SEYMOUR PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Public Hearing Minutes
June 8, 2017
Norma Drummer Room, Town Hall

Members Present:  J. Ziehl, W. Birdsell, J. Hanewicz

Member Absent:  T. Lavranchuk, J. Niezelski, G. Vasas

Others Present:  Bill Paecht, ZEO, Brian Nesteriak, Town Engineer,

Seymour Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on June 8, 2017 in the Norma Drummer Room, Seymour Town Hall starting at 7:00 p.m. This hearing will be on an application for a special permit to allow the completion of Phase 2 of Great Oak Residential Community, 45 Spring Street and Summer Brook Way. The completion of Phase 2 involves the construction of 12 townhouse units and associated site improvements. Project plans are on file in the Town Planner’s Office. The hearing was opened.

Jim Pendry, owner of Summit Seymour LLC, the developer of the project. He stated that the first phase was developed with 34 units. He stated that he purchased the adjoining 2 1/2 acre parcel and went through an approval for additional 22 units. He stated that those were started in the beginning of 2007. He stated that basically the project was stopped until about a year ago. He stated that he has financing now and is ready to go.

Mr. Ziehl asked if had a copy of the comment letter from the town engineer. Mr. Pendry stated that he did and will be addressing those.

Atty. Chris Smith, Shipman & Goodman representing the applicant. He stated that they just received the comment letter and will be addressing those and generating additional materials. He stated that they would like to make their presentation and know that they do have to provide additional information for the town engineer to review. He stated that they have a Wetlands hearing scheduled for the end of the month. He stated that a different town engineer is handling the Wetlands review and they are hopeful to have information for both town engineers.

Atty. Smith stated that there was an approval in 2007 for Phase 2 for the 22 units. He stated that approval expired in the fall. He stated that they chose to file a new application. He stated that essentially they are asking for re-approval of what was approved in 2007. He stated that there have been some changes relative to the unit types. They will be the same square footage. There have not been any substantial material change with the proposal itself.
Ted Hart, engineer, Milone and MacBroom stated it is substantially the same plan that was previously approved. He stated that the first two buildings contained units 1 through 10. The units in the first building has six units which are longer and narrower. The next four buildings have units that are little wider and not quite as steep from the back. He pointed out where the setback was changed. He stated that the plan is to extend the 24 foot wide road to the end and create a turnaround. The drainage system remains basically the same. They also presented a soil and erosion control plan. He stated that there was a comment that units 11 through 16 did not comply with the side yard setback. He stated that they look at that and believe that they do meet the setbacks. He stated that they submitted a traffic study and the levels of service remain the same.

Mr. Birdsell stated that he spoke with Mr. Looker and he seemed to have a problem with the six units in a row. He stated that Mr. Looker also had concerns with the last driveway. Mr. Birdsell asked about fire access to the rear of the buildings and Atty. Smith stated that fire access can be achieved from the front of the buildings.

Mr. Nesteriak stated that in his comments did not address the setbacks but another issue. He stated that the units should be staggered. He stated that he also had some concerns with the circulation on the property.

Mr. Nesteriak stated that he does not know about any architectural drawings that were submitted and that is a requirement of a site plan approval. Atty. Smith stated that they were submitted to the Building Department. Mr. Nesteriak stated that the application did not include architectural drawings which are required in the zoning regulations. He stated that they are trying to submit them now and they do not match what is being asked to be approved. Atty. Smith stated that the plans have to be modified because the buildings need to be staggered. He stated that Building 2 is not a submission and that will be done within the week. He also stated that they will be getting the information requested by Mr. Nesteriak and was just explaining what is being proposed. He stated that they will get everything together and submitted.

M. Nesteriak stated that plans need to be adapted. He also stated that the soil and erosion control plan submitted will cause a lot of disturbance to those units.

Mr. Ziehl asked for any public comment.

Cynthia Lucas, 270 Pearl Street stated that the buildings will be higher than some of the houses in the area and was concerned about water from an adjacent property. At one time there was going to be a walking trail and that has never been maintained. She stated that the Spring Street side of the property is overgrown. She was concerned with a lot of dwellings in a small area.
Claude Traver stated that there is a blind spot on Spring Street and you cannot see cars pulling out of this development.

Mr. Pendry stated that the walking trail system is the responsibility of the condominium association. He stated that no one was really using it so it was not maintained. He stated that they will be doing some screening to the residential lot.

MOTION: J. Hanewicz/T. Lavranchuk/ to continue the public hearing to the July meeting at 7:00 p.m.  
Motion Carried 3-0.

The public hearing was closed at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maryanne DeTullio, Recording Secretary