs that I took off the street in front of my house. I have been a resident of Watertown for 40 years; I have lived 55 of those 40 years at my present address from 1968 to 1970 renting from Harold and Louise Ladden and from 1975 to the present the owner of my house. The Laddens owned a farm which included land along both sides of Nova Scotia Hill Road including much of the land that is now Veterans Memorial Park their house was on the northwest side of the street and the farm directly across the road on the southeast side. My house is built on the foundation of that barn that burned it only 21 feet from the edge of the road to my front door. I have submitted photos to attest to this. From 1968 to 1970 and 1975 it did not matter how close we lived to the road because at most there might have been 100 vehicles using that rural road in a week. In 1972 the land area that is now Veterans Memorial Park was designated a wildlife nature area with dirt walking trails. With a desire for more playing fields in the community it was decided and approved to build athletic fields within nature preserve with the entrance located off Park Road an industrial area with appropriate traffic access, it was never approved to have the entrance at its present location off Nova Scotia Hill Road. Why was the original approved access location move to the current Nova Scotia

location which was never approved? In the entire complex that is currently stands in violation of the original approved design, if there has been any traffic studies done prior to or after the changes from nature preserve to the present athletic complex. Zoned as an R90 rural area is the town in compliance with the zoning regulations to hold electronically enhanced concerts, car shows, fall festivals, fireworks etc. which by the way this is going to hear will be after dusk at the areas designated as Veterans Memorial Park. I am not a traffic expert however I do live very close to the one time country road and would venture to guess that thousands of vehicles now pass within 21 feet of my house with little concern of the 25 mile per hour speed limit. With further development at the athletic complex referring to the construction of the proposed indoor athletic facility traffic will certainly increase year around and further affect the quality of life of all residents on quiet country road. Therefore I am not in favor of the construction of the proposed indoor athletic facility at Avery Land fare Athletic Complex. Until the matters of safety and legality are resolved I respectfully request the Commission to deny the application for this facility. And may I also ask no one has mentioned heating and the cost of heating the facility of this nature.

Masayda: This Commission in the past has asked why the access does come off of Nova Scotia Hill Road and due to other proposals from this Commission and I guess the reason the disconnect to Park Road was because of Wetland impact it would also have a section of wetland which not to say that the town can't pursue a permit to cross that wetland.

Baker: There are bridges that can be built and it was approved to be off that road not to be where it is.

Masayda: I am just stating the fact that she is correct that this Commission did ask that question in previous years that indicated that...

Baker: It has never been approved to have that access off Nova Scotia Hill Road and yet that is where it is and so as far as I am concerned it is an illegal access.

Masayda: She is correct it is more appropriate to come off of industrial road than a local road.

Minnich: Is there anyone else with public comment?

**Coe Forino – 472 Nova Scotia Hill Road**

I pretty sure this is a building that I looked at better than 30 years ago and in 31 years and before I got out of a business it was 2 years before I came up here. I went out to the Western Hill Farms Southbury its run by Mr. and Mrs. John Ryker they raised four horses and cutting horses. We had this building being put up and he asked me that I be up there to see this building. I went up there and it was quite going up because these animals are fantastic and the farm was great. I looked at it, I met John Ryker a college of mine, John Ryker maintenance man and a man I don't know if it was a field engineer or a foreman to put this building up, it was not quite finished. Now I have the following calculations I don't know the roof the hip on this building but will go modestly I think its figures will come out right. The roof size without the peak plus a two feet overhang on the building lance and I say 20 cars and some instance 100. Well the figures will come out pretty darn close. The building is 100 by 200 that is 2, 880, square inches. The overhang of 200 feet is 115,200 square inches. Parking I say just for 20 cars but the figures will come right. For 25 is 460,800 square inches. The total square inches will be between 3, 456,000 to 3, 916,800 square inches. In a rain storm one inch rain storm you would have to disperse 15,000 gallons of water or take the figures from 15,000 you may have to go to 17,000. On a 2 inch rain storm you got 34,000 gallons of water to get rid of. And I hope that nobody is going to listen and take the path of least residence just dump it and see where it goes. Because I am the guy that comes up here complaining about water and every time I come up here people just look right through me like I am a piece of glass. No mention has been made regarding the cost or the method of site construction and this well as following be handled by our town employees laid in the surveying plans. Construction of tiers to anchor the steel plus a possible foundation beside the fields, erection of steel structure was 100 foot spans are going to cross. Replacing the roof replacement, roofing replacement if this building if this is the building that I looked at 30 years ago doesn't it need replacing and who is going to pay for it? I hope I am not. When this building is accepted by town the following amenities should be considered. Will it need heating in winter and cooling in the summer? I don't want to hear anybody say about we can allow windows and a lot of doors; I worked in a metal building I earned every buck I got out of it. Will lavatories for each sex? Will the dirt floor need paving, will its upkeep be managed by our current personnel or do we have to hire another gang of people? I am neither for or against this project however I believe the cost should be investigated by our engineer and personnel before accepting this building. This is

building is not a doll house it is equal to half a square acre of land. Is there anything you do not understand? Beautiful I will sit and listen.

Minnich: Is there anyone else who has public comment? Just for the record I won't read them into the record except to notice them there is a letter from part of the record to be referenced a letter from the Watertown Softball dated February 15<sup>th</sup>, George Columba president who paraphrasing support this. Also Patricia Kensley secretary of the Watertown Association no date on it except it was received February 15<sup>th</sup> 2008 also in support and Watertown Athletic Club Philip Perosey dated February 12, 2008 also in support. I have mentioned that the site walk and I have mentioned to staff my concern about this application with regards to its completeness and I concur this evening a number of issues that are not complete. I am prepared to encourage my colleagues to close this public hearing and at the regular session to deny this application. It has not come to us of public hearing even having gotten the review of the inland and wetlands and has number of deficiencies that we know this evening and number of issue that obviously that generated by question I asked. I do compliment the staff and the town clerk very much wanting to do as much and obviously save all us tax payers a lot of money with regards in doing it. It obviously need more time, I say to everyone as we all know and have heard to many times particular those here on this Commission, our job is really simple and that is make sure that the regulations are complied with and that is our only role and I see that it is not. So I would ask the applicant and having said my comments and certainly hear others that to consider at this point withdrawing the application and submit it again when it is more complete. Otherwise I will proceed with what I just mentioned. Do you have any statements to that?

**Chuck Berger – Town Engineer**

Given those comments we would request that you allow to us to withdraw the application this evening.

Minnich: Thank you is there any further comments from the Commission? Are there any further comments from the public? Any further comments from the applicant?

Baker: I want to make sure that all of us on Nova Scotia Hill Road are aware of the new application and there will be a traffic study done?

Minnich: We are required to send notices and they will do that. Also for people that did come this evening when they reapply again you will need to repeat your comments because it will be a new application and it is our practice that this application be closed this evening when they resubmit again these comments will get carried forward because it is a new application, so when it comes back again what you said tonight if it still applies you need to repeat again at the time. May I have my photographs back if they won't be used?

Minnich: Yes that is fair at this time. Ruth will you give her photographs back. Are there any other comments from members of the Commission? Is there a motion to close this public hearing? Is there a second? Any further comments all those in favor of closing the public hearing please say I, all those opposed no motion carries unanimously.

Text of Motion to close the public hearing.

Motion made by G. Martin and seconded by C. Mancini.

All in favor and none opposed.

Michael Masayda \_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary