

Town of Watertown
The Planning and Zoning Commission
Special Meeting/Route 262
September 17, 2008

Time: 7:45 PM (9:05PM)
Date: September 17, 2008
Place: Watertown High School Technology Center
324 French Street
Watertown, CT

Others Present: Ruth Mulcahy, Administrator of Land Use

Minnich: The special meeting of the Route 262 planned commercial subcommittee I call this meeting to order at 9:05 pm on September 17, 2008. Carol would you please call the roll.

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

Minnich: Gary is absent so Ken will you sit in for Gary.

Demirs: Yes

Minnich: What is before you is a draft is just more comments if any you have for this evening regarding the Route 262 text language. You may indicate in general terms what was done since last time. Do you recall we had a discussion about the main focus of our last meeting whether we were going to proceed with this whole topic of a Route 262 plan for commercial district? And we said as a Commission that we are going to proceed and then we obviously because not having studies which we had a vote that that would occur. Then we talked about a couple of options for not providing the laying of the zone right now. And this language that is here and draft presents a concept that there would be an overlay zone and the overlay zone would not be laid until there is an application so the underlying zone of the IR80 would be remain in place. And then when there is a application for laying the zone they would submit the application as well as some special conditions with regards to which are the language that is in our plan of development for some of the studies and some of the questions that we wanted to make sure that get answered, those are laid out here in this draft. With regards to Mike's proposals and suggestions and comments last time regarding the bikeways

I have included all of those in here that he suggested with the exception of he suggested that bikeways be a requirement we have more than encouraged and in this draft I left the encouraged language in here but all the references elsewhere where it said pedestrian walkways and bikeways make sure I included both of those.

Masayda: I gave ample reasons of why it was a good idea to have required there was no reason why it shouldn't not have been a required in your opinion be encourage and not required. Every time we make an amendment you pick and choose on the amendments you want to include into this regulation and taking your own input here and I provided good reasons and it just over looked and put back the way you like it.

Minnich: I gave the reasons last time and I will be happy to repeat them again. It is not my decision these are just draft languages. It's the Commission decision I am not sure if any...

Masayda: There was no debatement the last time except the discussion was between you and me.

Minnich: Well let me tell you what my discussion and it was. Your suggestion was require the bikeways in terms of the property and external to the property.

Masayda: External to the property not internal. I changed it afterwards.

Minnich: You withdrew the internal. The issue regarding the external to the properties is not what we had discussed in the plan of development. There is no requirement anywhere of any, when new roads get put in they have to be bikeways.

Masayda: We can put in anything we want, why does it have to be relative to that. This is a new development that is going to have significant impact on the community. Why not include anything; we can do what we want for the good of the town. And to me not having that is not to the advantage of the town. Just like many towns and many communities and even this town has lost the opportunities by not including something now. We put all the rail ways and in town for a dollar and now our staff and our town are paying big money to buy this property back. Here we lose the opportunity because you have not encouraged it instead of required. Right don't we go forward with the requirement and change it at a later time.

Mancini: Maybe that was not the whole consensus of the whole Commission either Mike that was your consensus.

Masayda: You were not even in the debatement last time it was just Dave and I.

Minnich: I thought there was but in any event Mike one has to look at the bounds of what is being asked of the developer and what is the town responsibility. This developer when the project gets through is being asked by requirement to put in bike paths on adjacent to roads to which has never been part of our plan of development . We have bike paths and we have indicated but it has never been even discussed before about being adjacent to roads. If that is what is to be done, then we should have a discussion with the relationship to the plan of development with regards to having that requirement because it does not meet that standard, additionally if that is really what we want to do why this developer the being asked to require to put in bike paths along these roads to this development.

Masayda: When is the most economical time to something like this? Do you think it is while they are doing the road construction and acquiring the adjacent property or developing the adjacent property or is that after everything is developed and doing it at a later date with grants from the town and disputes among property owners. Our Town Public Works Director went to a workshop which included all this information on, now is the time to do it while you have an active construction project in. The amount of money of what this development is going to cost and the amount of money to put these trails in is going to be insignificant in regards to that. So why even put the town through all these added expenses of some future time when we know for sure that the Naugatuck River Greenway is going through and we are not going to have any connection to it. Why would you want to do it at a later time the cost is such a significant expense just like all these other communities are occurring and the town is currently trying require property for another trail that we gave away numerous years ago. It does not make any sense to me.

Minnich: Well it makes a lot of sense to me regarding who should pay for this. Why should a developer

Masayda: He has the right in the roads anyway. He accommodates a path at the same time.

Minnich: But there is no plan that this Commission has with regards with bikeways along roads

Masayda: What do you mean by a plan, a drawing made up, what do you mean by a plan?

Minnich: We have no conceptual discussion about requiring along roads which is what we are talking about that are exterior now to this property of having bike paths that has never been a part of the plan of development to have...

Masayda: Sorry for drawing the rest of the Commission on but we had this discussion on this thing, we know that it is going in there, and it was either a connection from the residents of the town and I know I am just reiterating the last two or three meetings but it just getting into the draft like it should be. If you put a major development how are you going to get safe access, safety is part of doing the development because this is a major recreational trail how you are going to get there with the major development in the amount of vehicles that are going to be attracted to this development without having a this put into place as part of the development.

Minnich: Part of the problem being need be what you are defining what is defined at the moment by you is exterior to the development that is not the bike path. The path that has been talked about with relationship to the bike path that is in the plan of conservation development. All of these roads that you are talking about whatever they are are not part of a plan. So that if it was even to be required by the developer there is a bike path to nowhere because they do not connect to any bike path.

Masayda: You have to get to from the local roads to the Naugatuck River Greenway which we know is going to happen so how are you going to do that without having this connection.

Minnich: We indicated where we wanted to have the greenway.

Masayda: What greenway you are talking about?

Minnich: The greenway you are talking about.

Masayda: The Naugatuck River Greenway.

Minnich: We were specific in the plan where that was going to go and the connections on the roads. By your statement which I am hearing clearly now is roads exterior to this development is adding additional roads to which is not part of what we discussed before, that is my ... you said that the language here that you should have these bike paths on roads exterior to the site. I am saying that the roads exterior to the site is additional to what was in the plan of development for access to the Naugatuck River Greenway.

Masayda: Roads exterior to the side, I am talking like adjacent to 262 or adjacent to Echo Lake Road part of the path would be road aid improvements that would be required as part of the development. Again any type of development that is going incur at this location is going to require widening of obviously 262 to more than one lane in each direction. There may be additional added lanes requirements on Echo Lake Road and all the ramps and part of those exterior improvements of the 262 site should require them to have bike facilities.

Minnich: Are both the two roads you mentioned Echo Lake Road and Route 262 part of the bike paths that we indicated in the plan of development.

Masayda: Yes they were.

Minnich: I don't recall that but whatever.

Masayda: I am looking at the safety of our community to get to this major recreational facility and for the people from the recreational facility to get access to our town. How else are they going to get safe access to go the business that they want to ride bikes to work or who knows where gas is going to go or what kind of forms of transportation is going to be in the future.

Minnich: So now you are qualifying this that roads to whom you are talking about are the roads that are identified in the plan of conservation development? My objection is the word, is getting off requiring the developer to do something that is outside of what we had as in the plan of development.

Masayda: Even if it wasn't in the plan of development why can't the developer do it at this most economical time that is a good time to do it? Trying to do it afterwards your talking about significance expense to the town.

Minnich: Perhaps put a bike path along this route. That is exterior to the building...

Mancini: Instead of debating between the two of you, take the consensus of the Commission and see how they feel about. Okay do it that way.

Duane: I think we should do encourage.

Mancini: I like the word encourage I do not think it should be required.

Masayda: It just does not make sense how new regulations.

Russ: I don't know if this project is going to deem to these roads have to be redone. If they do that to be redone then at that I would say yeah put the bike paths in but it is off site again and you cannot make that a requirement off site.

Masayda: Why can't you?

Russ: Because it is off site.

Masayda: Yes you can make it a regulation.

Blais: I don't see bike paths. Are you talking about the greenway? Use the word encourage.

Dupliese: I think the reasons why and I will tell you why I would not want them. If I was the developer putting in stores I would not want to have a bicycle path for kids to come riding their bikes down into the shopping centers.

Rondeau: But you are not here representing the developer, you are here representing the town.

Dupliese: Number two this is one big hill this is not going to be someplace for kids to come riding their bikes anyway, so I just don't see the need for offsite improvement for a bicycle path at this site.

Masayda: Most people that ride bikes on roadways are a lot of adults who ride bikes to work not just kids. For that attitude why don't you just take sidewalks off too?

Dupliese: Encourage is fine.

Demirs: I don't know much about this greenway but my express that this is suppose to connect us from point A to the greenway so I don't know is there any other way to connect there if we don't do it on this site?

Masayda: You know where the drive in is?

Demirs: Correct.

Masayda: What two roads are the only accesses to the residents of Watertown? Which are the two roads that connect to that area?

Demirs: Echo Lake and Route 262.

Masayda: Those are the two roads I am talking about? So how else?

Demirs: Where is the greenway going?

Masayda: Along the river it connects from Massachusetts all the way down to New Haven.

Demirs: So the only way to connect to it would be to have, why would you impose that on the developer though?

Masayda: Do you want the town to do it by a grant?

Demirs: Whatever, if I was the developer then I would build my plaza in another town.

Rondeau: Why can't you put in that if roadwork is required on those roads I wouldn't suggest that the developer would have to just go and redo all the roads just to put in a bike path. But I might recommend that the way it be done is that if roadwork is going to have to be done on those roads anyway to widen them for safety purposes, whatever I don't think the cost associated with adding an extra four feet for a bike is going to be something that is going to keep the developer from making a decision. If it comes down to a couple hundred yards of tar like ten feet wide is going to make or break the developer from making a decision.

Demirs: We are talking about not having a lot of kids hanging around this development. This is going to be...

Rondeau: First of all it goes down to you are trying to get them down to the river.

Demirs: They would have to go by this...

Rondeau: So you are saying that if there is not a bike trail there that no one would use that road.

Demirs: No I did not say that at all. In the meeting we would like to avoid having a lot of kids hanging around.

Minnich: I see there is a consensus in favor of using the word encourage relating to offsite bike paths and would like if you don't support that for the purposes of this draft and bringing it to the public hearing we will leave as the issue of encourage and everything on this whole document when it gets to public hearing it open for discussion and for draft purposes we will leave it as encourage for right now.

Rondeau: Can we bring up other topics besides the ones we have now.

Mancini: Let's go through the ones we have first and then add it afterwards.

Masayda: I did not have an opportunity to review this document under initial discussion here I would like an opportunity to read this before we further discuss this.

Minnich: Before you vote to that extreme and you always have a right to go that there is not any intent at least on my part that we are going to do any approvals tonight but we are here to discuss this and what any of us want to talk about on this and the end result is to incorporate that into the draft and so that the fear that you have is that by not reading it, that we are going to approve this tonight. That is not the intent we need to wait to get some feedback and comments from if any from the Town Manager regarding staff ...

Masayda: Again you are progressing at a rate where you the one that wrote these 20 pages and everybody ample opportunity to review it and provide comments before it goes forward to others of the town and staff and whoever you are giving it to. I don't feel that I am given that opportunity to provide my input.

Minnich: It was not the intent that staff outside of our own staff here at the Planning and Zoning Commission was going to get this document. They were being asked merely to provide whatever comments they thought that was necessary on a site this size, they did this same exercise a year and half ago and now it is asking them again with a 650,000 square foot facility to be accommodate that.

Masayda: But you are basing it upon something you wrote which I would be able to, I just have a motion before we forward it others that the Commission members should have an opportunity to read your last revision so that we can comment on it before you start handing it out to others.

Minnich: That is in a form of a motion? Is there a second? Carol would you please call the roll for the purpose of recording our votes.

George: Do we all have a chance to vote on this?

Minnich: The motion is that before anything gets sent to anybody other than us and staff that the Commission had not had a chance to approve or consider the draft before it goes. On a vote of two in favor and 7 opposed the motion is (inaudible). We will ask the staff for comments, I thought we resolved this at the regular meeting but (inaudible).

Mancini: I want to say something to this Commission. I don't agree with Dave Minnich all the time and I am going to say one thing here is a Chairman who is putting a lot of hours into this it is just a starting point and everybody is jumping all over him because he did his work, these are his words that he is bringing to us and we can discuss them and say yes or no on. And what is everybody arguing about that Dave did this himself and Dave did that. I wouldn't want to be paying the guy for

the hours he has put on this. It is only a starting point it does not agree with everything he says here.

Russ: It just says paragraph 1 line 1 read and we will have a discussion yes or no, then we will just go down the page. Hopefully we can finish before midnight.

Minnich: I thought doing it that way we need to wait to get Chuck's input but then we will have that language in here that will be pretty near our draft our final so. I wouldn't suggest we go through word for word at this point. But is there any other conceptual issues here on this that you thought should be included in this or changes conceptually what's in here.

Dupliese: I was not sure about 3631 & 10 Commission may require the applicant to pay their consultant study independent of the applicant and under the direction of the Commission to review all or part of the applicant's submission. I am not understanding this I thought that we, I guess we can require the applicant to another study is that what we are saying here? Is that depending on what the applicant brings to us we may require another study?

Minnich: Kind of, what this is saying is that elsewhere above this the applicant is required to provide to us a traffic study, IT and trip generation all of that interaction. It very well maybe that, that traffic study that we get back we may say to ourselves as a Commission we need a third party review and what this section intents not just a traffic study but anything in the same concept is those areas to which we get responses back from the applicant for the overlay zone laying. That if we need to get a third party consultant for anything specific we can. If there is things to which we want to ask or we have not asked before we need a consultant all this is saying I that there is no requirement here but if when we get the information back we need feel as a commission we need to have further information this is informing the applicant you are going to pay for it. Any other...

Rondeau: I have a question on page two I think line 17 you are talking about an overlay district and it would us for that to be a floating zone vs. an overlay. I think it would be appropriate to change the wording accordingly. I think a floating zone would give us for some reason if somebody comes to good for us and with an application that we don't feel would be appropriate for the town we have a little bit more leeway with a floating zone than we do with a overlay district.

Minnich: Let me help to tell you what this overlay zone concept is that in accordance with state law we have to have the regulations for what the zone is that is what all of this is about. The second requirement is that the boundaries of that district be defined and public hearing and notice also be done. So when applying an overlay zone which this does not lay the zone yet, it just establishes a language when someone comes with an application they have no of right to do anything regarding the language that we are now looking at. What they first have to do is they will have to define the meets and boundaries so with the legislative action that we have we hear would hear all of those issues and comments that we will get from them and then decide whether we going to the overlay zone. So the meets and boundaries are defined by us and the zone is not here yet until such time as we get an application.

Mulcahy: Just a clarification I was asked the question the difference between a floating zone and an overlay zone and I looked in the land use law books and when you do an overlay please refer to the floating zone and they treat them the exact same way, you can interchange the terminology according to the land use law books in the office.

Rondeau: How about our regulations?

Minnich: Well this is the very process overlay zone the very language that we have used for the overlay in fact 3 overlay zones that we for the transitional zone and for the two ages restricted tones we use the word overlay zone. If you are talking about specifics in overlay and floating I am not following what the difference is?

Rondeau: Do we not use those terms separately and independently in our own regulations?

Minnich: We only use to date we only used overlay zones we only have three overlay zones and we use the word overlay in all three of them. Is there any other conceptual issues?

Dupliese: In that 36.2 that overlay district let see the Commission may adopt an IR district in accordance with conditions here and the after structure and the site development in connection with section 36 the entire planned commercial district may be one of several lots however all lots shall be developed as if one lot. So if we get the developer who only wants half of the site let's say half of the hundred and some odd acres it has to be developed as one site. Everything has to be developed at the same time because that what it sounds like all the lots shall be developed as if one lot.

Minnich: The general premise of this zone before the overlay zone came into effect was that they needed to be a general site plan. And there needs to be a detailed site plan those are new terms for us to define here plus the state law states there has to be a site plan. We have put it into two processes that first general site plan is define here is to make it real simple for location issues, where roads are going to be, conceptual work, where catch basins and all those things are going to be. Is to be on the entire zone that includes all of the lots and so that the language here needs to be cleaned up a little bit but it needs to be certain that all the lots are signing the application for which they are going to have the overlay zone and we need to point here. I think here is a good one is that we need to make sure that is a little clearer. But the concept is that this planning part of it will be for the whole zone.

Dupliese: As if all one lot being developed at the same time.

Minnich: And then when they go to develop it, that is part of that second phase or the second part is the detailed site plan to which then they may decide to do in phases. But the utilities and all those things that would be joined to the whole property such as parking is the real issue I saw. That would be already decided by the general site plans that the detail site plan needs to be consistent with the general site plan that the detail site plan is proposed is not then they have to go back and revise the general site plan if they approve the detailed site plan that is not consistent with the general site plan. That language in that full concept is new to us. I understand where that is and where it comes from but that is typical in different variations of the sixteen communities that I have (inaudible) it is a two part process so you can't just develop a simple lot. Is there any other conceptual issues? The only one I have is to add is that area of the parking in terms what required for parking that it is not in here but I am suggesting that you leave the parking up to the decision of the Commission so because it is silent one would then invite a definition here and you can refer back to our language that is in the parking area of our regulations and I am not so sure we want to get all just leave a statement that it be up to the parking requirements left to the decision of the Commission. Is that okay with everyone?

Rondeau: On the first page 3611 line 8 you said to provide an opportunity to develop high quality retail. It seems to I really did not have a chance to go over this entirely do you have anywhere in here where you define what high quality is? In other words that is a term but really does not mean anything unless we have some kind of a definition as to what you may have obviously you have some type of intention?

Minnich: I thought and obviously we cannot define the brand of stores that are going in there. But because of particularly the issues we have with the materials and colors and the human scale issues which of course are issues that we would be reviewing and we give them plenty of options. That was my definition of a higher quality you have a store without a planned front and that is where all the buildings are going to be with the same kind of clearly that does not address the variations that we have listed in this documents are not high quality but by listing them and they have to go through and they have several options to which they can choose from that's of a higher quality development. That is best I could come to and the best I could come to reading from others, other committees that have done this sort of defining brand name stores.

Rondeau: Although from a legal standpoint we might be able to write specifically that we are trying to limit for encourage one particular store or another just to give me an idea as far as what your concept is could you give me an idea of what you consider high quality vs. low quality?

Blais: Tiffany

Mancini: Cabella

Rondeau: Those are high quality.

Mancini: Yes

Rondeau: You guys are throwing names out I am just asking what are considered low quality.

Dupliese: It also says in here that a strip plaza we don't want something in here that is a strip plaza at the same time we have all the parking in the front and you have the buildings in the back. And you are looking at all these cars that are parked there and you have these ugly strip plazas.

Masayda: No job lots.

Dupliese: We are not trying to put in a dollar store, no railroad salvage that is not what we are looking for. And dollar stores are not going to bring you high value in the building. You are not going to get high quality value so you want to bring in the better names and that is what we are looking to bring here.

Masayda: How do you write a regulation to pick and choose which?

- Rondeau: That was my next question with that being said what have we done in here that helps us although we may not be able to say we don't want the dollar store, Job Lot in here what in the regulations helps us to steer development in the direction that we want.
- Minnich: By all of the conception that would do with scale, with materials and colors, let me refer to section 36.4.
- Rondeau: Like I said I have not had the chance to read it.
- Minnich: 36.4, 36.6, 36.1, 36.6.2, .3, .4, .5 36.6 that whole section is things to which there is a lot of language here because there is a lot of options they have. We are not going to be the designers obviously but the thought process we have for selections that they can pick for what would be a higher quality store.
- Masayda: So a high quality store goes in there all of a sudden goes out of business how preclude a Job Lot from moving in? This will not do it.
- Minnich: So where are you going with that then?
- Masayda: Well I am just saying steering it toward the high quality but I am not sure that you can really steer it that way. I did not get a chance to read these but I am not sure what is in those sections.
- Minnich: When the time comes hopefully soon here give us your thoughts as to how you can include high quality what definitions you have for high quality? I tried by reading others how to include that in here without naming stores.
- Blais: I read when they are building in malls they always ask for anchor stores and the anchor stores are usually big well name stores. And the developers try to get four or five well known stores as anchor stores thinking the smaller stores on a higher level will come also.
- Rondeau: So I asked this question before that it appears based on the wording here and what everybody had said before that most would prefer to have something like Canton Commons and everybody shift their head yes and I don't want to put words in their mouth but would everybody agree that is the case. You may or may not have been in the meeting but.
- Demirs: I have never been to Canton Corners so I don't know.

- Rondeau: Or are we looking to put something that is like Wolcott Street where there is Bob's and that type of thing. My understanding was that consensus was that we were trying to do something more towards Canton Commons. That being said what we or what can have we done that would prevent some of those anchor stores as Jim was mentioning from being a Super Wal-Mart I don't or the dollar store.
- Blais: We cannot do that. If one of those lower stores comes in we cannot say no to it. That is common sense.
- Rondeau: Okay everybody is sitting here and saying to everybody this is what we are going to do, we are going to put in this entire high end. No one can sit here and say this what we are going to put in, because you could get Super Wal-Mart, Kmart, and Target six of the lower end stores.
- Blais: Absolutely why are we wasting our time talking about it?
- George: We talked about business last week when you were here.
- Blais: You cannot say because the name is a certain name you can't come in.
- Rondeau: I need to bring up Glen asked several questions that we all knew the answers to because we were at past meetings so. I have the opportunity to discuss things and I will take that opportunity now thank you. I am not trying to be confrontational what I am trying to do is trying to figure how or what we can do.
- Blais: This is just common sense don't you have that common sense.
- Rondeau: If it is common sense why isn't it in here? We need to do something whatever that is. I haven't had the opportunity to read this could you tell me where in this document this information might be found.
- Minnich: That is where the intent is for the higher quality. The intent also for the higher quality in terms is the process that we have developed which is obviously the overlay zone but the classic site plan they have to give an overall general site plan. And they have to give a number of things a traffic study it is all listed what they have to do. They are required to answer all of the questions that we spent long time on it on our plan of conservation and development they need to answer that at the time of the general site plan. But all of the general site plan information is required at the time they present the overlay. Are you following me?
- Rondeau: Yes

Minnich: All the answers to which we said we wanted to have we should have at the time that they present to us an application for an overlay zone. No when they do the overlay zone presented they are not approving the general site plan they to do it again or make any changes when they do the general site plan.

Masayda: Yes but you are saying that you are approving the overlay zone ahead of time?

Minnich: No we are not laying the zone, what we are doing, one of the concepts that I thought we had gone through was that we wanted to be as clear as possible to the developer as to what we were looking at in terms what our expectations were. The document says we would like you to do a variety of things in combination with regards to changing the fisad and the colors. That is what and we will know what those are at the time in their conceptual plan at the time they give us the overlay zone.

Masayda: During the whole conceptual time when does the overlay zone actually get put down?

Minnich: Gets down when they submit that information to us.

Masayda: So things could change after that during the site plan?

Minnich: Sure they can change.

Masayda: So why not do it like a floating zone or the overlay zone that gets approved afterwards where if they do not do everything as we require then we don't have to lay it down. Why not do it in that regard?

Minnich: That is another meeting as far as the laying of the project? That is the very issue which Konover and others that have heard and listened to that have a problem that even having wanting to come to (inaudible) and that is a statement I made before hand our goal was to be as clear as possible as to what we expected. So if we write down now and spend the time telling what we expect then we have no reason to change our minds later on and this is the expectation the fears that developers and Konover is one of them, we come to you with an application and we don't know what you want to do or if you are going to do it or not do it. This attempts to give definition to what are our expectations. And that is why it takes twenty pages to write it out.

Rondeau: I am looking at a couple of things like 36.6 point so on and so forth you have things like overhangs and roof slopes and materials and colors and so on and so forth, do you think those cosmetic issues are going to keep one type of store out vs. another? I think like a dollar store would not come in because they had to have only 2 slopes on the roof vs...

Minnich: Let's be realistic a dollar store coming in is never going to develop that site. The site is going to be developed by a developer in a combination of a lot of stores. So the problem has always been and will always be here that the brand name store that goes in there we don't have control over. So the control we have is what is in the zoning issues in terms of what the site is going to look like, the parking lots, the paths, and the building facade is going to look like and what goes in there is not in our control.

Rondeau: I think most people would agree that the stores that are considered by most to be the lower grade stores tend to be the Wal-Mart's, the Kmart's, the bigger box stores.

Mancini: How could you say that Wal-Mart is the lower grade, is probably one of the biggest corporations in the world.

Rondeau: Just because they are the biggest corporation in the world that doesn't mean that the kind of quality that is not considered a high quality store.

Minnich: Any conversation that you going to have with regards to brand name store we can't address. That is the round of discussion we had and we have had that from day one we can't define the brand name store that goes in there. We don't have that authority all we can do is from a zoning perspective define what the site should look like. I think we have in this proposal and I hope we will make some improvements if not that we design the park, or we talked about parking lots, we talked about how this should be in relationship to the islands and the stripping and the quality of the parking lots and so forth and so on. I don't how much more we can do but if you have some ideas short of naming the names of stores in there. By all means help us to put it in here.

Rondeau: Then I will bring up something that I brought on numerous occasions that the I think one thing we could do to increase the quality of the store is to limit the store size.

- Mancini: How many times have we discussed store size Ray? I don't care if you have the floor or not how many times have we said the subcommittee meetings that we are not going to change the floor sites. You voted on it a year ago they voted down 50,000 square feet you tried to bring it up five or six times already we said no. It is not going to happen and keep on bringing it up why?
- Rondeau: Carl yelled at me last time for bringing it up it is your turn today.
- Mancini: Because Mike it is done with, we voted on it. The prices are minimal why not do these, but Mark Tedesco wanted something two weeks you said oh no he don't have to do it is only 24 feet fine and good. But down there you got to do something else you talk both ways too. I am telling Ray you do and if you came to the meetings enough you would know what you were talking about you would know we already talked about this. And you should have been prepared for tonight's meeting.
- Rondeau: I am sorry you have a lot more time than perhaps some of us.
- Masayda: The point that Ray is trying to make is like I brought up last week how do you have high quality with unlimited square footage and we already talked about it last week.
- Mancini: But we talked about it all the time. You keep on taking consensus. We knocked it down. We are not going to limit the 50,000 square feet.
- Dupliese: Square footage I don't think we are going to limit. As far as the kind of stores that are going to come in here then the cost that it is going to take to develop this site. It is going to take an awful lot of money to develop this. So the developer is going to be at 30 or 40 dollars a square foot just the site work on this site. Then you got the building on top of that. Duane George will tell you he has built a bunch of them. Then you have to outfit the inside of the building. You are not going to get a dollar store that is going to come in here and rent it for \$4.00 dollars a square foot. The developer is not if he rents it for \$4.00 dollars a square foot to a dollar store he is going to lose his shirt. He got to rent it to high end for 20 or 22 dollars a square foot all day long. So I don't know what we are arguing about. The low end the high end it's going to be high end the developer is not going be able to afford to put anybody in there.
- Mancini: I agree keep on hearing. I keep on hearing square footage, the square footage determines the high end store or not and we talked about it at the last meeting.

Dupliese: The last Commission said they were going to bring industry well that was 20 years ago and you see any industry on that site. No it is a different Planning and Zoning Commission let's take our chance now it is us now okay it is not somebody else running it now it is somebody else it is us. It looks like we have enough here to change this and to make it right and to bring in some high end people onto this site and bring some taxes into the town.

Rondeau: That is not our concern in Planning and Zoning.

Dupliese: We want taxes that are what we are doing this for.

Rondeau: Planning and Zoning was not designed nor is it purpose to worry about the tax structure of the town of Watertown.

Minnich: I disagree that one of the purposes of the planning and development as stated in state statues is just that is taxation and the diversity of the tax base and diversity of zoning is one of the issues but anyway. Ray I am going to make this statement as I said before the task that we are now doing to brining this to public hearing and the statement that I made to you before on this issue is that we have taken a consensus on this issue for brining this document to public hearing if the issue of size of the buildings is not a topic that we are going to have for a discussion on. We voted on that as a consensus and so if there is any more discussion I will just move along.

Masayda: So the floating zone is off did we ever take a vote on that? The floating zone should be done.

Dupliese: She said as far as it goes...

Masayda: It should be laid down at the final stage after site plan not before site plan approval and the reason for that is that could be a lot of offsite improvements that could cost the community a lot of money where if that is occurring that we could say we are not going to lay the zone down because you are not in the best interest of the town.

Minnich: Chuck would be ready for next Wednesday there is a possibility you want to meet next Wednesday and potentially finalize this document in terms of brining this to public hearing is that okay with everybody's schedule. So we have a meeting every Wednesday of this month.

Masayda: Are you going to take a little breather here so we can do something else.

Dupliese: If you cannot make there are alternates.

Minnich: We will do that then is there anything else this evening? Hearing none is there a motion to adjourn? Is there a second? Any further discussion all those in favor please say I, all those opposed no motion carries unanimously.

Text of Motion: For purposes of the draft that is going to the public hearing we will leave as is the issue of the word “encourage” and everything on this whole document is open for discussion and decision again at the public hearing.

Text of Motion: Before we forward the draft to ourselves and staff, the Commission members should have an opportunity to consider the draft before it is forwarded to others.

Motion made by: M. Masayda and seconded by: D. Minnich

Aye: M. Masayda, R. Rondeau

Nay: D. Minnich, R. Russ, C. Mancini, G. Dupliese, J. Blais,
K. Demirs, D. George

On a vote of 2 in favor and 7 opposed, the motion is not approved.

Text of Motion: Adjourn at 9:54PM

Motion made by R. Russ and seconded by C. Mancini

All in favor and none opposed.

Michael Masayda _____
Secretary

Planning and Zoning Commission
Special Meeting/Route 262
Wednesday, September 17, 2008
Page20