CITY OF DANBURY

155 DEER HILL AVENUE
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT 06810

PLANNING COMMISSION
(203) 797-4525
(203) 797-4586 (FAX)

MINUTES
MARCH 17, 2010

%%%

Joseph Canas, PE from Tighe & Bond said the Planning Dept. had made several request regading the sidewalks and cross walks. He said this plan eliminates and any connection to the Duchess site. He said they ended up eliminating a few compact spaces in the back of the building to accommodate the truck turning. He then said regarding stormwater management, this land is very conducive to infiltration which is a positive thing. Catch basins directed toward infiltration system also is a relief in case of failure. He explained that these plans are subject to Health Dept review because this is within an environmentally sensitive area. They are still in process of addressing the Engineering Dept. comments. Chairman Finaldi asked him to point out the site of the oil spill. He did and then Attorney Jaber said that a point of clarification, there is a difference between the Public Water Supply Watershed District and the Aquifer Protection District.

Joseph Balskus, PE & Traffic Engineer from Tighe & Bond said he had prepared the traffic study and speak about it briefly this evening. Since the previously approved plan was never developed, they had to try a new approach because of the State Traffic Commission (STC). They came up with a plan to move the driveway and after three-to-four meetings with both the STC and the Dept. of Transportation (DOT), they came up with this plan. It was DOT's idea to widen the travel lanes. There already were so many signalized intersections that was not an option. Since the shoulders on both sides were fairly wide, DOT suggested using them as bypass areas. They also wanted to keep the left hand turn where it was. Mr. Balskus said the traffic study was prepared based on all of this.
He said they have a perpetual easement. Mr. Keller asked if the left turn lane is wide enough for a car to pass by a car waiting to turn. Mr. Balskus said the DOT standard for bypass is 20 ft. and they also have a dimensional requirement on the length of the bypass lane. He said there is no problem turning left here and people will be directed by signage to the other driveway. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if there will be any improvements needed to accommodate the additional traffic. Mr. Balskus said none for this project. He added that although the Master Plan for The Reserve didn't have any improvements east of Old Ridgebury Rd., the proposed improvements for the Prindle La. project were extensive. He added that those volumes and improvements are included in this traffic study even though those developments are not done. This means that no matter what, these improvements have to be done, even if the others are not built out. There were no improvements to the exit ramp, only to Mill Plain Rd. They did new traffic counts because the previous ones did not include the weekend counts. He said he just wanted them to know that a lot of traffic volumes built into this report are not there now and may not be there ever. And the end result is that there was no significant impact despite including volumes from these other proposed developments.

Mr. Urice asked when the Prindle La. counts were taken. Mr. Balskus said at the end of 2008, but the Commission did not get them until 2009. Mr. Urice asked why they used the 7th edition of the ITE studies. Mr. Balskus said although the 8th edition is out, this report was prepared before they had received it at his office. He said he would check to be sure that nothing has changed between the two editions. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if the bypass lane would be marked. Mr. Balskus said it would not. Ms. Hoffstaetter then asked about the truck turning plan. Mr. Canas said it is not done yet.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to this and there was no one.

Mrs. Emminger asked that they continue the public hearing since we are waiting for revisions to be submitted by the applicant.

Mr. Keller made a motion to continue the public hearing. Mr. Urice seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

NNNN

Mr. Keller read the legal notice. Attorney Neil Marcus spoke in favor of this. He said the Wooster School campus consists of 111 acres. The parcel they are talking about creating consists of 17 acres and is located at the top of the parcel with frontage on Noteworthy Dr. He explained that this same subdivision was approved in 2009, but they never had the final mylar signed. The school was not sure what they wanted to do and now they are back before this Commission asking that they reapprove what they approved before. Since that time, they have hired a new surveyor and a new engineer. This is important because the staff report indicates that they did not comply with the last report from the City Engineering Dept. The reason was because it had to do with what was necessary in order to pull a zoning permit. He added that the application has also been revised to show that the only lot affected by this would be #E19001. During the previous hearings, there was a lot of public concern about the impact to the traffic on Noteworthy Dr., so this new Engineering firm has analyzed the access options for this new parcel. Mrs. Emminger said to clarify this, any comments only apply to what the Dept. has seen which is not a formal submission at this time. They just wanted to advise the applicant of what could be necessary if the proposed development includes more than the 17 acre parcel that this subdivision will create. At this time, Mr. Keller made a motion to incorporate the entire contents of the previous application file into this application. Ms. Hoffstaetter seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition to this and two people came forward.

Marie O'Neill, 14 Greta Dr., asked how many residences there would be in a cluster development on this property. Mrs. Emminger explained that a lot of the property on Greta Dr. is wetlands and also the Airport beacon is there. She added that it also is part of the reserved open space area for this subdivision, so it will have to remain that way.

Lisa Davis, 12 Greta Dr., said this area has always been wooded and secluded. She wants to be sure that they are not going to be looking at a big development. Mrs. Emminger said most of the required open space area is located along the Greta Dr. area. She added that if a cluster development comes before this Commission that would be the forum for these kinds of comments.

Mrs. Emminger said they are waiting for revisions to the subdivision map to be submitted.

Mr. Keller made a motion to continue the public hearing. Ms. Hoffstaetter seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

%%%

Ben Doto, PE, then said they have addressed all the things that they had spoken about at the previous meeting. They have agreed to put sidewalks on all three sides including ramps where there are curbs. They pulled the curb line down a little bit to make a smaller loading zone. They restricted the exit to left-turn only and they altered the internal connector to prevent people from going the wrong way. He said those changes were in response to Building, Highway and the City Traffic Engineer. The Engineering letter was all technical issues which they are working on with them. And in response to the Planning Dept. comments, a note has been added about the lighting and street trees have been added to the landscaping plan. He said they had gotten a variance because the property has four front yards and there was some question as to meeting the landscaping requirements for the same reason. He added that the only other thing they changed was they increased the width of the snow shelf from three to five feet at the request of the City Traffic Engineer. So they believe they have addressed all of the comments and issues. Ms. Hoffstaetter asked if the was any concern about people using the new passway unnecessarily. Mr. Balskus answered saying that is not something to be concerned about since it is built to City road standards. He added that not too many people use it anyway.

Mrs. Emminger said that revised plans were received on Monday, so comments are not back but she sees no reason to keep this open. Mr. Urice asked her if she was sure about this. Mrs. Emminger said if there are any issues, they can be conditioned in the resolution. Mr. Keller made a motion to close the public hearing. Ms. Hoffstatter seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously. Mr. Urice then made a motion to move this to number two under the Old Business so they could give Mrs. Emminger some guidance for the resolution. Ms. Hoffstatter seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

%%%

to submit a lighting plan also. There was no further discussion and Mrs. Emminger said she would get the draft resolution out to the Commission members for their review.

%%%