

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TOWN OF WEST HARTFORD

TOWN COUNCIL PUBLIC HEARING  
February 27, 2018, 6:45 p.m.,  
Legislative Chambers

Re: Application on behalf of Ringgold  
Crescent Partners, LLC, for Special  
Development District Designation for the 1.33  
Acre Patrissi Nursery Site at 35 Ringgold and  
34 Crescent Streets in the RM-1 Zone, to  
Remove the Existing Structures and Create the  
Townhomes at Ringgold Estates, a Community of  
25 Townhomes in 5 Buildings, Mark Lovely and  
Anthony M. Valenti, Members, and Co-Trustees  
of the Richard F. Patrissi Trust, Owner.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A p p e a r a n c e s :

Town Council Members Present:

- MAYOR SHARI CANTOR
- LIAM SWEENEY
- LEON DAVIDOFF
- CHRIS BARNES
- MARY FAY
- CHRIS WILLIAMS
- BETH KERRIGAN
- BEN WENOGRAD

Alternate:

- KATE FARRAR
  
- PATRICK ALAIR
- Corporation Counsel
  
- DUANE MARTIN
- Town Engineer
  
- ESSIE LABROT
- Town Clerk

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

A p p e a r a n c e s :

For the Applicant:

ALTER & PEARSON, LLC  
701 Hebron Avenue  
Glastonbury, Connecticut 06033

By: ROBIN M. PEARSON, ESQ.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay. We are  
calling the 6:45 public hearing to order,  
application on behalf of Ringgold Crescent  
Partners, LLC, for special development  
district designation for the 1.33-acre  
Patrissi Nursery site at 35 Ringgold and 34  
Crescent Streets in the RM-1 zone, to remove  
the existing structures and create the  
Townhomes at Ringgold Estates, a community of  
25 townhomes in 5 Buildings; Mark Lovely and  
Anthony M. Valenti, Members, and Co-Trustees  
of the Richard F. Patrissi Trust, Owner.

Rollcall, Ms. Labrot?

MS. LABROT: Mr. Barnes.

COUNCILOR BARNES: Present.

MS. LABROT: Ms. Cantor.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Here.

MS. LABROT: Mr. Davidoff.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Here.

MS. LABROT: Mr. Dodge is absent.

We have Kate Farrar sitting in for Mr. Dodge.

MS. FARRAR: Here.

MS. LABROT: Ms. Fay.

COUNCILOR FAY: Here.

MS. LABROT: Ms. Kerrigan.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Here.

5

MS. LABROT: Mr. Sweeney.

COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Here.

MS. LABROT: Mr. Wenograd.

COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Here.

MS. LABROT: And Mr. Williams.

COUNCILOR WILLIAMS: Here.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.

Labrot.

Do we have a presentation from the applicant?

MS. PEARSON: Good evening, Madam Mayor, members of the Council. My name is Robin Pearson. I'm an attorney with the Law Firm of Alter & Pearson in Glastonbury, Connecticut, and I'm pleased to be here this evening on behalf of the applicant, Ringgold Crescent Partners, LLC.

This particular LLC, or company was formed to be able to proceed with this application. The LLC has entered into a contract to purchase the site previously known as the Patrissi Nursery which had been in business for decades and decades at the site of 35 Ringgold and 34 Crescent. They

1 entered into the purchase agreement with the 6  
2 intent to both buy the property, permit it,  
3 and develop it for 25 townhome units on the  
4 site.

5 I have provided to the Clerk a copy  
6 of the sign affidavit indicating that it has  
7 been posted for the requisite seven days  
8 before this hearing.

9 The purpose of our application is  
10 to secure a special development district  
11 approval for 25 townhome units. They're  
12 going to be dispersed through the site within  
13 five different buildings. The density that's  
14 proposed is allowed by the underlying RM-1,  
15 or RM-1 residential zone and the uses are  
16 also allowed by the underlying zone. So the  
17 application before you tonight does not have  
18 any impact on, or propose to change the  
19 underlying zone at all.

20 Frankly, I think you might want to  
21 keep this in mind as you consider this  
22 application, but for the need or the desire  
23 to create a better development by using the  
24 special development district process, which  
25 is a process created to allow for better

1 aesthetics and design within a development  
2 framework, this application could have been  
3 approved as of right by the Town Planner  
4 without having to come before this board.

7

5 Let me elaborate on that a little bit more.

6           The reason the applicant is here is  
7 because this special development district  
8 application requests relief from -- I believe  
9 it's five standards of the underlying RM-1  
10 zone. And they deal with things such as  
11 setbacks, the number of signs for the  
12 entrance to the driveway, but primarily  
13 setbacks both from buildings, within each  
14 other, within the development itself and also  
15 from the street.

16           Some of the design changes that are  
17 exemplified in this application are as a  
18 result of suggestions from staff as to things  
19 that would make a better development,  
20 bringing the building a little bit forward on  
21 the street.

22           But if the applicant did not need  
23 to get any of those design changes from the  
24 standard, or permission from you to be able  
25 to proceed without adhering to those design

1 standards, the applicant could have done this 8  
2 approval entirely as of right by going to the  
3 Town Planner and submitting an application  
4 for a site plan review.

5 Indeed the underlying zone, the  
6 RM-1 zone would allow as of right 57 units on  
7 this particular 1.33-acre property. So 25  
8 are being proposed here. Twenty-five is  
9 significantly less than the density that  
10 would be allowed overall.

11 And the reason we have to come to  
12 you for the SDD is because we're seeking some  
13 relief from some of those design standards in  
14 the zone, not for density, not for height,  
15 not for building massing, but basically for  
16 building setbacks within the RM-1 zone.

17 So that said, we are here. So we  
18 have to go through the process and we do need  
19 you to consider this application by applying  
20 all the standards of your SDD regulation and  
21 deciding that indeed those changes that are  
22 requested make sense, and this application is  
23 appropriate for approval.

24 I'll quickly go through who's here  
25 and how we will effectuate our presentation



1           tonight. The two partners in Ringgold 9

2           Crescent Partners, LLC, are Mark Lovely and,  
3           we'll call him "Tony" Valenti.

4                       And Mark has done development in  
5           the town of West Hartford before, he is  
6           President of Lovely Development, Inc, a fully  
7           licensed and insured homebuilding business  
8           that serves primarily Plantsville,  
9           Connecticut, and the surrounding areas since  
10          1985.

11                      His companies have built between  
12          themselves over -- or nearly 1,200 homes  
13          including several in West Hartford. His  
14          company also purchases, renovates and manages  
15          various types of commercial properties  
16          including shopping plazas, apartment  
17          buildings and professional office space. So  
18          Mark has a great deal of experience in the  
19          development of real estate.

20                      His partner Tony Valenti is a  
21          managing member of New England Hotels, LLC, a  
22          hotel company established in 2000, and is a  
23          business partner in two Hilton Inns, by  
24          Hampton Hotels in Connecticut. He's also a  
25          licensed real estate broker partnering with

1 the R. Calabrese agency and specializes in 10  
2 commercial real estate, and owns and/or  
3 manages numerous mixed-use and residential  
4 properties.

5 They want you to know that with --  
6 as is true as to all of their developments,  
7 their intent is to bring forth a development  
8 that is worthy of West Hartford, a  
9 high-quality residential development and to  
10 make significant investment in the town  
11 itself through this particular application.

12 Also here as part of the team --  
13 and they won't be speaking, but they can  
14 certainly answer any questions that you might  
15 have, but also here as part of the team is  
16 Brandon Handfield. He is the owner of Yantic  
17 River Consultants, LLC, a civil engineering  
18 firm located in Lebanon, Connecticut.

19 And he has done all of the  
20 preparation of the plan primarily that you've  
21 seen. He has over 18 years of experience as  
22 a civil engineer and in the site development  
23 field.

24 He will do -- once I sit down, he  
25 will go through the specifics of the

1 application for you. We will use a 11  
2 PowerPoint, and we've done that so the screen  
3 will come down so that people in the audience  
4 will have a chance to see what you are  
5 looking at also as you evaluate this  
6 application.

7 He will be followed by me. I'm  
8 going to stand in for our traffic consultant  
9 who is unable to be here tonight. And you do  
10 have his report, and you do have a report  
11 from the town traffic -- or engineering  
12 department with regard to their review of his  
13 traffic report, which is positive. But I  
14 will quickly go through our traffic report as  
15 he has presented it to you, and then we'll be  
16 followed by Chuck Coursey.

17 You all know Chuck -- but for  
18 people in the audience who may not, Chuck  
19 Coursey is with Coursey & Company, and he has  
20 been handling all of the community outreach  
21 efforts for this proposal. And he will do a  
22 comprehensive presentation on what he has  
23 learned. As he has reached out on behalf of  
24 the applicant to the community.

25 So with that, I'm going to ask for

1 the screen to come down and dim the lights, 12  
2 and Brandon will come up and go through the  
3 application for you.

4 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Okay. While we  
5 wait for the screen to come down, again my  
6 name is Brandon Handfield with Yantic River  
7 Consultants. I'm a professional engineer  
8 licensed in the state of Connecticut with  
9 over 18 years of experience.

10 And my presentation tonight will  
11 walk you through the existing site briefly.  
12 And I'll also spend a little time going  
13 through the proposed development, the  
14 buildings, the drainage very quickly, the  
15 utilities, landscaping and answer any other  
16 questions you may have.

17 So I did come prepared should we  
18 have any technical difficulties. So I will  
19 grab the board -- and I apologize to the  
20 audience. I wish I had control.

21 Okay. I'll do my best from the  
22 board until it turns on. And when it does,  
23 we'll step back if there's any questions or  
24 if people can't see anything.

25 So to orient you on the site based

1 on this board here -- I know it's a little 13  
2 dark for a board, but to the right of your  
3 page is north. This would be Park Road, and  
4 the Park Road businesses on the north side.

5 Outlined in orange you will see the  
6 subject site which is 34 Crescent Street.  
7 Crescent Street is on the top of the page, or  
8 to the west -- and 35 Ringgold Street which  
9 is along Ringgold, which kind of goes through  
10 the middle of the page. To the east of  
11 Ringgold Street you'll see the sisters of  
12 St. Joseph property here, mostly green space  
13 with the buildings located in the bottom  
14 corner.

15 It looks like we're almost there.  
16 Gillette Street is going to be  
17 situated to the south of our site -- and  
18 almost there.

19 Further to the south of our site at  
20 the end of Ringgold Street at the cul-de-sac  
21 you will see Kennedy Memorial Park. So  
22 that's about a 400-foot distance from our  
23 site to Kennedy Memorial Park, and as part of  
24 our presentation we are proposing to use that  
25 existing recreational amenity as part of this

1 development and the recreation space that we 14

2 hope to have. So again, there are sidewalks  
3 that lead pedestrians to that existing park,  
4 and we hope to use that.

5 And I'll do my best from the board  
6 if there's any questions. We can wait until  
7 the screen comes down. No problem.

8 I'll go really fast before it goes  
9 up again. Just for the purposes of making  
10 sure everybody can see it, I'll briefly go  
11 through this slide again.

12 To go to the right of the screen,  
13 for those of you that couldn't see behind me,  
14 is Park Road. To the left of the screen,  
15 which would be south, is Kennedy Memorial  
16 Park. Ringgold Street runs through the  
17 middle of the sheet, and our site is outlined  
18 in orange to the top center.

19 So Crescent Street would be to the  
20 west or above the orange, which is our site.  
21 Gillette Street would be to the south, and of  
22 course, we abut Ringgold Street through the  
23 center.

24 The existing site is two parcels,  
25 approximately 1.33 acres total. They will be

1 combined into one parcel as part of this 15  
2 development through a lot line revision plan,  
3 which we have submitted to the Town, and that  
4 will be filed on the land records once  
5 complete.

6 The existing site here and the  
7 aerial here, you can see the former Patrissi  
8 Nursery. So this is a 2016 aerial. So it's  
9 a pretty recent shot. It is at the tail end  
10 of their operation. So I've been there a  
11 number of times and the existing site has not  
12 been cared for in a number of years.

13 So there is grass growing through  
14 the old gravel lots. There is some remnants  
15 of the old hoop houses still there. So you  
16 can see in the center there this white is an  
17 old hoop house, and then the two buildings  
18 are located in the south corner of the lot.

19 In general the topography here is  
20 very flat. So down here is very flat and  
21 it's basically almost the same grade as  
22 Ringgold Street. So that's where they had  
23 their main operation in terms of outdoor  
24 parking, plant storage.

25 And then as you get further to the

1 south here at the existing buildings there is 16  
2 a slope up to Gillette Street. It's about a  
3 six to eight-foot grade change there. And  
4 then as you make your way up to Crescent  
5 Street there is a series of stepped retaining  
6 walls and a stepped grade that's about a ten  
7 to twelve-foot grade change up to Crescent  
8 Street.

9 So in prospective view, when you're  
10 standing at Crescent and Crosby Street you're  
11 actually about twelve feet above Ringgold  
12 Street. And you'll see later as we get into  
13 our development that we did take advantage of  
14 that slope to try to minimize the scope of  
15 our work and the visual impact of these  
16 buildings.

17 In terms of vegetation there's not  
18 a lot of vegetation on the existing site.  
19 There are some remaining plants that they may  
20 have planted as part of their operation. I'm  
21 not quite sure. And then as you get over to  
22 Gillette Street there are some existing pine  
23 trees or similar type trees that are growing  
24 along the existing fence there, but other  
25 than that there's not a lot of significant



1 vegetation on the site.

17

2 All right. Before the screen turns  
3 off again -- moving onto the proposed  
4 development. The first step to this will be  
5 removing or demolishing all the existing  
6 buildings and hoop houses on the site. And  
7 what you see in front of you are the five  
8 buildings, all basically in a pink or  
9 orange-ish color.

10 So you have three buildings along  
11 Ringgold Street. There will be five units in  
12 building one, seven units in building two,  
13 six units in building three. And then as you  
14 work your way up the site there will be two  
15 buildings with frontage on Crescent Street.  
16 Building four will have three units.  
17 Building five will have four units.

18 Making your way up here you will  
19 see that there are three larger units as  
20 compared to the rest of them. Those are the  
21 handicapped accessible units. So there  
22 there's a bedroom, a kitchen, a bathroom, all  
23 the necessary living amenities on that first  
24 floor and will be directly accessible from  
25 the parking areas or driveways off of

1 Crescent Street.

18

2           So we have two parking areas here.  
3 They have been designed to allow for  
4 handicapped parking. Theirs is up there, so  
5 they're all code compliant in terms of size,  
6 however there can be a situation where that  
7 space can be re-stripped based on occupancy.  
8 So we do meet the ADA requirement for  
9 handicapped accessible spaces, but we don't  
10 want to make them all accessible should there  
11 be somebody living up there and can't park.

12           As you make your way down the main  
13 access to the site will be through a 24-foot  
14 wide paved access drive from Ringgold Street.  
15 There will also be a sidewalk parallel to the  
16 driveway as you enter the site. And  
17 basically that will serve the entire -- all  
18 of the garages and most of the interior  
19 parking.

20           So all of the traffic that is local  
21 or typically going to use these buildings on  
22 a daily basis will be through this entrance  
23 here. So every garage, even the ones up on  
24 Crescent will be served as drive-under  
25 garages served from that entrance. So there

1 will be no through access from the 19  
2 intersection of Crescent and Crosby to the  
3 west.

4 Let's see here. In terms of  
5 parking, so each unit has a drive-under  
6 garage. So you can see each driveway  
7 entrance into the garage -- and which will be  
8 a drive-under. It's an oversized garage. I  
9 believe it's twelve feet wide with a  
10 nine-foot door. So it can perfectly  
11 accommodate those 25 parking spaces. So  
12 those are included in our parking count.

13 We also have 15 exterior parking  
14 spaces. So you'll see a bay here. A regular  
15 standard parking space is 9 by 18. We have  
16 one handicapped accessible space here which  
17 also happens to be near our proposed outdoor  
18 recreational amenity and the mail pad, and  
19 can service the entire lower portion of the  
20 site. So there would be accessibility to all  
21 the lower garages from there.

22 As you make your way further to the  
23 west towards Crescent Street there are six --  
24 seven, I apologize, seven drive-under garages  
25 there. There's no outdoor parking, but again

1 we have 40 total parking spaces which exceeds 20  
2 the town standard for a multifamily  
3 development.

4 We talked briefly about pedestrian  
5 access. So there will be an interconnection  
6 between our development and a sidewalk along  
7 Ringgold Street. I will speak a little bit  
8 more about the condition of the right-of-way  
9 in the street and the sidewalk in Ringgold in  
10 a minute, but as you make your way onto the  
11 site there will be a concrete sidewalk.  
12 Again that basically spills to the center of  
13 the site where the mail pad is.

14 There will be a direct connection  
15 to the outdoor patio and the handicapped  
16 accessible space. So every everything from  
17 the lower portion of the site will have  
18 direct access to Ringgold, and that direct  
19 access through a sidewalk will serve Kennedy  
20 Memorial Park and be a pedestrian -- or a  
21 walkable pedestrian connection to your  
22 existing amenity.

23 So while we're on it -- I'll be  
24 quicker. So while we're on this, Ringgold  
25 Street, right now you can see the limit of

1 pavement basically goes right up to the  
2 property line, and that was a function of the  
3 form of business. So the Patrissi Nursery,  
4 you know, I was not a client of theirs, nor  
5 had I visited the site when it was under  
6 operation, but it did appear to be parallel  
7 parking where people came off the street to  
8 access their facility in addition to getting  
9 into the gravel parking areas here.

10 So right now there's no sidewalk  
11 along the frontage and the street is very  
12 wide. There is a sidewalk that exists to the  
13 north that interconnects with Park Road, and  
14 there is a sidewalk to the south that  
15 interconnects with Kennedy Memorial Park.

16 This is a gap, and in our  
17 conversations with the engineering department  
18 it was intentionally not done because of the  
19 operation of Patrissi. We have an  
20 opportunity now to work with the Town as part  
21 of this development to actually improve that  
22 section of the road. You will see in a  
23 minute there's utility improvements as well  
24 as the right-of-way improvements.

25 So we show what the Town may be

1 doing, or will likely be doing. We don't 22  
2 have a final design on that road. So the way  
3 we designed our site is up to the property  
4 line with the assumption and anticipation of  
5 the engineering department and the public  
6 works department working in parallel to  
7 finish this part of the road. And we have  
8 had conversations with them about that.

9 So what you will have as part of  
10 this development is a four-foot wide concrete  
11 sidewalk that interconnects the existing all  
12 the way to Gillette Street to the south. You  
13 will likely have a grass shoulder to match  
14 the existing condition and you will have a  
15 road that's less wide than currently exists,  
16 but will blend in with the road that's  
17 located to the north and to the south.

18 Those details will be fleshed out  
19 as we go along, but at the end of the day  
20 there will be a sidewalk along the entire  
21 frontage of the site all the way up to the  
22 southwest corner where it intersects to an  
23 existing sidewalk -- right about there --  
24 that you can see.

25 On this plan are all of the items

1 that we're requesting flexibility to the 23

2 zoning regulations as part of this process.

3 I'd be happy to go through them -- unless

4 Attorney Pearson would like to go through

5 them. And I can highlight them as we go.

6 We are asking for a reduction in

7 the building line from 23 feet to 17 and a

8 half feet along Ringgold Street. So you see

9 this is the existing veranda line. And right

10 behind that you'll see there is the

11 existing -- or the documented building line

12 for Ringgold Street, which is 23 feet.

13 Our buildings are located farther

14 east than that, and that actually came about

15 as part of our conversation with the Design

16 Review Advisory Committee.

17 As we went through the process our

18 buildings were actually located behind that

19 front building line, and they took it as an

20 opportunity to shift the buildings a little

21 closer to Ringgold Street, match in with what

22 you see here in terms of the other existing

23 residential structures. So that front face,

24 you will have a similar feel as you drive

25 down the road in terms of their proximity to

1 the street and also provide additional space  
2 to the rear.

24

3 So it allowed us to have a bigger  
4 vegetated area behind the garages and next to  
5 the driveway. So it was a comment that we  
6 took very seriously from the planning  
7 department and DRAC, and we felt it made it a  
8 better development. So we feel strongly that  
9 it's a good idea for that building line.

10 The second thing we're asking for,  
11 a reduction in side yard setback for building  
12 one. So building one is here, and you'll see  
13 here the side yard setback, we're requesting  
14 a reduction from the 16.7 feet to 14.2 feet.

15 So 16.7 feet is based on the  
16 average building height of building one, and  
17 that's from the average low eve to the  
18 average high peak from the average grade  
19 around it. So those calculations were  
20 performed, and we're requesting a side yard  
21 setback that's slightly less.

22 The reason for that basically is  
23 our original concepts had one very long  
24 building. And as we came about this process,  
25 again we felt that having three buildings



1 with air and space between them was a better  
2 product for this location rather than one  
3 long building as you drive down the street.

25

4 As part of that we wanted to  
5 provide minimum distance to allow light and  
6 air through them and also provide minimum  
7 distances here for the access drive. So we  
8 tried to maximize where we could while also  
9 appreciating that we had to get our driveway  
10 in, our grass shelves and our sidewalks.

11 So the other side yard setback we  
12 are requesting a reduction from is very  
13 minor, however it is -- a request for  
14 flexibility is building this one right  
15 here -- I believe. I wrote the wrong number  
16 down and I would have to zoom in, but this  
17 location right here I believe is the request.

18 And we're requesting from 15.6 feet  
19 to 15.5 feet. Again, that 15.6 is based on  
20 the average building height. So in this case  
21 the way it worked out with the proper  
22 separation for driveways and curves it ended  
23 up being 15.5. Not a huge variation, but it  
24 is less than the standard.

25 The third item is a reduction in

1 the minimum required open space. We spoke 26  
2 briefly. We are proposing open space in the  
3 center. It is a paver patio that's located  
4 right next to the mail pad and handicapped  
5 accessible parking space. The total area  
6 with landscaping around it is about 550  
7 square feet.

8 So this area right here, there is  
9 an outline in the plan. There are details  
10 included in the plan on what that paver patio  
11 is. So it is an Eco-Lock product. It will  
12 be a reddish color to match the brick facades  
13 on the building and blend in.

14 And in the center of it we are  
15 proposing a fire pit and grill area for the  
16 residents to use. There will be extensive  
17 landscaping around it. That is, the required  
18 recreation area for this development for 25  
19 units is 5,000 square feet. So we're  
20 proposing 550.

21 And again, with the investment  
22 we're making to improve the pedestrian access  
23 to this area we are requesting Kennedy  
24 Memorial Park be considered and we can reduce  
25 our recreation area.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The fourth item -- you've got to be quick -- is a reduction in the minimum distance between certain buildings. So building two and three, what you see here, we have 18 feet between them. There are regulations that discuss courtyards and distances between buildings.

Again, we had originally one long building, so there would have been another unit in there. We decided that separating the buildings, providing some gaps between them, an airspace was a better design. So we're requesting an 18-foot separation between the buildings, which I believe would be less than the 50-foot required minimum.

The same applies between buildings four and five up on Crescent Street. Those building face each other, technically, which would require a 50 to 75-foot separation. We provide 47 feet and that's a function of the width of the driveway and the necessary turning radius to get into the parking areas or the garages. Again, we wanted to keep that as tight as possible to provide the maximum side yard setbacks as well.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Two more items I will touch on

really quick. We are requesting to reduce the sign setback from Ringgold Street from 15 feet to 10 feet. We are proposing two brick pillar monument signs.

So I do have detail on these plans that I can get to if you would like, but they're three by three brick pillars and we'll either have a bronze or a brass, or wood plaque on them that has the name of the development. And we have one on each side right here and right here.

So as you drive in there will be two brick pillars. They're located 10 feet back from the property line rather than 15. That's a function of, one, if we move the buildings closer to the street so we didn't want the signs to be located right at the corner of the building. And two, the appearance of it so it won't impact site lines. It will fit in with the buildings.

As part of that we are also requesting a sign be put on both pillars. So the regulations state that you can only have one sign per street. We're requesting two

1 small plaque signs, one on each pillar. In 29  
2 total the sign area is less than the  
3 regulations allow. So we're asking for two  
4 small signs rather than one larger one.

5 I believe that covers all of the  
6 requests in our special development district  
7 application. If there's no questions, I'll  
8 move on and we'll quickly go through drainage  
9 and utilities.

10 PRESIDENT CANTOR: We just want to  
11 make sure there's no more questions.

12 Mr. Wenograd?

13 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Just on the  
14 western side, the designation on the top.  
15 What is that rectangle right there?

16 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Right there?

17 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: No, next to  
18 it, above it.

19 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Right here?

20 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: No, to the  
21 left. That.

22 BRANDON HANDFIELD: That is a  
23 landscape slope. So we talked about that  
24 steep slope that comes down now. We're  
25 mimicking that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Okay.

30

BRANDON HANDFIELD: So it's a two-to-one slope. It's entirely mulched and landscaped. So this entire area here is a four-foot high picket fence that connects to the two buildings and both -- on both sides of that.

So as you come down the slope towards our parking area there are a number of shrubs and foundation plantings proposed. On the Crescent side of that you will see some plantings to break up the appearance of that fence, but there is a white four-foot high picket fence that divides it.

COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: And can you show where the pedestrian access to the site is?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Sure. The main pedestrian access is here. It will come along the driveway.

There is an accessible ramp here and an accessible ramp here. Located right there is the mail pad, and this is the handicapped accessible space.

COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: And are there

1 others to the south?

31

2 BRANDON HANDFIELD: There are not.

3 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: The only  
4 pedestrian entrance is at --

5 BRANDON HANDFIELD: From a public  
6 perspective, yes. Each unit also has what  
7 would be considered a front stoop and  
8 sidewalk connection to the new sidewalk.

9 So there are -- I would have to do  
10 the math in my head real quick -- but 18  
11 sidewalks that interconnect with the Town's  
12 from their front stoop. And you'll see in  
13 the images that as we proceed with the  
14 presentation how that transitions between the  
15 building and the street.

16 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Okay. And  
17 then there's nothing on that, on the south?

18 BRANDON HANDFIELD: There's no  
19 interconnection between our site and Gillette  
20 Street, but we will be finishing the sidewalk  
21 along Gillette Street as part of this  
22 development.

23 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Okay. So  
24 you're at the edge of that parking in the far  
25 left corner. That's just a fence right

1 there.

32

2           BRANDON HANDFIELD: That is a  
3 one-way out.

4           COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Oh, that is?  
5 Okay.

6           BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes, one-way  
7 out. So I'm sorry. I should have done a  
8 better job with traffic and flow, but two-way  
9 here. Two-way here, and as you go behind the  
10 units this is all one way out to Gillette  
11 Street.

12           COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Okay. All  
13 right. So there's no pedestrian, but that  
14 is.

15           BRANDON HANDFIELD: That is in  
16 that.

17           COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: People would  
18 walk out that way?

19           BRANDON HANDFIELD: That's correct.

20           COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: All right.  
21 Thank you.

22           PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
23 Wenograd.

24           Mr. Sweeney?

25           COUNCILOR SWEENEY: You mentioned



1 that you have some sort of plans with the  
2 sidewalk on Crescent Street -- sorry. On  
3 Ringgold?

33

4 Is it your anticipation that you  
5 guys would cover the cost of putting the  
6 sidewalk together?

7 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes. As part  
8 of the review process the engineering  
9 department came up with what they believe the  
10 cost would be for them to construct a  
11 sidewalk as part of their road reconstruction  
12 project. They provided those numbers to us  
13 and we agreed to them.

14 So I believe it was 33,000 or  
15 30,000 dollars. It's in our response that we  
16 agreed to that number.

17 COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Okay. Thank  
18 you very much.

19 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Mr. Barnes?

20 COUNCILOR BARNES: Thank you.

21 In the middle there's like a heart  
22 shape kind of east to west through the middle  
23 of the property.

24 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Oh, this?

25 COUNCILOR BARNES: Yeah. What is

1 that? What does that indicate?

34

2 BRANDON HANDFIELD: That is the  
3 regulated area from -- there's 150-foot  
4 regulated area from the wetlands on the  
5 Sisters of St. Joseph property.

6 So these are the same plans that  
7 were presented to the inland, wetlands and  
8 watercourse agency. Down here -- and it's  
9 hard to see, but there's a blue line right  
10 there. Those are the wetlands on the  
11 Sister's property. This is the 150-foot  
12 radius. And anything within that would be  
13 regulated, and we did get -- obtain approval  
14 from them on February 5th.

15 COUNCILOR BARNES: Okay. So that's  
16 all set. That's not an issue?

17 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Correct.

18 COUNCILOR BARNES: Thank you.

19 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you,  
20 Mr. Barnes.

21 Ms. Kerrigan?

22 COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Thank you,  
23 Madam Mayor.

24 Mr. Barnes, thank you for  
25 describing it. I was going to go, what is

1 this, the heart shape?

35

2           BRANDON HANDFIELD: He was kind  
3 with the description.

4           COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: It was a great  
5 description.

6           The 5,000 square-foot open-space  
7 requirement, is that a West Hartford thing?  
8 Or is that a standard in development?

9           BRANDON HANDFIELD: It's a standard  
10 in the multifamily district that each unit  
11 have 200 square feet of open space.

12           COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: West Hartford  
13 specific or in just multi --

14           BRANDON HANDFIELD: It's in your  
15 zoning ordinances.

16           COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: So we did  
17 that?

18           BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes.

19           So on this site it would have been  
20 very difficult to do, especially if you look  
21 at the maximum density for this zone. It  
22 would have been very difficult to meet in any  
23 case the square footage of area required.

24           Now you can have porches and  
25 porticos, and things that are attached to the

1 building that count towards it, but you do  
2 have to have some outdoor green space.

36

3 COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Thank you.

4 BRANDON HANDFIELD: You're welcome.

5 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.  
6 Kerrigan.

7 Ms. Fay?

8 COUNCILOR FAY: Yes, thank you.

9 So my question, I'm going to try to  
10 simplify it. You went through, oh, a half a  
11 dozen or so of changes that you would like to  
12 see implemented. In simplifying this again,  
13 the changes seem to, in summary, make the  
14 developable space bigger. Right?

15 So making a smaller recreation area  
16 has more for development. Less of a setback  
17 has more for development. Signs, not a  
18 setback, but are more for development.

19 So if we said no to all these  
20 different changes -- I'm not suggesting that  
21 we would, but if you couldn't get these  
22 changes implemented what would that do in  
23 terms of the size and scope of the number of  
24 units?

25 BRANDON HANDFIELD: We obviously

1 ran a number of concepts as we looked at this  
2 project, and our ultimate goal is always to  
3 meet all of a zoning regulations.

37

4           What it would impact is perhaps the  
5 size of the units and how they're configured,  
6 and how the utilities go through the site.  
7 So as you see in the next few slides there  
8 are utilities that go from Crescent Street  
9 down to Ringgold Street. They go straight  
10 through the site, and that's an existing  
11 public sewer and existing drainage main.

12           So Crosby Street historically was a  
13 paver road that would have come down. It no  
14 longer does. The road was abandoned I think  
15 in the 1950s. So as part of that those  
16 utilities exist. There are no easements, but  
17 saying that, they could be routed.

18           So I've started to belabor the  
19 conversation, but we could get  
20 approximately -- or if not the same number of  
21 units on this site, they might be smaller  
22 units. They might be a different  
23 configuration. It also could be a different  
24 product.

25           So these are townhouses that go

1 from basement to ceiling. They could be a 38  
2 horizontal type unit where the apartments are  
3 on top of each other and it would be higher.  
4 So there's a number of different ways around  
5 it. For this particular product it would be  
6 a very similar development, just  
7 reconfigured.

8 COUNCILOR FAY: But there would be  
9 an impact, a pretty sizable impact. Because  
10 if we're granting -- you're asking for relief  
11 on several different --

12 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Uh-huh. I  
13 can't say that it would be sizable, to be  
14 quite honest with you. I think the unit  
15 sizes might get smaller in terms of their  
16 footprint and the actual configuration of  
17 these units, but I think we could get a  
18 similar development on this site regardless  
19 of those regulations.

20 COUNCILOR FAY: Thank you.

21 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay, Ms. Fay.  
22 Mr. Davidoff?

23 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Thank you,  
24 Madam Mayor. I've got several questions. We  
25 will start with respect to Attorney Pearson's

1 first comment that the applicant is proposing 39  
2 to address this property through an SDD  
3 application rather than through by right.  
4 And the reason that I understood was that by  
5 right you wouldn't be able to address  
6 building line setbacks, open space, the sign  
7 requirements in our zoning code.

8 So by right you would not get a  
9 project that would look anything like this.  
10 It would be much different, or the units that  
11 would be built may not be townhomes. They  
12 could be single-family homes?

13 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I would agree  
14 that the development itself may be different  
15 in terms of its appearance. Obviously the  
16 buildings wouldn't be as close to the road,  
17 but we could make adjustments to the size of  
18 the buildings, the interior of the site and  
19 the layout to get this density.

20 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: According to  
21 the materials you submitted, the average  
22 square footage of a unit is 1,058 square  
23 feet. You just testified that these units  
24 could be smaller in size. How small would  
25 they be?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BRANDON HANDFIELD: There are many different sizes of townhome units on the market. I have personally worked on a site where they were 16 feet wide rather than 18 feet wide. It is certainly a different product for a different market, but those are achievable dimensions even down to 15 feet from what I have seen in terms of other developments.

So the width of these buildings could be reduced, however not every building suits every town and every market.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Because according to the materials that were submitted, I believe in the late submission the asking retail price of the unit was over \$230,000.

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yeah, we do have information on the home, the values of these homes, the anticipated selling values as we get to those pages, and we also have information on the value of those homes to the Town of West Hartford.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: So the materials said it was, like, close to



1 \$240,000. Is that correct?

41

2 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I think it's  
3 above that. I think it's closer to 280  
4 thousand dollars -- 289, yes.

5 PRESIDENT CANTOR: For 1,058 square  
6 feet. Correct?

7 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Correct.

8 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: With respect  
9 to the minimum requirement open-space waiver  
10 our regulations require 5,000 square feet of  
11 recreational space. The current proposal has  
12 550 square feet. You mentioned in your  
13 testimony that you're going to ask us to  
14 consider proximity to Kennedy Park to be  
15 counted towards meeting that minimum  
16 requirement.

17 What types of discussions did you  
18 have with the Town of West Hartford with  
19 respect to allowing for that to take place?

20 BRANDON HANDFIELD: It was one of  
21 our early conversations in our informal  
22 discussions with staff. We acknowledged that  
23 providing all of that on-site green space  
24 would not be necessarily achievable with the  
25 development we felt was appropriate.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Again, we could have explored the use of stacked decks that could be counted towards that space, but in this case, you know, as you do a more vertical style of unit those decks become more part of the unit. But in a townhouse style we felt not having those decks, using the proximity to Kennedy Memorial Park was a good idea.

And it was our impression that the planning staff felt the proximity of Kennedy Memorial Park was also something that should be considered here. So providing more green space so close to another park isn't necessarily the best option for this neighborhood and this area.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Are you aware of whether or not you had any discussions with the Town with respect to offering any type of improvements to be made to Kennedy Park if you're going to take it almost to be tenfold as part of your open space requirements?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that?

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: So since

1 you're asking for almost a -- what was 43  
2 required, what you're offering compared to  
3 what was required is, like, tenfold.

4 So my question is, where there any  
5 discussions with the Town of West Hartford on  
6 behalf of the developer with respect to  
7 offering any type of improvements to our  
8 public recreational facilities so that, as an  
9 offset if you're relying so heavily on that?

10 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I'm sorry. I  
11 get the question now.

12 Our conversations were mainly based  
13 on getting people to that park. So if you  
14 look at what we are agreeing to do, it's  
15 finish the sidewalks and the  
16 interconnectivity between Park Road and that  
17 park. Finish the sidewalk up Gillette  
18 Street.

19 In addition to that -- and it's a  
20 little off the page and I can go back and  
21 possibly see it here -- we also agreed to  
22 this location right here to -- again  
23 engineering came up with a cost for them to  
24 add a crosswalk that gets people from the  
25 north side of Park onto Ringgold Street and

1 the sidewalk in order to have that  
2 interconnectivity.

44

3 So they came up with a cost that  
4 was slightly higher than \$3,000. And again,  
5 we agreed to pay for that, those services or  
6 reimburse the Town for installing that  
7 crosswalk, the necessary signage and the  
8 approach signage. So in terms of what we  
9 agreed to do for public infrastructure, it  
10 really led to getting people and pedestrians  
11 to that existing resource rather than  
12 improving it more.

13 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Right. So we  
14 obviously want to get more feet into another  
15 business district that we have in our town,  
16 mainly in this particular instance, the Park  
17 Road business community which would be  
18 positively impacted by having more customers  
19 able to patronize their businesses.

20 With respect to the reduction in  
21 distance between buildings, you said that our  
22 requirements are 50 feet between buildings,  
23 and you came up with 18 for one particular  
24 one?

25 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes. Buildings

1 two -- in building three there's an 18-foot  
2 separation between them. Our original plan  
3 had a longer building, and we decided  
4 providing that airgap was a better plan than  
5 having one long building.

6 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Was there  
7 feedback from DRAC with respect to that part  
8 of the proposal?

9 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes, there was.  
10 We talked extensively about having three  
11 separate structures separating the feel of  
12 those structures through landscaping. And  
13 what you'll see on the landscaping plan are a  
14 number of options that allow each unit to fit  
15 in with the neighboring area and show some  
16 separation between them.

17 So it's really structured to give  
18 more of a change in the feel as you drive  
19 down the street while also matching into the  
20 neighboring landscapes.

21 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: The three  
22 buildings that affront Ringgold Street in  
23 terms of their setback from the street, how  
24 does it line up with those two residential  
25 buildings that are shown in the lower right

1 corner? What's the distance?

46

2 BRANDON HANDFIELD: What's the  
3 distance to their setback as compared to --

4 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: No, you're set  
5 back obviously a little further than they  
6 are.

7 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes.

8 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Is it the  
9 porches there, or are those vestibules?

10 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I think it's a  
11 combination of both. I have a picture. I  
12 don't know if you'll see it in the distance  
13 there -- and I can measure it on this plan  
14 right here. Just let me grab a scale.

15 So if you look at the -- I'll get  
16 the microphone here -- and it's a little  
17 lazy, but there is a front jut out on that  
18 structure there, very similar to this one  
19 here. And there's a lot of them on the  
20 street that would be similar to a covered or  
21 enclosed porch.

22 Behind that you see the main  
23 structure. I think they're going to be in  
24 that 15 to 18-foot range from the street,  
25 similar to what we're proposing.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: With respect

to the request to have two signs on the property which are very close in proximity to one another, can you explain your reasoning as to why you would need to have signage on both pillars?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: I would be happy to flip through it and show you the sign so you get a feel.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: No, I saw the sign. But I want to understand the rationale as to why there would need to be two of them going to drive -- I think it's, like, 24 feet and you need two signs.

BRANDON HANDFIELD: They are set back. So I think between the signs there's probably 28 to 30 feet. It's really the same style pillar brick monument sign. They're pretty small in terms of the sign.

So we felt trying to put a sign on each staying under the signage regulations was a better plan than trying to put in a bigger sign that was more imposing on the street, but the rational really was the total area of the signage and having both pillars

1 look the same.

48

2 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Were there  
3 other alternatives explored?

4 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Our original --  
5 some of our original concepts showed more of  
6 a wall. So this was before we shifted the  
7 buildings towards Ringgold Street. We had a  
8 larger sign that would have been more of a  
9 L-style wall with this sign on the wall.

10 Once we pulled the buildings a  
11 little closer to the street we went to that  
12 three-foot square pillar rather than having  
13 the L-shaped wall on each side. So in some  
14 developments where you have more space around  
15 that access area that, you know, kind of  
16 defines as you come in. But in this case we  
17 kind of lost that breathing space and went  
18 with the smaller.

19 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: With respect  
20 to the buffer plantings between the abutting  
21 property owners, you didn't really talk much  
22 about that. Do you plan to do that further  
23 in your presentation?

24 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I do. I would  
25 be happy to do it now, or I can wait.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: No, that's

fine.

With respect to the fencing I noticed there was vinal fencing and picket fencing. And then I also noticed in your presentation there was something about the fencing, a six-foot high screen fence with the materials that --

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Also white vinyl.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: White vinyl?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yeah, it's a solid white vinyl privacy fence, six feet high.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Why the distinction between the picket and the vinyl fencing?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Where the picket is proposed -- so just on this plan you can see it. So the six-foot high stockade fence goes around the perimeter here, and all the way up to here. That's to serve as a dual function with the landscaping to provide a privacy screen for us and the neighbors.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

The four-foot picket fence is

50

proposed on Crescent Street. In our early meetings with Town and DRAC one of the things we discussed was the appearance of our site as people come down Crosby Street. So they acknowledged that by removing the fence, by installing the sidewalk -- they didn't want a big airgap as people came down the street.

So they wanted the extensive landscaping. They also suggested a physical break. So we suggested we connect these buildings with a four-foot high picket fence which allows some visibility through, some air through. It's not an imposing structure, but we can plan around it and provide that physical visual barrier as you're coming down Crosby Street.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Okay. And my last area of concern right now is talking about the parking. So 25 units, you said that every person would be restricted to no more than two, two cars per unit. Which would then tell me that I need to have 50 parking spaces on site. I know our requirements only require 38, and I get that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Your site only has room for 40

51

spaces, and then there was a whole discussion about people parking in their garages in tandem.

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Right.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: So I just want to be clear. So the garage is one space, and the space in front of the garage is another space in your calculation? Or not?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: No, we did not count any of the driveways in our parking count. So the 40 spaces are delineated standard spaces. So 25 garages, 15 spaces that meet or exceed town regulations. And where they exceed it would be the two ADA spaces.

There are opportunities to park in the driveways in front of the garage, and there are opportunities for people to tandem park should they have two small cars, or a motorcycle and a car in the garage. So they're 32 feet long, these buildings. The garage goes front to back.

So it's obviously two small cars or one very big car, but either way there's

1 ample room in those buildings for either two 52

2 small cars, a car and a bike, a car and a  
3 motorcycle, two vehicles.

4 Outside there's 15 more spaces and  
5 there are some driveways where a car would  
6 fit. We did not stripe them because they're  
7 all -- they're not all compliant, but there  
8 are some that exceed your regulations, and  
9 people could park there.

10 We did install measures to  
11 discourage parking, especially in between the  
12 units for where it's a little tighter. That  
13 was on a recommendation of the engineering  
14 department -- just to make sure it doesn't  
15 turn off.

16 So these units here, you'll see we  
17 have our front concrete stoop, and then we  
18 installed a curbed area outside of that which  
19 the resident -- or it can be planned as part  
20 of this development. That's to discourage  
21 people from parking diagonally or sideways on  
22 the transition zone between the units. So  
23 really it funnels them into their garage.

24 There's opportunities to park more  
25 than the 40 cars that we are proposing, but

1 we're going to stick with the 40 formal  
2 spaces.

53

3 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: And I did  
4 notice that there's no dumpsters for the  
5 unit, because according to your application  
6 each resident is going to be issued a West  
7 Hartford trash recycling bin as well as a  
8 trashcan that they'll have to store, I  
9 presume, within their garage?

10 BRANDON HANDFIELD: In my  
11 experience, in most of these developments  
12 especially in townhouses that have the  
13 garages, they get the smaller units. They're  
14 stored inside.

15 Again, as you walk into these  
16 garages on your right or left will be an  
17 entrance to the stairs that gets you up to  
18 the living space. Behind those stairs an  
19 entire garage is wide open for storage. So  
20 there's ample room for storing recyclables  
21 and municipal solid waste within the existing  
22 garages.

23 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: So these cans  
24 are not going to be on the outside. They're  
25 going to be on the inside, or that was not

1 discussed?

54

2           BRANDON HANDFIELD: In terms of the  
3 operations of the development I think that  
4 would come up with, you know, the condo  
5 documents and how people have to maintain  
6 their spaces and when they can put out their  
7 trash.

8           But in terms of how they're stored,  
9 yes, they should be stored inside.

10           COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Right.  
11 Because then when we do have trash collection  
12 day those barrels need to be located  
13 somewhere. So they're going to be at the end  
14 of your driveway. Okay. So they just can't  
15 be sitting out there all week long.

16           And from an aesthetic point of  
17 view, if someone is going to be purchasing a  
18 unit for \$280,000, I don't think they want to  
19 look at trashcans. Okay? So I think on the  
20 front end, before we move forward I think  
21 that really needs to be understood.

22           And my last thing about parking  
23 along Ringgold, Ringgold Street now I  
24 understand that the current use was that  
25 people would park parallel to the site when

1 they went to the nursery?

55

2 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes.

3 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Is parking  
4 going to be permitted in front of this  
5 development?

6 BRANDON HANDFIELD: For this  
7 development we are not promoting parking in  
8 front of it. So we'd have to work with the  
9 engineering department on the width of the  
10 road that's actually constructed.

11 I believe there are regulations for  
12 parking overnight around the street in West  
13 Hartford in terms of notifying who's parked  
14 there, but in terms of our development our  
15 intent is to build the sidewalk, or work with  
16 the Town to build the sidewalk, narrow up the  
17 street and make sure our cars park on the lot  
18 and not rely on --

19 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: The reason I  
20 ask that is that your testimony this evening  
21 said that the road was going to be narrower  
22 than before.

23 So if the road is going to be  
24 narrower and we have parked cars there, it  
25 makes it really narrow which would probably

1 infringe the ability of people to go in both 56  
2 directions on the street that they wish to go  
3 both directions on.

4           So I think there has to be some  
5 type of agreement prior to approval  
6 understanding how the traffic would flow in  
7 that particular location, especially since  
8 that's your main entrance into your parking.  
9 And I don't want to be in the position  
10 after -- should this pass that people will  
11 say, well, why didn't you think about that  
12 before you voted on it?

13           And I think people would have the  
14 expectation, especially those who would be  
15 voters.

16           And then lastly, Mr. Patrissi used  
17 to sit in on a lot of zoning applications and  
18 I just have a question about the landscaping  
19 that was chosen. Do you think that -- you  
20 may not be able to answer this question  
21 because you really didn't know Mr. Patrissi,  
22 but do you think that the plantings that have  
23 been selected for this parcel would be in  
24 harmony with what Mr. Patrissi would have  
25 picked had he been sitting here? Because he



1 was pretty specific on a lot of applications 57

2 that he thought that this kind of tree should  
3 be here, or this type of plant should be here  
4 in terms of the aesthetics of the parcel.

5 So was there any discussion with  
6 the Patrissi family with respect to the types  
7 of plantings?

8 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I don't know  
9 that it went as far as the plants. I know  
10 there were discussions on other items related  
11 to their history of this site and how it  
12 could be carried forward.

13 Our landscape architect Kevin  
14 Grindle is a registered landscape architect  
15 in Connecticut. We went through a number of  
16 iterations with DRAC. DRAC brought up on a  
17 number of occasions the Patrissi name and its  
18 importance to this area. And we hope that  
19 part of our interaction in the numerous  
20 revisions that we went through satisfied DRAC  
21 and their understanding of the Patrissi  
22 family.

23 But from my experience I don't know  
24 exactly what he would like, but I know we  
25 picked species of trees and plants that fit

1 in with this area. We went through different 58  
2 iterations with the plan this afternoon with  
3 DRAC, and we hope ultimately the site looks  
4 great.

5 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Well, thank  
6 you for your thoughtful answers and the  
7 thoroughness of your responses.

8 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you.  
9 Ms. Farrar.

10 MS. FARRAR: One quick question on  
11 the 15 spaces in the development. Are those  
12 for the residents or visitors?

13 BRANDON HANDFIELD: There's no  
14 restriction from our standpoint on who  
15 they're for. It's just the total number of  
16 parking spaces. Obviously there's 25  
17 dedicated formal spaces to the residents.

18 MS. FARRAR: Okay. Thank you.

19 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.  
20 Farrar.

21 Ms. Kerrigan?

22 COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Thank you,  
23 Madam Mayor.

24 Back to the waste and recycling.  
25 So the individual keeps them in the garage,

1     though I must say my garbage stays outside my     59  
2     house.  I don't have a problem with it -- but  
3     so it's in the garage.  And then since  
4     they'll pull it up to the driveway -- so  
5     where is that?

6                   BRANDON HANDFIELD:  There's  
7     actually a six-foot space outside of each  
8     unit that's not their driveway.  So these  
9     units are 18 feet wide.  The driveways are  
10    eleven or twelve feet.  You'll see these are  
11    paver transitions.  So they allow us to do  
12    the grade break between the paved.

13                   So each unit is stepped to work  
14    into the buildings, or into the existing  
15    grade.  These transitions here allow us to  
16    transition that grade, and it's also a  
17    six-foot wide storage space where they can  
18    wheel out their recycling and MSW containers,  
19    put it off of their driveway between each  
20    unit and still get out of their garage.  
21    However, I don't think it's a convenient  
22    place to store it.  So they can still get by,  
23    but --

24                   COUNCILOR KERRIGAN:  So I assume  
25    that Todd and our crew went through the whole

1 garbage truck thing, backing up, turning 60  
2 around and all that kind of stuff, whoever,  
3 to make sure that the garbage trucks don't  
4 have an issue with getting out or getting in?

5 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes. So the  
6 way it is, is whatever contract this  
7 development signs up with, whether it's West  
8 Hartford or a private hauler, the way it  
9 would work is that those bins are put out on  
10 the curb to the standard that they require to  
11 be able to be picked up on their way through.  
12 So multiple movements are discouraged.

13 The one location where there would  
14 be some movements would be this top area here  
15 where they might have to back out, but in  
16 terms of a residential development that's not  
17 a very long stretch for a garbage truck to  
18 get out.

19 COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Okay.

20 One other question. There's a  
21 comment here from someone that talks about  
22 the deed over to the Powers land from the  
23 Patrissi property that they're going to deed  
24 the land over.

25 So does the resident have a lawyer

1 that will be sure that this happens, should 61

2 this happen, that the deed is transferred?

3 How is that going to play out?

4 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I'll leave the  
5 legal terms up to Ms. Pearson.

6 MS. PEARSON: We have agreed to do  
7 that with the abutting property owner. So  
8 you can put it as a condition, but we've  
9 incorporated it in the application.

10 So that will be done. That is  
11 going to be deeded over. So I don't know  
12 what else you would want.

13 COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: So the  
14 resident won't need an attorney to  
15 represent their --

16 MS. PEARSON: To come after us?

17 I pledge here that that is not the  
18 case, and that the deal -- or the arrangement  
19 with them is that at the time my client  
20 closes on the property they're going to  
21 effectuate that transfer. You have a lot  
22 line plan that shows that as part of this  
23 approval. That was the submittal that came  
24 in about 15 days before the hearing. That  
25 shows this.

1           So it will all happen as part of,  
2   you know, effectuating this, this plan and  
3   this approval.

4           COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Thank you.

5           MS. PEARSON: They may have an  
6   Attorney. I just don't know.

7           PRESIDENT CANTOR: Mr. Hart had a  
8   question.

9           COUNCILOR HART: Well, thank you,  
10   Mayor.

11           I just wanted to point out that our  
12   Town Engineer Mr. Martin is here this evening  
13   who could assist with questions regarding the  
14   roadway and parking, et cetera, if the  
15   Council would like him to add additional  
16   detail to the applicant's responses.

17           PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
18   Hart. He did not go unnoticed.

19           Mr. Wenograd?

20           COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: I'm sorry.  
21   We're working off each other now. Everybody  
22   raising questions and then raising more ones.

23           Councilwoman Kerrigan made the  
24   question about the waste collection. So I  
25   notice here that it is for -- you're not

1 claiming the right to have the Town pick up.

63

2 This is going to be privately picked up.

3           Maybe Pat could give us a reminder  
4 of our policy on condo pickup, because we've  
5 certainly had the problem in the past of down  
6 the line condo owners and new associations  
7 then coming to us and legitimately raising  
8 the question of, why does one condo get  
9 picked up and not a different one?

10           So if you could give us a brief  
11 history of the condos, please?

12           MR. ALAIR: The brief history is we  
13 did have some residential special development  
14 district which incorporated a condition of  
15 approval which really migrated from  
16 commercial projects that had preceded them,  
17 and said that refuse collection will be the  
18 obligation of the developer. That is  
19 inconsistent with our ordinance which says  
20 that condominiums get refuse collection.

21           The ordinance was amended in 2016  
22 as a result of the minor kerfuffle which had  
23 occurred -- and I want to see how that gets  
24 spelled in the transcript -- but it allows,  
25 the ordinance now allows the director of

1 public works to specify the means and methods  
2 of collection within condominiums.

64

3 So it may well be for example that  
4 in a project like this it makes sense to have  
5 the traditional barrels that we see  
6 throughout the town, albeit maybe smaller  
7 ones, and it may well be that the director of  
8 public works specifies a different method of  
9 collection. I don't know.

10 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: But that is  
11 premised on if we were picking it up?

12 MR. ALAIR: Yes.

13 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: But there, by  
14 application they're saying we're not picking  
15 it up. So I'm not sure. Maybe we get an  
16 answer as to -- before we start who's  
17 planning on doing what.

18 MS. PEARSON: Just to be clear, our  
19 intent and what we have committed to do is to  
20 have private pickup. And also just to be  
21 clear, there will be a requirement in the  
22 condominium documents that will mandate that  
23 people bring their trash out for pickup only  
24 on the day of pickup, and then they  
25 immediately take it back in and store it



1 within the garages. So those two things with 65  
2 regard to trash might be helpful.

3 MR. ALAIR: Well, then to be  
4 equally clear, I had actually prepared a  
5 draft set of conditions of approval. And I  
6 have removed the private trash collection  
7 condition. So I will have to put that back  
8 in.

9 MS. PEARSON: I looked for it. I  
10 didn't see it.

11 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay. Just a  
12 couple questions. Most of my questions were  
13 asked. The AC condensers that are outside, I  
14 don't know if that's something you'll go  
15 through in the utility section, if that's  
16 something you're going to talk about.

17 And I also wanted to talk about  
18 lighting that we hadn't talked about. So is  
19 that something that you'll cover in the next?

20 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Yes.

21 PRESIDENT CANTOR: All right.

22 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Okay. The one  
23 thing we didn't talk much about is drainage.  
24 I'll be very quick about it. We did talk  
25 that there is an existing drainage service

1 connection from Crescent Street to Ringgold 66

2 Street. So Crescent is up here. Ringgold is  
3 here. This orange line would be your  
4 existing drainage pipe. As part of this  
5 project we're proposing to realign it  
6 slightly and replace all of the pipes.

7 In our conversations with the  
8 engineering there are a number of sections  
9 that are in bad shape. So we will be  
10 upgrading this site, the pipes, not only in  
11 type but also in size. So we did also get  
12 some feedback that there are some drainage or  
13 localized drainage issues in particular on  
14 Ringgold where the pipes either are  
15 undersized or not maintained.

16 In this case we will be putting in  
17 a better pipe and our development will  
18 connect to that. So our development here is  
19 left to right. Those are our collection  
20 systems there. All of our systems will  
21 discharge to a subsurface detention basin.  
22 The important reason I bring that up is we  
23 are proposing -- or reducing both peak flows  
24 and volumes from the site, and the reduction  
25 ranges, based on the storm, a 10 to

1 25 percent reduction.

67

2 So from that Ringgold developed  
3 site as compared to what you'll have here  
4 with this detention, there's a 10 to  
5 25 percent reduction in stormwater.

6 In addition that will provide the  
7 necessary treatment of the water quality flow  
8 in accordance with the DEEP storm water  
9 quality manual. So we will also be improving  
10 the water quality that is used at the site as  
11 compared to what exists today, which is a  
12 system of open yard drains and culverts from  
13 an un-stabilized site.

14 If there's no questions on  
15 drainage, the one thing you might want to  
16 know is this pipe here we are also replacing.  
17 And that is actually the discharge point that  
18 goes onto the Sister's property. So this is  
19 an existing 12-inch RCP pipe. There are some  
20 localized drainage issues that I witnessed  
21 myself. We'll be putting in a 15-inch. It  
22 should improve the condition of Ringgold  
23 Street drainage.

24 General system of utilities, the  
25 colors on here are basically your standard

1     CBYD colors. The main focus that I would  
2     have right here in blue along Ringgold Street  
3     from the south to the north is a new water  
4     main that we're proposing to install.

68

5             So again, the sections of Ringgold  
6     Street that were improved have a water main,  
7     and the section of Ringgold Street at  
8     Gillette Street has a water main. There's no  
9     water main in front of us. So we are  
10    agreeing to connect the existing water main  
11    here with an eight-inch water main over to  
12    the intersection on Gillette Street, and our  
13    units will connect to that new service. The  
14    units on Crescent will all have individual  
15    water service connections to an existing  
16    main.

17            And similar to the drainage the  
18    sewer comes from Crescent Street down to  
19    Ringgold Street. So it's right here shown  
20    in, again an orange-red color. That sewer  
21    will be removed and we will realign it so it  
22    fits within our proposed access drive, or  
23    paved access drive. So it's a defined limit  
24    in terms of the future easement maintenance.  
25    It will connect to the existing system in

1 Ringgold street.

69

2           As part of the water and sewer work  
3 we did obtain an availability and capacity  
4 analysis from the MDC acknowledging that they  
5 do have adequate service for this  
6 development. And in addition we are  
7 proposing a new hydrant at our location. So  
8 there are no hydrants in this general area.  
9 There are hydrants up on Crescent Street. So  
10 there will be an available hydrant on  
11 Ringgold Street which does not exist today.

12           Also shown on here are the gas, the  
13 electric and the telecommunications networks  
14 which we will work with the appropriate  
15 utility company to finalize, however there  
16 are gas mains available within Ringgold  
17 Street. There is a small gap here that we  
18 couldn't find mapping for. And electric can  
19 come from a number of sources, but we're  
20 proposing to come down Gillette Street with  
21 underground electric.

22           And onto the landscaping plan,  
23 which there were questions about --

24           PRESIDENT CANTOR: One quick  
25 question before you go on.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Ms. Kerrigan?

COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Do we, or do you pay for the fire hydrant?

BRANDON HANDFIELD: I believe we do.

COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: That's a good answer.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay. Sorry.

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Onto landscaping. What you have in front of you, it's a very extensive landscaping plan. It's a combination of the border plantings which complement the six-foot high vinyl screening fence as well as street trees where it's an open development as you come down the street to blend into the surrounding area, and foundation plantings and mulch beds to complement the buildings. So our landscape architect Kevin Brindle prepared this plan in a number of interactions with DRAC.

What we came up with are various species of trees as you come down the street. They are all acceptable street trees, but it will provide that variation, again as you go

1 down further. So the development is here.

71

2 The existing single-family development is  
3 here, and as you go further towards Kennedy  
4 Memorial Park you'll see very nice  
5 landscaping on slopes.

6 As they come down, they have some  
7 steps that come down to the sidewalk. We  
8 tried to mimic that and you'll see that in  
9 the pictures as we go forward as you come off  
10 that sidewalk there's a few steps up to a  
11 slope. It's landscaped, a sidewalk that  
12 serves the existing porches on the building.

13 So we paid a lot of attention to  
14 what's going on, on both sides of us and  
15 tried to incorporate or finish the street  
16 that has been developed over the years.

17 Similarly on Crescent Street  
18 there's not a whole lot of vegetation up here  
19 now. A few small trees that existed from the  
20 former development. We learned from one of  
21 the abutters that there may be an apple tree  
22 that's up there now. What we're trying to do  
23 is return it to a streetscape, provide native  
24 vegetation up there that meets the area.

25 And we talked briefly about that

1 four-foot high fence shown in a little better  
2 detail there. We can try to zoom in. There  
3 you go.

72

4 So now you can see here, there's  
5 your four-foot fence. There's their interior  
6 landscaping consisting of bushes, shrubs,  
7 foundation plantings, flowers, grasses. We  
8 have some vegetation on the front facing  
9 Crescent Street there as well as just these  
10 street trees here.

11 My Latin is poor so I can't tell  
12 you exactly what type of trees they are, but  
13 they are -- all right.

14 And as we work our way around we  
15 have our border landscaping that's a mixture  
16 of both coniferous trees and deciduous trees  
17 to provide some air gaps between. So you  
18 have some extensive plantings four to five  
19 feet on center to provide that vertical break  
20 over the fence. All the way around here, and  
21 also here. So really we're trying to create  
22 a visual break between this development and  
23 the neighbors with that fence and vegetation.

24 And then down below here at the  
25 suggestion of DRAC we expanded our foundation



1 plantings and sidewalk plantings. So we gave 73  
2 a number of options that as they develop it  
3 they can use to really improve that  
4 streetscape and fit in with those surrounding  
5 concrete steps of the neighbors.

6 So again, we'll see it in the  
7 picture. As we go forward you'll see those  
8 areas where there's a lot of flexibility in  
9 terms of how they get planted to really fit  
10 in.

11 Any questions on landscaping before  
12 we go on?

13 PRESIDENT CANTOR: All set.

14 BRANDON HANDFIELD: Okay. There  
15 was a question about lighting. I have the  
16 lighting plan at the end of the presentation.  
17 So I'll show you on this one we have lighting  
18 as you come into the site. So there's one  
19 light here. There's one light by the mail  
20 pad and the handicapped accessible.

21 There's one light -- or two lights  
22 here, and there's one light here. And as you  
23 work your way out there's a light here, here,  
24 and one here. It's a ten-foot high colonial  
25 style fixture, direct down light -- and I'll

1 let you finish.

74

2 PRESIDENT CANTOR: There's no up  
3 light for the pillars. Or are the pillars  
4 lit in any way?

5 BRANDON HANDFIELD: We do show  
6 spotlights onto the sign. It really depends  
7 on if both those signs, or not, be we do show  
8 up lighting that will be directed right at  
9 the pillar.

10 And I have a picture of the  
11 lighting fixture if you would like to see it.  
12 And we can scroll to it. It won't take long.  
13 It's totally up to you.

14 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay.

15 BRANDON HANDFIELD: There you go.  
16 So it's ten feet high from the ground to the  
17 service. It's not colored. I apologize.  
18 It's a metro-scape style. So it's a colonial  
19 fixture head ten feet off the ground. So  
20 it's relatively low. Again, we have six-foot  
21 high fences and higher landscaping.

22 We did an isometric analysis, and  
23 all these little dots here, what you see are  
24 all zeros across the property line. So there  
25 is no shed of light past our property line.

1 The fixture is actually mounted in the top,  
2 or the light actually is mounted in the top  
3 of the fixture. So it's a direct down light.  
4 And the way these work is like little eyelids  
5 they put on each LED to direct it to where we  
6 want it to go. So where it gets close to a  
7 property line, there is an eyelid behind that  
8 fixture that sends it towards the parking  
9 areas and not onto the neighbors.

10 Any questions on lighting before I  
11 go all the way back?

12 PRESIDENT CANTOR: No, I'm all set.

13 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I think  
14 that wraps up --

15 COUNCILOR BARNES: I'm sorry. Some  
16 of those pictures would actually be nice to  
17 look at -- or is that still to come?

18 BRANDON HANDFIELD: We're almost  
19 there. I'm sorry. I just went all the way  
20 to the end. I kept all the plans in case  
21 there was questions, but the presentation  
22 didn't have the dotted lighting plan in it.

23 So now that we're done with  
24 landscaping, I'll just -- yeah, it's a deck  
25 of cards. We're almost there.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: He can't wait.

BRANDON HANDFIELD: All right. So we are onto the way the buildings will look and the way the street looks. So what you're seeing here is the intersection of Gillette and Ringgold looking almost due north. On your left is the Patrissi Nursery property. You can see the chain-link fence in the front, the two buildings, the hoop houses in the rear.

On the right would be the Sister's property. And this is the condition of road. And one thing you'll notice in this picture is it's the day I visited when we got the two five-inch rainstorms almost consecutively. You see some staining on the road there. The reason I visited that day was to see what's going on.

Part of this localized flooding is from debris that came, you know, there's some pine trees and other leaves that were down that kind of clogged the catchbasin quickly, but this is the condition that we worked with the Town to try to improve. So in terms of the appearance this is what it looks like

1 when you're standing on Gillette Street and  
2 Ringgold Street looking north. And then  
3 these are -- the next two photos are going to  
4 be renderings of the proposed buildings from  
5 Ringgold Street.

6 So this would be on the northern  
7 side looking southwest. This is building  
8 number one and it gives you the feel of the  
9 building, the sidewalks up to the new road.

10 These first stories here, again  
11 that's the back of the garage. So the living  
12 space would be here and here. This would be  
13 the drive under the garage from the rear, and  
14 we tried to make the backside a formal access  
15 point for the resident, but also look like  
16 the units as you make your way down the  
17 street.

18 We discussed briefly before the  
19 average size of these units. These are  
20 approximately 1150 square feet. These are  
21 all two-bedroom units with two baths, a  
22 projected sale price starting at twenty-eight  
23 ninety-nine and the approximate taxes to the  
24 Town will be a little over \$8,000 apiece.  
25 And there are 22 of these two-bedroom units

1 on the site.

78

2 Let's see. This next photo, this  
3 would be building three. So very close to  
4 where I took the picture looking -- so I took  
5 the picture on the left side here, looking  
6 this way.

7 This building would now be on your  
8 left. And the reason this is important --  
9 obviously we took some landscaping off so you  
10 can see the building, but you can see here  
11 this condition where we have the steps coming  
12 off the sidewalk there will be a landscaped  
13 berm similar to what exists, mainly in this  
14 direction. So mainly to the south as you get  
15 closer to Kennedy Park.

16 That will be extensively planted.  
17 There will be street trees in between every  
18 other one of these, but again we tried to  
19 build that vertical separation between the  
20 sidewalk on the street and our units, and  
21 step it into grade to minimize excavation.

22 These are also all two-bedroom  
23 units with the same qualities of building one  
24 and building two.

25 And this last photo here would be

1 standing on Crescent Street looking east. So 79  
2 actually behind these units, the Sister's  
3 property would be back there.

4 So the important thing to see about  
5 these is, again we have that big grade change  
6 between Crescent Street and Ringgold Street.  
7 That's the vegetative slope. Again we don't  
8 show the plantings so you can see the  
9 buildings, but there will be a fence here, a  
10 four-foot high picket fence with extensive  
11 planting. So it will obscure a lot of that  
12 view, but you can see we built these  
13 buildings into the grade.

14 So from Crescent Street it's a  
15 two-story structure very similar to the  
16 buildings that are next -- a driveway off the  
17 street very similar to the buildings that  
18 exist next to it. And then we step down and  
19 the garages are drive-under which are access  
20 from Ringgold Street.

21 Again, from a scale point of view  
22 we stacked these into the slope and tried to  
23 minimize the elevation from Crescent Street  
24 to blend in with the houses next to it. Any  
25 questions on these?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(No response.)

BRANDON HANDFIELD: Okay. And with that I believe I will turn it back --

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Can you talk about the condenser units? I don't see any of them on the renderings yet.

BRANDON HANDFIELD: I forgot all about that. I apologize. So on these plans we tried to put them between the buildings so each unit will have it's own condenser. So in this case there, these four will serve units 207 through 204. These three will serve 301 through 303.

The reason that they're on both sides of the building -- I'm not a mechanical engineer, but I've heard enough to understand it, is that there's a certain distance that you can have between the condenser and where the unit serves.

So in the case of this building we had to split them on both sides. Where they're between buildings we do not show landscaping to obscure them, but where they're closer to the street there will be



1 some plantings planted around them, mulch  
2 beds to try to break up that view where we  
3 can. So we were cognizant of it, and  
4 wherever they're facing the public we did  
5 conceal them.

81

6 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you.

7 Ms. Kerrigan has a question.

8 COUNCILOR KERRIGAN: Thank you,  
9 Madam Mayor.

10 I noticed in the renderings the  
11 individuals that are living there look like  
12 they are empty nesters, seniors. And I ask  
13 this question only because we had the  
14 developer for Steele Road come who originally  
15 was marketing -- I thought they were  
16 marketing towards the empty-nesters and found  
17 out that the millennials actually found these  
18 apartments attractive.

19 If you had to guess, what do you  
20 think the market is for these folks?

21 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I honestly  
22 can't guess to the market that will go in  
23 these units. I would have to leave those up  
24 to people that know the development side --  
25 and I'll turn it over to Mr. Lovely for that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MARK LOVELY: Good evening, Madam  
Mayor and fellow commissioners. Mark Lovely,  
President of Lovely Development located at  
710 Main Street, Plantsville Connecticut.

What we've seen in these type of  
downloads -- and I've built two of these in  
Southington. It's funny. A lot were  
teachers, single firemen, single teachers and  
stuff like that that actually wanted to get  
out of their homes and downsize. That's what  
we've seen in most of these.

You think they would be more of the  
younger generation, but in the two  
developments I did there -- actually we did a  
total of 32 units. There were 3 kids in all  
those 32 units and they were all probably  
anywhere from their high forties to probably  
just under 60, which was amazing in those two  
developments.

I think we will see some of that  
younger generation here, which we hope that  
will walk and use the Park Road businesses  
and stuff. We think we're going to get a  
mixture -- I think.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Attorney Pearson.

MS. PEARSON: As I mentioned before, Jim Bubaris is our traffic consultant who prepared the analysis that you have in the materials that were submitted. He could not be here tonight. So I have taken over his responsibility to the extent that I can.

And I really think -- a couple points. First of all, this is not -- what he prepared was not a full-blown traffic study, or impact analysis of intersections and everything else that you might find for a new development for two reasons.

One, the town administrative staff did not think that was by any means required. This is a small development that's going to have small generation. And what we felt was the most important thing to get across and analyze would be the comparison between the traffic that could had been expected to have been generated by Patrissi Nursery -- because we did not take counts, of course, before they went out of business at this particular locale -- and compare that to what would be projected based on the ITE, the trip

1 generation analysis that is the sine qua non  
2 for traffic experts as to how you figure out  
3 how much traffic is going to be generated by  
4 a particular development. And that is the  
5 Institute of Transportation and Engineers  
6 document often just referred to as the ITE  
7 analysis or manual.

84

8 So what the report indicates is  
9 that if you look at the Patrissi Nursery  
10 commercial use, and that comprised a total of  
11 15,847 square feet of commercial structure,  
12 it would be, if you looked at the manual,  
13 expected to generate a certain amount of  
14 traffic or trips per day diagnosed as an  
15 overall day number.

16 But also of particular interest is  
17 the number and the times that the roads are  
18 at their peak capacity, the a.m., the morning  
19 peak and the p.m. evening peak, and also over  
20 the weekend there is a Saturday peak and a  
21 Sunday peak which is typically around midday.

22 And what that analysis, by  
23 referring to the ITE report, indicates is  
24 that you could have expected for the morning  
25 peak for the Patrissi Nursery site -- it

1 could generate or would have generated 48 85  
2 trips per day. This development is  
3 projected -- and Mr. Bubaris, he used  
4 multifamily tables for projections and he  
5 used the most conservative analysis which is  
6 based on a condominium type of development or  
7 ownership which generates more cars than,  
8 say, would a typical apartment.

9 The comparison is, 48 could have  
10 been expected for the a.m. peak for the  
11 nursery and 11 projected for a.m. peak for  
12 this development. He did include the number  
13 for maximum buildout, should that be possible  
14 to obtain from this site, which at 57 units  
15 would have generated 25 cars in the morning.

16 So again, this is the number of  
17 cars that could -- that would be anticipated  
18 to be generated during the busiest time in  
19 the morning, busiest hour from 25 residential  
20 condominium units at this location.

21 It's based on -- and I know you are  
22 all familiar, though I have just heard some  
23 chuckles from the audience -- but actually  
24 the manual is a very fair, comprehensive  
25 analysis of objectives of developments across

1 the country, and it's a tried-and-true  
2 standard by which generation is judged.

86

3 And you've also just had the  
4 experience, for those sitting at this table,  
5 of having had the development of Steele Road  
6 which was previously referenced. And you  
7 know that the analysis that was done pre  
8 through the permitting process projected a  
9 certain number of trips per day to be  
10 generated by that development, and the post,  
11 after construction. And it was all based on  
12 the ITE manual, and the analysis that was  
13 projected upon which you made your decision  
14 was deemed to be a conservative one.

15 They looked at the highest possible  
16 generation and you considered the application  
17 in that light. After construction and a  
18 hundred percent occupancy, that development,  
19 when the traffic consultants went back out  
20 and measured what was actually being  
21 generated during the peak hours, it was a  
22 little less than what had been proposed for  
23 your consideration based on the ITE trip  
24 generation figures upon which you based your  
25 decision.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I throw that out there because it's something that you've had recent experience with. You know, nobody really likes to believe a traffic consultant, but more often than not -- and I can think of the same result that occurred after the traffic post construction was counted for the Home Depot/BJ's development, which was extremely controversial at the time that was done.

And post construction measurements of traffic generation were also significantly less than what had been proposed as a possible amount of generation when that particular project was approved. Those are two I can think of right off the top of my head, but that is usually the case.

So again, going to the comparisons, the morning a.m. peak, the comparison was 48 could have been generated from that site for the nursery with 11 being generated for this proposal. As to the p.m. peak, that's when the nursery would have been more busy and it would have been expected to generate 80 cars during the afternoon peak, whereas this would generate 13 cars at the end of the day peak.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

And if you look at Saturday when of course the nursery could be expected to be quite busy -- the same thing is true of Sunday -- you would have expected a generation of 96 trips generated by that nursery, whereas you would expect 12 to affect the area roadways as a result of the generation with this proposal.

So the bottom line was Mr. Bavaris' summary where he says, we find that the subject proposed residential development should not have an adverse impact on the surrounding roadway network given that a substantially higher trip generator was previously served by the site.

And I will add in concern after, you know, knowing that Mr. Bubaris couldn't be here, we did ask town staff to just take another look at everything and make sure that they were comfortable with this analysis.

And you should have in your materials of February 26, 2018, a memo to Todd Dumais from Duane Martin, Town Engineer where he says, the engineering division reviewed the trip generation comparison



1 prepared by Bubaris Traffic Associates, dated 89  
2 December 19, 2017, for the proposed  
3 redevelopment of 35 Ringgold Street and have  
4 no comments or concerns.

5 The trip generation comparison  
6 identifies that the proposed redevelopment  
7 will generate a small amount of traffic to  
8 and from the site. This small amount of  
9 traffic is much less than what was previously  
10 generated by the nursery and will not pose an  
11 issue to the surrounding roadway network.

12 So if you have any questions of me,  
13 I'll try and answer them, but I don't pretend  
14 to be a traffic engineer.

15 So I'd like to now -- unless there  
16 are any questions with that, I would like to  
17 have Chuck Coursey come up and talk about his  
18 outreach that he undertook on behalf of the  
19 applicant.

20 CHUCK COURSEY: Good evening.  
21 Mayor Cantor and Leader Barnes, and members  
22 of the Council, my name is Chuck Coursey. I  
23 live at 21 Walbridge Road and I conducted the  
24 neighborhood outreach for this application  
25 before you tonight.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

As I like to say I want to give

just -- before I get into my methodology and some of the results that I found, just talk a little bit about the purpose of outreach. And again, the purpose of outreach is to not go out into the community and find support for the project, but to find out what folks, what neighbors, what stakeholders are concerned about so that those concerns can be addressed before we get to a meeting like this and eventually make it a better project.

The Town of West Hartford

encourages developers to reach out to property owners and residents within 250 feet of the applications, those applications. I chose -- I usually go a little bit longer. In this case our outreach area was 500 feet out from the Patrissi site. And just to orient you, you can see the site right here.

Ringgold, Gillette, Crescent up

here, Crosby and Park Road with the Sisters over here.

You have before you up on the

screen a list of the homes that were in the outreach area. And let me talk a little bit

1 about my methodology.

91

2 First and foremost, we got our list  
3 of addresses from -- the town provided us the  
4 addresses for all those folks on those  
5 streets. And also I forgot to mention Twin  
6 Oaks condominiums right here. There's three  
7 buildings right here.

8 We mailed to everybody -- and  
9 there's a copy of the letter that we sent out  
10 that's in your packet. We mailed that to  
11 everybody knowing that not everybody has a  
12 landline phone. Some of these homes were not  
13 owner occupied, but we wanted to make sure we  
14 hit everybody.

15 So we mailed out with the  
16 invitation to reach out to me either the  
17 e-mail, call me -- I would be more than happy  
18 to go out and visit with them. Several  
19 people fortunately took me up on that. I  
20 then, for all those that I could find phone  
21 numbers for, I reached out over the phone,  
22 left messages.

23 For those folks finally that I  
24 couldn't reach on the phone, didn't have a  
25 phone number for or didn't respond, I then

1 went door to door with another letter and an 92  
2 invitation to meet.

3           You'll see that in a lot of cases  
4 there's a lot of left messages, there's a lot  
5 of left fliers and letters sent, but we  
6 really tried to make every effort to reach  
7 all the folks in the property area and give  
8 people who wanted talk to us the chance to do  
9 that.

10           I'd like to draw your attention to  
11 a couple of residents on the outreach report  
12 that I think might be helpful. There were  
13 some -- and I'm going to get to the main  
14 topic. What were concerns that folks had?

15           I put these in two different  
16 categories, both on-site concerns and  
17 off-site concerns. And I want to thank -- in  
18 particular I thank actually everybody that  
19 took the time to meet with me and provide  
20 input, but Jeremy Guida who lives at 17 --  
21 Jeremy lives right here, right to the north  
22 of the property up on Crescent -- or I'm  
23 sorry. That's not true.

24           Jeremy lives right here next to  
25 Sarah. Ryan Tagney lives right there. And

1 then Lori Powers lives here and Lola and Rob  
2 Hugh live right across from Lori. And Anne  
3 Hess lives right across the street. They  
4 were very helpful and some of their -- if you  
5 look on the outreach report you can see kind  
6 of similar themes and concerns.

7           So what I thought I would do is  
8 walk you through -- I kind of put them all  
9 together and wanted to talk about those.  
10 Some of these have already been addressed.  
11 Let me go through -- on applications like  
12 this traffic is always a major concern. And  
13 as Attorney Pearson just said, it's very hard  
14 to convince somebody traffic that is not  
15 going to be an issue.

16           I know if I lived in the  
17 neighborhood, traffic would be a concern.  
18 You have a new property that's generating  
19 traffic were currently none exist. We tried  
20 to do our best to address those traffic  
21 concerns, and I'm sure folks may want to talk  
22 a little bit more about that.

23           One of the things that the  
24 developer agreed to do -- and I think  
25 Mr. Davidoff referred to that, is there was a

1 concern that what if somebody has three cars?

94

2 What if they had several kids and they have  
3 three cars? They have agreed to put in the  
4 condo documents that would limit each unit to  
5 only two cars.

6 On a similar note there was a  
7 concern about, Okay. This is going to condos  
8 and they're going to be for sale, but what  
9 happens if somebody wants to lease their  
10 condo out, and slowly this becomes more of a  
11 rental property? It's also going to be in  
12 the condo documents that no more than  
13 20 percent at any given time -- no more than  
14 20 percent of the units can be sublet.

15 And I believe the reason for that  
16 is that it's very difficult to get financing  
17 if people are going to sell, if there's not  
18 the right compatibles, or comparables. So  
19 that's also something that's going to be in  
20 the condo documents.

21 Gillette street access, this was a  
22 concern of folks on Gillette Street and  
23 Crescent. And it's a concern, quite frankly,  
24 that couldn't be addressed. It couldn't be  
25 made, because the property needs to have two

1 access points. And you cannot just have the  
2 access point only on Ringgold. There has to  
3 be second access point, and that was  
4 Gillette.

5 Property line encroachment, let me  
6 talk about that. I know Mrs. Kerrigan  
7 brought that up, but again, one of the  
8 reasons that we do outreach is I find out  
9 things that I wouldn't have known, concerns  
10 had I not talked to folks.

11 And when I went to go meet with  
12 Lori and Greg Powers, one of their biggest  
13 concerns was they looked at the plan -- and  
14 I'll show you right here. And they very  
15 astutely noticed that here's the fence line,  
16 the existing green chain-link fence on the  
17 Patrissi site. But the plans -- and it even  
18 says on your plans, apparent encouragement of  
19 driveway.

20 It turns out the actual property  
21 line for the Patrissi site encroached on  
22 their driveway. So understandably they were  
23 very concerned that if they ever went to sell  
24 they didn't want to lose part of their  
25 driveway if the construction went over.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Again, if you look at your outreach report -- and I made sure. I shared this with Lori to make sure that I got it right, because the last thing I want to do is misrepresent or get something wrong in my report, but the developer has agreed at no cost to the Powers to deed over that property. The fence is going to be where the existing fence line is, bringing the chain-link fence that's on the property now.

Let's go back. Garbage collection and noise. I think we've addressed that. Again, it's a private hauler that's going to come. It's going to be in the condo documents about the proper use.

Lighting, we talked about that.

Construction traffic, folks were concerned about construction vehicles accessing the property and all that. The developers agree that construction traffic will only access via Ringgold on Park Road. So you will not have construction traffic going on Crescent/Gillette trying to cut up towards Oakwood Avenue.

Landscaping buffer, we talked about



1 that.

97

2           The fire pit. Oh, that's something  
3 that was touched on briefly. We had several  
4 folks that were a little concerned about the  
5 fire pit when, you know, the smell, noise.

6           People, you know, we all enjoy a  
7 good fire pit every now and then, but it can  
8 turn into something that could be a nuisance  
9 for the neighbors. The developers agreed to,  
10 if in the Council's judgment if that is not  
11 something that is appropriate, that they  
12 would be willing to take that out.

13           The fencing issue, we met again  
14 with several neighbors. Jeremy Guida, Ryan,  
15 and the Powers, showed them the fencing. The  
16 fencing is very durable in terms of it washes  
17 very easily -- and with not immediate  
18 maintenance. Its maintenance is much more  
19 stronger.

20           Construction time, people were  
21 worried about construction vehicles. They  
22 have agreed to follow -- they must follow the  
23 town ordinance about when construction time  
24 can start and end. They don't anticipate  
25 doing any Sunday construction, and it's very

1 unlikely that they will be doing any Saturday 98  
2 construction even though that is allowed  
3 under town ordinance.

4 Snow removal, people were worried  
5 that there wasn't enough room on site for  
6 snow removal and they didn't want to see snow  
7 being plowed off the property into their  
8 yards. They were assured after the Town  
9 review that there's plenty of room on the  
10 property for snow removal. And in case we  
11 have one of these terrible storms which I  
12 hope we're not going to get on Friday -- they  
13 will have to com in and take snow off the  
14 property to remove it.

15 Air-conditioning units and noise,  
16 Mayor Cantor talked about that.

17 Site views, we talked about that.

18 Possible erosion, I know that that  
19 was something Ryan was concerned about. He's  
20 on the slope up on Crescent, but again our  
21 plans, the developer's plans which have been  
22 reviewed by the town engineering satisfy  
23 that.

24 The off-site concerns, and these  
25 are things that understandably people are

1 very passionate about. When you talk to  
2 folks -- I'm sure you hear it in talking to  
3 folks, speed and traffic are the biggest  
4 concerns that everyone has in town, and folks  
5 in this wonderful neighborhood, it's  
6 certainly no exception.

7           At this intersection of Gillette  
8 and Ringgold right now if you were traveling  
9 south on Ringgold and take a right on  
10 Gillette there's no stop sign there. There's  
11 also these terrible sightlines here. That's  
12 going to be solved when -- if this project  
13 goes forward.

14           But the neighbors -- and there's  
15 also -- the neighbors, but there's no stop  
16 sign going this way. There's only the one  
17 stop sign. The neighbors would really like  
18 to see a three-way stop sign there. Again,  
19 I'm not a traffic engineer. I would leave  
20 that up to Mr. Martin to discuss the merits  
21 of that, but that is a concern that folks  
22 have.

23           Also -- and I must admit I was  
24 guilty of it -- on the south side of  
25 Gillette, that entire street is no parking.

1 There's some signs posted every probably  
2 40 yards, but when I was there I didn't  
3 notice the signs and I also noticed cars  
4 parked there.

100

5           When I went to go visit the Hess' I  
6 made the terrible mistake of parking there.  
7 Fortunately they set me right. But I can see  
8 if it's not being enforced and you see other  
9 cars on the street there -- I'm not trying to  
10 excuse myself, but that is something that  
11 they're very concerned about.

12           In talking with them, with many of  
13 the neighbors on the street thinking that  
14 maybe some painting, better signage and  
15 markings on the street could help alleviate  
16 that -- because the street is not wide enough  
17 to accommodate that.

18           There's also no speed limit signs  
19 on Gillette. And again, Gillette runs from  
20 Ringgold all the way to Oakwood. Maybe one  
21 of those flashing speed limit signs would be  
22 something that the neighborhood could benefit  
23 for a time. Again something the Town can  
24 further discuss, but there are some serious  
25 traffic concerns currently that the

1 neighborhood has.

101

2 I know that there's concern that  
3 anything that happens at the Patrissi site  
4 could exacerbate that, but hopefully by  
5 looking at some of the possible remedies of  
6 what's going on now that could be mitigated.

7 That is all I have. I would be  
8 more than happy to answer any questions that  
9 any members of the Council might have.

10 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
11 Coursey.

12 Mr. Sweeney?

13 COUNCILOR SWEENEY: On the  
14 suggestions that you have, Mr. Coursey, can  
15 we get, just for clarification, would the  
16 developer be willing to pay for these as  
17 well?

18 CHUCK COURSEY: That has not been  
19 part of the conversation. I mean, these are  
20 things that the Town is doing throughout the  
21 town. And they're really -- I don't know  
22 what the cost is for each, but I know that  
23 those are things that are happening  
24 throughout town.

25 COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Okay. But

1 these are questions that are coming from this 102  
2 proposal?

3 CHUCK COURSEY: Yeah.

4 MARK LOVELY: Good evening. Mr.  
5 Lovely again. If it's just putting up some  
6 stop signs and some no-parking signs, we  
7 would have no problem doing that. We would  
8 work with the town staff and take care of  
9 that also.

10 COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Thank you so  
11 much.

12 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Mr. Wenograd?

13 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: I have a few  
14 concerns just -- and I suppose it's somewhat,  
15 you know, of a legal question, but it's  
16 raised by the issues that people raised with  
17 you.

18 Condo rules, it's one thing for a  
19 developer to put in rules when you start it.  
20 Obviously, then at some point it would get  
21 turned over to the condo association. So I  
22 mean, unless we're putting it as a condition  
23 for the builder we have no control over those  
24 things.

25 So I'm not necessarily even -- I

1 mean, not suggesting that we add them. I'm 103  
2 not sure they're appropriate, but the two-car  
3 limit, again I mean, that's not anything that  
4 you can promise will so -- and we can't  
5 guarantee that will be maintained.

6 And that's nothing that I would  
7 think the rules can prevent a future -- kind  
8 of to say it's from changing. And  
9 subletting, again the same thing.

10 And I guess the fire pit, if you  
11 don't put it in, it would be like a minor  
12 issue depending on what you want to do with  
13 it, but certainly with the subletting and the  
14 car limit, you might have even one other  
15 where you have sort of referenced the rules.  
16 Again, the trash as well.

17 How does that work and how is that  
18 enforceable down the line?

19 MARK LOVELY: Mark Lovely again.  
20 I'll just go as trash. We wouldn't have a  
21 problem if you guys -- if you did motion for  
22 a move, that you stipulated that it be  
23 private pickups. So then there was no  
24 question to come back to the Town and try to  
25 have that picked up in the future.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: That, we've

already figured that out. It was the part about having it be individual cans as opposed to a dumpster.

MARK LOVELY: I would put it there myself and we can make that a stipulation in there it becomes dumpsters. That was my suggestion. I don't like dumpsters on sites. I don't like the stuff that flows out of them, the animals and stuff like that.

So actually that was my suggestion not to have the dumpsters there. That's what I did in my other two previous developments. So we wouldn't have a problem as that being a stipulation that says no dumpsters allowed.

The other thing on the parking, we wouldn't have a problem, if that was stipulated that with you guys, that only two parking spots per unit per the Town. There's no problem at all. Basically on the regulations on the rental, that's pretty much a standard boilerplate kind of doc that we've seen. And we've seen most of the time that we use the maximum because of people obtaining mortgages and different things like



1 that, when it gets to over an 80 percent it 105  
2 makes it tougher.

3 Now somebody cannot rent their unit  
4 unless they notify the board and get approval  
5 from the board, too. So you can't just go  
6 out and rent your unit without approval from  
7 the board.

8 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Okay. And  
9 that's based upon sort of your own -- I mean,  
10 you start with the rules of the condo  
11 association?

12 MARK LOVELY: Yes.

13 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: And then again  
14 at some point it gets turned over to the  
15 residents.

16 MARK LOVELY: Yeah, they would have  
17 to have a majority vote to change those  
18 throughout the association, so if a lot of  
19 people didn't want rentals -- I mean, to be  
20 honest with you in my 32 units that I did  
21 there's not a one rental in those. And some  
22 of those have been up over five years.

23 So we don't see a lot of people  
24 renting these honestly, but that's usually  
25 pretty much standard boilerplate wording

1 that's in, though.

106

2 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Thank you.

3 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
4 Wenograd.

5 Mr. Barnes.

6 COUNCILOR BARNES: Thank you.

7 Mr. Coursey, we've been receiving  
8 your good work for years now here at the  
9 Council. And there are times when the  
10 information that you provide that, you know,  
11 it's substantial. There's a lot of stuff to  
12 review.

13 And so one suggestion going  
14 forward, I know that this is a work in  
15 progress right up to kind of the end, you  
16 know, before we get to our hearing. But it  
17 would be something I think we would all  
18 benefit from seeing before we get to the  
19 table, you know, on the night of the hearing,  
20 because of just this list right here of  
21 things that we're thinking about. And so you  
22 know, it's -- I don't know, 30 pages, 35  
23 pages.

24 CHUCK COURSEY: I had sent  
25 Mr. Dumais a copy on Friday that I believe

1 was in your Friday packets. That was sent to 107  
2 him. And I also sent to Mr. Dumais a  
3 preliminary report right before the planning  
4 and zoning meeting that we had.

5 So this is actually the version I  
6 gave today, because there were still changes  
7 to this over the weekend. The version I gave  
8 today is actually the third formal submittal  
9 I had. But again, I got actually an e-mail  
10 from Todd's office this morning asking if  
11 they wanted to print out -- wanted me to have  
12 them print out the report I gave last week.  
13 And I said, no, it's outdated already. I  
14 have a new report right now.

15 But I understand your question and  
16 take it to heart, absolutely. And sometimes  
17 when you do outreach like this there's  
18 people, as you get closer to the hearing --  
19 they don't want to talk to me a month ago,  
20 but as you get closer to the hearing there's  
21 more interest, which is understandable.

22 COUNCILOR BARNES: Sure.

23 MARK LOVELY: It's something I  
24 struggle with, but that's an excellent  
25 question.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR BARNES: Yeah, it would

just be helpful to have it sooner in the process.

And so I have just one question.

So the property owner on the northeast corner, you referred to them by name. I couldn't find them by names, and I didn't have their addresses. So I don't know who the homeowner is on the northeast corner. And he is the one that abuts with the --

CHUCK COURSEY: Right there. That

is Jeremy Guida. His address is 1719 Ringgold.

COUNCILOR BARNES: 1719 Ringgold.

And based upon the earlier presentation he's the one that's going to have the closer setback by a couple feet on his property line?

CHUCK COURSEY: Right.

COUNCILOR BARNES: And so does he

know that and --

CHUCK COURSEY: We actually went

out and talked to him. I went to his office in New Britain and talked with him earlier in late January. And then Tony and Mark and I

1 went and brought him a section of the fence  
2 to look at.

109

3           It's the same situation. You've  
4 got a green chain-link fence and he has a  
5 stockade fence that's probably about a decade  
6 old that's falling apart. They have agreed  
7 to take both and put the fence up, the white  
8 fence that they have.

9           And he had no problem with that.

10           COUNCILOR BARNES: So he's okay  
11 with the fence, but is he aware that the  
12 setback is going to be narrower than --

13           CHUCK COURSEY: You know, the  
14 setback -- I don't think -- I wasn't aware of  
15 the limitations and I, you know, I showed him  
16 the plans and he saw the distances.

17           The distances, I remember him  
18 saying it looks about the same distance  
19 between my house and the neighbors on the  
20 other side, but it wasn't something that he  
21 knew -- I would not say that he knew that  
22 this was something that we were looking to  
23 change that wasn't, you know -- what's the  
24 right word I'm looking for?

25           MR. ALAIR: A waiver.

1                   CHUCK COURSEY: A waiver. Exactly.                   110

2 Thank you, Pat.

3                   COUNCILOR BARNES: I just think it  
4 would be appropriate if someone told him that  
5 so he would know that, that that's being  
6 changed.

7                   CHUCK COURSEY: I would be happy  
8 to.

9                   COUNCILOR BARNES: And then  
10 actually -- I misspoke. Not one thing, but  
11 two things. Since we were talking about  
12 construction times and the length of the  
13 construction my concern is with the, you  
14 know, the private homeowners in that area  
15 during this 18-month or so process while  
16 these are being built.

17                   And I was reminded of -- I think it  
18 was Bishop Road when Councilwoman Kindall was  
19 on the Council and she lived on that street.  
20 I think I've got that right street, right off  
21 of Farmington. There was the apartment  
22 complex that went in there and there wasn't,  
23 you know, proper fencing around that.

24                   There was a safety issue, and when  
25 the issue came up before the Council I recall

1 at the time the response was, well, we really 111  
2 don't have a standard, you know, about that.  
3 And the developer agreed to put in a higher  
4 fence with the green screening at all of that  
5 stuff for a safety issue.

6 And so my question is, how will,  
7 you know, what type of divider will be in  
8 place here, you know, to protect the abutting  
9 landowners?

10 MARK LOVELY: Good evening. Mark  
11 Lovely again. Our plans are, right now  
12 during construction is to keep up those  
13 chain-link fences there. And we are putting  
14 a camera system in for security reasons on  
15 the site during construction.

16 What our plans are going to be is  
17 to basically get in there, do all the site  
18 work, construct building four with foundation  
19 first. Get in, do all of our site work.

20 Where building one is, we're going  
21 to use that as a staging area. So no  
22 equipment or anything, or cars or vehicles or  
23 construction trucks have to park on the road.  
24 They'll all park there.

25 After we get our drainage in, water

1 in, sewer in, get it all processed, the site, 112

2 what we're going to do is do all  
3 four foundations at once so we can grade the  
4 site, landscape it, put up our vinal fence  
5 all the way around it. So beautify it and  
6 then build the buildings as we go.

7 This will make it a lot faster  
8 construction timeline when we do this. Get  
9 out the heavy vehicles that make the most  
10 noise on the site. We're going to try and do  
11 it all at once so it's not a hindrance to the  
12 neighbors through a long period of time.

13 We're actually going to bring our  
14 water and sewer in, pour all of our concrete  
15 and everything so it's all done in one shot.

16 COUNCILOR BARNES: Well, I  
17 appreciate that detail. That's certainly not  
18 something that, you know, that I'm familiar  
19 with. But hopefully for you to be mindful of  
20 those abutting landowners particularly with,  
21 you know, dirt and anything that encroaches  
22 on their property, you know, to take the  
23 extra time to make sure that you protect  
24 that.

25 MARK LOVELY: No, we look forward



1 to that and we will work with the neighbors. 113

2 And we've given our business cards out to  
3 some that were here tonight, and we do have  
4 dust control and everything like that -- our  
5 excavators do also, to keep the dust down.

6 Thank you.

7 COUNCILOR BARNES: Thank you.

8 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
9 Barnes.

10 Mr. Wenograd.

11 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: One other just  
12 quick question. Was your outreach to the  
13 nuns?

14 CHUCK COURSEY: Yes.

15 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: They're  
16 abutters?

17 CHUCK COURSEY: Yes.

18 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: I did not see  
19 them in the report. I might have missed it.

20 CHUCK COURSEY: It's like one of  
21 the first ones. Their property manager Joe,  
22 who if any of you have gone to the Park Road  
23 Association on Ringgold Street, the third or  
24 fourth one on Ringgold Street -- Joe  
25 Angellico, he's a regular at the Park Road

1 Association meetings.

114

2 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: I see it. I'm  
3 there for the first time. Thank you.

4 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Mr. Martin, I  
5 thought maybe it would be helpful if you came  
6 up. Mr. Coursey, maybe you can put the  
7 concerns that -- from outside the  
8 development? Thank you. Just talk about  
9 some of that.

10 MR. MARTIN: Sure. Good evening.  
11 Duane Martin, West Hartford Town Engineer.  
12 So I had an opportunity obviously to review  
13 the traffic report that was submitted as part  
14 of this and we've had conversations with some  
15 of the residents before this was even applied  
16 for, for redevelopment, just ongoing traffic  
17 and issues regarding pedestrians, et cetera.

18 I also, as part of the review of  
19 this redevelopment, had the opportunity to go  
20 through our -- we have traffic files in the  
21 engineering division, and they go back  
22 several decades. And so there's information  
23 in there that was related to some of the  
24 complaints that are ongoing still to this  
25 day.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

And for various reasons things

didn't change, or did change over time as the neighborhood changed and the development in the area changed. So most of what I'm seeing here I'm not surprised just from conversations with the neighborhood and it's an opportunity with this development for the residents nearby to get anxious or upset about some of these things. So it's understandable.

At least one thing on here which is really not something that the Town even has jurisdiction over which is the speed limit on Gillette Street. That's something that the town would apply to the State for review and approval for a speed limit.

I'm not saying that we would object to that. I just -- I don't think it necessarily should be a condition of approval for the development. That's something the Town should really look into on its own, and we would be fine. The engineering division could handle that.

I think historically the reason why there isn't a speed limit is the road is

1 fairly short. It's about 900 feet in length 116  
2 and it doesn't connect to another through  
3 street. You have to physically turn onto and  
4 off of Gillette. So more than likely that's  
5 the reason why there's no posted speed limit,  
6 but it's something that we can look into.

7 With regards to -- I'll go through  
8 these one by one here.

9 Additional residential traffic or  
10 just traffic generated by this site, I could  
11 hear the reaction when some of the traffic  
12 information was being discussed.

13 And the thing about it is it's a  
14 residential development. Right? So it's not  
15 as if there's hours related. It's not like a  
16 store we have with business hours or shifts if  
17 it's a factory. People come and go as they  
18 please and that's spread out throughout the  
19 course of the day. And that can depend on  
20 the particular person that lives in each  
21 unit.

22 If they have kids they may travel  
23 more for various reasons. Maybe they work at  
24 their home. They don't drive as much so it  
25 fluctuates, but the important thing to keep

1 in mind is it changes throughout the day. 117

2 It's not necessarily during the normal course  
3 of time where people are driving each and  
4 every day. It can change. So yes, there's  
5 25 units that are proposed. That doesn't  
6 mean that they're all going to come and go at  
7 the same time. So that's why the numbers per  
8 peak hour are less than 25 as far as the  
9 trips go.

10 The other thing to keep in mind is  
11 there's three driveways. So depending on  
12 where they're going or coming from, it can be  
13 dispersed amongst those three driveways to a  
14 certain extent. I know one of them is a  
15 one-way out.

16 A VOICE: There's two.

17 MR. MARTIN: Well, there's  
18 driveways off of Crescent. So sorry about  
19 that, but the fact of the matter is you'll  
20 have traffic on all three of those roadways.

21 So let's see.

22 Construction traffic, I know it's a  
23 little difficult because it's on three  
24 streets, but the majority of the frontage is  
25 on Ringgold. And quite frankly from a

1 selfish standpoint, Ringgold is probably beat 118  
2 up the most out of all those. So the focus  
3 probably would be to concentrate most of that  
4 on Ringgold Street, but that is up for  
5 consideration.

6 I know we discussed a little bit --  
7 but related to what we just said, the Town  
8 does plan to follow this development if it's  
9 approved with the reconstruction of Ringgold.  
10 But we would reconstruct the road regardless  
11 if it's not approved. So the plan is to come  
12 after the development if it's approved  
13 because there's a lot of utility cuts in  
14 Ringgold, and it would be a reconstruction.  
15 So it would be curbing, of course, the  
16 roadway.

17 The reason we ask for some of the  
18 things, payment in lieu of them actually  
19 doing them is really a timing issue. For  
20 example, a sidewalk along Ringgold, it  
21 wouldn't make sense to install if we're going  
22 to reconstruct the road because the grade of  
23 the sidewalk may change when we go to  
24 reconstruct it. So that's why that happened.

25 The crosswalk in Park Road, that

1 would be great to implement as part of the 119  
2 development, but there's a gas project that's  
3 proposed on Park Road going right by it. So  
4 inevitably that street is going to get  
5 repaved. So it's kind of a waste to put it  
6 down and then have to put it after the paving  
7 is done. So let me keep going.

8 PRESIDENT CANTOR: There was a  
9 question about a three-way stop sign. I see  
10 a four way up here, but --

11 MR. MARTIN: Yeah, it's a  
12 T-intersection. So it would be a three-way  
13 stop sign. This was reviewed recently.  
14 There was a complaint I want to say last  
15 fall. And my staff went out and looked at  
16 it. There was a sightline issue related to a  
17 tree and low hanging branches, which was  
18 pruned.

19 There is a little bit of a  
20 geometric issue at the intersection. There's  
21 a hill. Basically you come up and over on  
22 Ringgold. That's something my office can  
23 revisit again.

24 The one thing I will say is that  
25 stop signs cannot be installed for speed

1 control which is oftentimes the request, but 120  
2 it's a little bit interesting in that, one,  
3 it's a T-intersection; and two, the  
4 prevailing movement is going down, up or down  
5 Ringgold and turning onto Gillette.

6 So normally when you're installing  
7 stop signs you typically put on the lesser  
8 volume approaches so that you're keeping  
9 people flowing through the intersections, but  
10 sightlines and the intersection geometry as I  
11 mentioned are factors that we need to  
12 incorporate as well.

13 So if it's just strictly a  
14 complaint about speeding to put stop signs up  
15 we wouldn't do that, but there may be other  
16 factors involved in that. Again, this is  
17 something the Town really should review. It  
18 really shouldn't be attached to the  
19 developer, even though I know that we have  
20 more traffic going through the intersection  
21 if this development is approved.

22 Enforcement of no parking on  
23 Gillette, this was a complaint. The Town did  
24 install -- I believe it was in the late  
25 eighties -- seven no-parking signs on



1 Gillette. The concern -- I think the road is 121  
2 about 26 feet wide. So if you have parking  
3 on both sides -- people were stopping,  
4 backing up, going in driveways in order to  
5 get around one another. So that's when the,  
6 you know, no-parking signs went in, but  
7 that's really a police enforcement.

8 So normally when this happens is  
9 the residents are out there all the time.  
10 We're not. So we just say it's best if you  
11 contact the police and have them come up,  
12 come out and enforce it. They'll come out  
13 basically whenever they have time available  
14 to do that.

15 We could consider doing pavement  
16 markings or other signage, but typically that  
17 really doesn't provide a benefit. The police  
18 are the best way of enforcing the no parking.

19 So speed limit signs, I mentioned  
20 speed limit enforcement. That's another  
21 thing, that the engineering division handles  
22 this quite a bit. We get speeding complaints  
23 all over town, as you guys are well aware.

24 My guess is -- no surprise probably  
25 to the people in the audience that Gillette

1 is used at times as a cut-through. People 122  
2 are avoiding the traffic signal, or for  
3 whatever reason they decide to connect from  
4 Oakwood to Park Road and they're using  
5 Gillette and Ringgold.

6 So we have the ability to go out  
7 and do measurements. We can assess the  
8 speeds and determine what the appropriate  
9 reaction is. Usually what we'll find is  
10 there, there's going to be some cut-through  
11 traffic and usually that traffic is not very  
12 respectful of the speed of the neighborhood.

13 They don't live there. They're  
14 just trying to get through the area quicker,  
15 unfortunately. But we can go out and  
16 typically will put devices out to measure the  
17 speeds for the course of a week or two and  
18 figure out how much traffic is going through  
19 the neighborhood.

20 Is it related to cut-through or  
21 not? And then we can do targeted  
22 enforcement, and there's other means that  
23 we've used working with the police to try and  
24 get the speeds to a management level. Like I  
25 mentioned the speed limit sign, if we do go

1 forward with that it would also help remind 123  
2 people about the speeds.

3 I think I went through all of  
4 those.

5 PRESIDENT CANTOR: I think we went  
6 through everything.

7 Does anybody have any questions for  
8 Mr. Martin?

9  
10 (No response.)

11  
12 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you for  
13 being here. Thank you for answering my  
14 question.

15 Okay. Attorney Pearson, I guess we  
16 should look, I think on -- I mean, it's your  
17 choice on when you want to comment, but I  
18 think maybe the public comment before you.

19 While you are looking for the  
20 sign-up sheet I can read into the record a  
21 letter dated February 7th -- because I know  
22 Attorney Pearson is going to do it anyway,  
23 but a letter dated February 7, 2018, from TPZ  
24 recommending approval; a letter dated January  
25 29, 2018, from DRAC recommending approval; a

1 letter dated February 13, 2018, from IWWA  
2 recommending approval.

124

3 MS. PEARSON: I am just going to be  
4 very quick because you have all of this  
5 information in your materials. I noticed --  
6 I had not realized this was being done, but  
7 you have a very comprehensive memo from the  
8 Town Manager on the town website with regard  
9 to this.

10 And basically it goes through much  
11 of what I would typically reiterate at the  
12 end of the presentation with regard to the  
13 status of the application.

14 Suffice it to say that he notes  
15 that the application was reviewed by  
16 appropriate town departments, engineering,  
17 fire, health, planning and police, and no  
18 technical concerns were identified.

19 You just read in -- I wanted to  
20 make sure the inland/wetland letter was  
21 there. You should also know -- I'm not sure  
22 it was mentioned, but the CEC, the  
23 Conservation and Environment Committee also  
24 reviewed this application and gave a positive  
25 referral.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

And you also now have, which I

previously referenced, the traffic letter that is in the file that just came in a day ago. So all I have left to do is to remind you of the findings that you have to consider when you look at this application and decide whether it's worthy of approval.

I did send those out in the materials that were submitted, but now you've had a chance to see our presentation, and in particular the slides. And this might resonate more with you at this point.

The reason we feel this should be approved is the proposed change from a noncommercial -- nonconforming commercial nursery use to a multifamily use in this RM-1 zone is in harmony with the overall objectives of the comprehensive plan, and that it will eliminate a nonconforming use. We haven't talked about that, but it's big as far as zoning is concerned -- and establish a residential use well within the maximum allowable density for the property.

The residential use is compatible with the neighborhood residential uses and

1 will help to support the commercial uses on 126  
2 Park Road, the sidewalk on Ringgold, and  
3 pedestrian crossing at Park at the end of  
4 Ringgold, which the applicant has said that  
5 he or they will pay for -- will certainly  
6 facilitate pedestrian access to and from the  
7 businesses in the Park Road neighborhood,  
8 which is a very positive thing.

9 The proximity of Kennedy Park at  
10 the end of Ringgold Street provides  
11 recreational opportunities and green space  
12 within a short stroll from the property.

13 Furthermore, the traffic impact  
14 analysis conducted indicates there is  
15 sufficient roadway capacity to accommodate  
16 the potentially modest increase in demand  
17 generated by this application, and it's  
18 clearly traffic generation that's  
19 significantly less than what was experienced  
20 with the site being used as a commercial  
21 nursery.

22 So there's no reasonable basis to  
23 conclude that the proposed development will  
24 not be in harmony with the residential area  
25 surrounding the property. And we've already

1 talked about why we believe this to be

127

2 superior plan to one that's possible under  
3 the regular standards of the code, which  
4 means the RM-1 zoning regulations.

5           And ultimately the total density of  
6 development in terms of floorspace and land  
7 coverage complies with the standards of the  
8 underlying RM-1 district. That's a specific  
9 finding that you have to make under 177-144,  
10 but it also is a density that is  
11 significantly less than what would be allowed  
12 at 57 units by a base computation of  
13 allowable density within the RM-1 zone.

14           For all those reasons we certainly  
15 hope that you will approve this. It will be  
16 a significant investment in this property.  
17 It will take a not particularly attractive  
18 site right now and turn it into something we  
19 feel is quite attractive. It has undergone  
20 significant design reviews and will overall  
21 be a significant investment in the town of  
22 West Hartford.

23           So thank you.

24           PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you,  
25 Attorney Pearson. Mr. Barnes, did you have a

1 question?

128

2 COUNCILOR BARNES: Thank you, Ms.  
3 Pearson -- and maybe Mr. Alair as well.

4 With respect to the use of Kennedy  
5 Park to, you know, basically supplement the  
6 open space requirement are either of you  
7 aware of the Town ever allowing, you know,  
8 that to be the case to use town property to  
9 satisfy an open space requirement?

10 MS. PEARSON: I am not aware. I  
11 can't recall anything in particular. You  
12 know, the purpose of it is just to have the  
13 development feel good. And so that when  
14 you're there you feel like, you know, there  
15 is some outdoors around you.

16 There's a good argument to be made  
17 that that feeling of, you know, a place where  
18 you can walk and be under trees is available  
19 down the street, and we're providing a  
20 sidewalk. But I cannot, off the top of my  
21 head, think of another one in particular.

22 MR. ALAIR: Next to the reservoir  
23 property?

24 MS. PEARSON: I'm trying to think  
25 of what we did for Mr. Kaoud's development on



1 North Main, and that was all just brick  
2 patio, I guess, out back.

129

3 MR. ALAIR: Having a multifamily  
4 SDD is a relatively unusual thing. So I  
5 can't recall a situation. And the other  
6 thing that happens of course is when you were  
7 asked to grant a waiver, the reasoning that  
8 you used to decide to grant it doesn't  
9 necessarily get reflected in the conditions  
10 of approval.

11 It's not like you have to say on  
12 the record, we're granting the waiver because  
13 the park is nearby. So there's no real clear  
14 record that I could go back and point to.  
15 I'm trying to think we did -- and I'm drawing  
16 a blank on the name of the project, the open  
17 space development on the mountain next to  
18 Renbrook.

19 MARK LOVELY: Mark Lovely. When we  
20 actually met with town staff there were some  
21 questions whether we did put vestibules off  
22 of these to count as the open space.

23 And it was to the fact where we  
24 didn't want to have people to store stuff  
25 out there because we could do four-foot

1 vestibules across the whole back of the 130  
2 property. That would count actually as open  
3 spaces -- but what we didn't want to have is  
4 have people put plantings out there, put  
5 grills out there, put different things like  
6 that and make a cluster of different things.  
7 And that's why we decided to go this route  
8 with staff in talking to Mr. Dumais.

9 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Stone Bridge  
10 Crossing?

11 MR. ALAIR: It's not Stone Bridge.  
12 It's the other side of the street, the south  
13 side.

14 I'm drawing a blank. What's the  
15 name of that project?

16 MS. PEARSON: Across from where?

17 MR. ALAIR: Just above Renbrook.

18 MS. PEARSON: Old Stone Crossing.

19 MR. ALAIR: Old Stone Crossing.

20 Thank you. That is an open space  
21 development. It's obviously a much larger,  
22 much bigger zone, but there was open space in  
23 there. And as I recall it, there was some  
24 discussion at least of the fact that there  
25 was also the MDC reservoir property

1 immediately adjacent. Whether that was part 131  
2 of the rationale or not, I can't tell you for  
3 certain about it.

4 MS. PEARSON: That's true. I  
5 remember.

6 MR. ALAIR: I do recall that  
7 conversation. That's the only time.

8 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you.  
9 Mr. Wenograd.

10 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: One of the  
11 documents we got February 2nd was from the  
12 Assistant Fire Chief raising the issue about  
13 sprinklers, and I can't find any response in  
14 here to that.

15 MS. PEARSON: Well, I'll tell what  
16 the -- the response is that that is a  
17 building code issue. It's not a zoning  
18 issue. So we will do whatever is required by  
19 building code.

20 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: There's no  
21 written response to that?

22 MS. PEARSON: No, there is nothing  
23 you are missing.

24 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Thank you.

25 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.

1 Wenograd.

132

2           So we're going to get to public  
3 comment. And according to the Council rules,  
4 residents or taxpayers of the town may  
5 address the Council for not more than three  
6 minutes regarding this item for the public  
7 hearing. There are two sign-up sheets and  
8 there's some duplication. So I'm going to  
9 cross off -- I'm going to go off one and then  
10 cross off just duplicates and keep going. So  
11 I apologize.

12           If you are just signing in, then  
13 just say, no, I don't want to speak. And  
14 there's no need to have to speak. And we  
15 appreciate not repeating what someone has  
16 said before. It would be great.

17           This has gone on longer than we  
18 expected, but we're here to hear you.

19           So Anne Hess is the first person.  
20 Again please state your name.

21           The next person I have on the list  
22 is Gail Holtzrichter.

23           ANNE HESS: Thank you. I'll be  
24 brief. It's past my bedtime already. So I  
25 live at 11 Gillette Street. We are the

1 second house in from the intersection of 133  
2 Gillette and Ringgold. We've been there for  
3 25 years. Our property is probably going to  
4 be a hundred feet away from egress onto  
5 Gillette Street.

6 We've raised our three kids there,  
7 and over the years my main concern is  
8 traffic, the traffic flow and the traffic  
9 pattern that comes from Gillette being a cut  
10 through street.

11 So I don't know if any of you folks  
12 have visited the area or know it well, but  
13 people will try to avoid traffic on Park Road  
14 and they don't want to go through the  
15 intersection at Park and Oakwood. So they  
16 come up Ringgold and turn onto Gillette, and  
17 they fly down the street.

18 So that's a concern. That's an  
19 ongoing concern, and we just want to be  
20 transparent about it now because I do think  
21 with increased traffic from the development  
22 that it's going to become exacerbated.

23 Also with the additional  
24 requirements for parking for the apartment --  
25 for the condo complex, we want to ensure that

1 the Town is making efforts to look at

134

2 Gillette Street from a parking perspective.

3 I know that people noted that there  
4 are no-parking signs on the south side of  
5 Gillette. There are 15 houses, 5 no-parking  
6 signs. That's one for every third house, and  
7 yet every day there are multiple cars parked  
8 on the south side of the street narrowing the  
9 roadway. And thus, you cannot have opposing,  
10 two opposing lanes of traffic going through.  
11 So again that's a concern.

12 We'd like to see a flashing speed  
13 sign, perhaps, or have the Town do a  
14 full-blown study and not just have the  
15 developer's traffic study, because that's  
16 going, you know, to err on the side for them,  
17 to be a benefit for them, not for the  
18 inhabitants of the neighborhood.

19 So that's my main concern, is the  
20 traffic and the flow and the parking. Also  
21 parking on Ringgold will eventually be an  
22 issue once the sidewalk gets put in and that  
23 road gets narrowed. And you're going to need  
24 to probably have parking only allowed on one  
25 side, not on both sides because you won't

1 have the two opposing lanes of traffic being 135  
2 able to compete there either.

3 One other concern that I did have  
4 was the price point for the condominiums. It  
5 sounds great. They look nice. The taxes are  
6 going to be a good revenue base for the Town,  
7 8,000 and 10,000 based on the -- whatever is  
8 a two-bedroom or three-bedroom, and I hope  
9 they can get that kind of money on our side  
10 of town because hopefully it will increase  
11 our property values.

12 But if they don't get that kind of  
13 money what happens then? Are they going to  
14 go down to low-income housing? Is there  
15 going to be a cutoff point where some of the  
16 units don't get sold, so they do something  
17 different with them in that regard? So  
18 that's just something to consider. That's  
19 all I have.

20 Thank you.

21 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.  
22 Hess. The next person, I had Gail  
23 Holtzrichter and then Jeff Gould after that.

24 GAIL HOLTZRICHTER: Hi, I'm Gail  
25 Holtzrichter from Oakwood Avenue. I've been

1 there for 22 years and of course what

136

2 everyone else has been talking about all  
3 night is additional traffic problems  
4 concerning density and traffic.

5 Living on Oakwood Avenue, it's a  
6 constant battle just to get out of the  
7 parking lot, or out of our garages to that  
8 street. And also I think if you're going to  
9 have people coming up Gillette Street all the  
10 time, because it's an exit from this condo  
11 there are going to be more problems as people  
12 have already been saying.

13 And I also have some questions  
14 about, are the trees to be taken down at the  
15 corner of the Ringgold and Gillette, the big  
16 tall ones?

17 Hello?

18 PRESIDENT CANTOR: They'll respond  
19 after. We're just here to hear your comment.

20 GAIL HOLTZRICHTER: Okay. And I am  
21 also concerned for the folks that do live on  
22 Gillette Street because it is not a wide  
23 street and quite a few people do park there,  
24 illegally obviously. But there's just so  
25 much traffic on Oakwood Avenue and also on



1 Park Road.

137

2           And will the construction equipment  
3 go out Gillette or Ringgold onto Park -- is a  
4 question. And I also believe that if you  
5 have that kind of density you probably need  
6 another fire hydrant, not just one. And I  
7 think you could ask the fire department about  
8 that.

9           I appreciate your time, and I just  
10 have one other question. Schools, walking  
11 distance. Would these students go to Smith,  
12 the elementary school? That's my question.

13           Thank you.

14           PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.  
15 Holtzrichter. Mr. Jeff Gould is next on the  
16 sign-up.

17           JEFF GOULD: Good evening. Jeff  
18 Gould, 23 Kingston. I've been a resident for  
19 16 years there. First of all, I wanted to  
20 say I am for this development, just not the  
21 way it is right now.

22           I feel it is too dense. And I  
23 think the profile of it is too much. The  
24 height of it, even though it's three separate  
25 buildings, I would hope that you wouldn't

1 consider one whole running building -- which 138  
2 is good.

3 I just think the scale of it is --  
4 it's too tall even though the rooflines will  
5 coincide with the two or three-families. I  
6 think the one right next to Webster, they are  
7 in sync there.

8 I think the recreation space, I  
9 guess it's 10 percent of things. I don't  
10 know if that is just a straight -- what is  
11 the word I want? You gave a special  
12 consideration to it. So it's 500 square feet  
13 versus 5,000, I guess. That is not even  
14 close, and I don't think that's right.

15 I think it should be three-foot  
16 sidewalks on Ringgold. I think four feet is  
17 too much of an urban concern. Maybe from the  
18 density you decide on and how many people  
19 will be there, four-foot is okay, but for the  
20 rest of the neighborhood -- or maybe they're  
21 two and a half feet. It should be tied in  
22 with them, but that's just a point I wanted  
23 to make.

24 The 18 feet versus 15 feet between  
25 buildings to me is unacceptable because it's

1 too big in scope.

139

2 Let's see.

3 I assume there's not too many costs  
4 that the engineering department would know  
5 for the road. It is going to be  
6 reconstructed anyways, I guess. And then as  
7 far as bringing a storm sewer down through  
8 the property, the developers will be  
9 absorbing that, so that's good.

10 Let's see. I wondered about  
11 affordable housing. I think nothing came  
12 about on New Park Avenue. I see nothing here  
13 with this, and what's up with that? I would  
14 like to applaud the outreach of Chuck  
15 Coursey. I think that's wonderful. That is  
16 really important to get, to get feedback from  
17 people before coming in.

18 I support that and I think that's  
19 great.

20 And I guess that's it -- oh, and  
21 you got this report, I guess, today. I think  
22 they said they had sent it, or Chuck did on  
23 Friday. If you're just getting this stuff  
24 now and there's 30 items or something,  
25 postpone the vote.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

Thank you.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you,  
Mr. Gould. The next person is Lori Powers.

LORI POWERS: Good evening. Lori Powers, 58 Crescent Street.

I'm the one without the lawyer, which I would like to say that Mark and Tony came to our house and gave us the option to the deed, which we were happy to hear about and we trusted them, what they said was going to be true. So if you guys think we should have a lawyer let me know -- or if you guys think so.

To reiterate the traffic issue, everyone seems to be on the same page as far as that goes.

There's just going to be a lot of additional traffic there no matter what anybody says out here. I live right down the road. That's going to be the egress on the Gillette Street being a one-way -- I don't think is the best solution.

Unfortunately it seems to be the only solution and I'm kind of surprised that the Council hasn't had any questions

1 regarding that. They didn't have a lot of 141  
2 questions about any of the traffic issue it  
3 seems, which I find surprising.

4 One of the things that should be  
5 taken into consideration is that there is a  
6 current bus stop on the intersection of  
7 Gillette and Crescent, and I think that might  
8 be causing an issue in the morning with all  
9 the additional traffic that will be coming  
10 and going from the new development.

11 There's also already congestion  
12 where Effie's and the bank is, where people  
13 park on Ringgold on the opposite side. I  
14 don't know how many more people we can put in  
15 that area.

16 One of the questions I had, Mark  
17 alluded to it before, that once they start  
18 the construction the fences will go up pretty  
19 quickly. During construction what kind of  
20 barriers will we have? I would like to know  
21 a little bit more about that, and how soon  
22 they'll be going up.

23 One of the things that keeps being  
24 played out through this whole thing is that  
25 it could be 57 units that are there, but

1 they're only putting in 25. With all the 142  
2 requests for zoning considerations to scale  
3 it down I don't know how 57 units could ever  
4 get in there. If they can barely fit the 25  
5 with the space that they have available I'm  
6 not really sure how that works out.

7 Another traffic consideration is  
8 that a lot of it was compared to Patrissi's  
9 operation. That was seasonal. This is going  
10 to be 365/7 days a week, blah, blah, blah,  
11 blah. So it's going to be -- it's really not  
12 apples-to-apples. I think it's a  
13 considerable difference.

14 I would reiterate the question that  
15 Anne had asked before about contingency if  
16 the properties do not sell at the prices that  
17 they think they're going to sell.

18 Let's see. Oh, tree plantings.  
19 You guys have indicated that there's a  
20 six-foot fence that's going up. Right now  
21 our house has been lined with, I don't know,  
22 30-foot trees that are out there that are all  
23 going to be taken down. So that's going to  
24 completely change my environment that's here.

25 And a six-foot white fence is

1 probably going to be maybe that tall. So it 143  
2 can be a complete opposite effect of what I  
3 have right now. And I think there are going  
4 to be trees on the other side of the fence,  
5 on the development side of it, not on my  
6 side.

7 And I'm wondering when those trees  
8 are planted are they going to be saplings  
9 that are going in or are they going to be  
10 full developed trees. So that will be --  
11 kind of fix that area in the 18 months that  
12 you're going to be developing the property.

13 And I think that's it. Thanks very  
14 much for your consideration.

15 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.  
16 Powers. The next person I have is William  
17 Krukas. And after that, Evan William.

18 WILLIAM KRUKAS: Good evening. I  
19 would like to say a couple things. First of  
20 all, I believe that this property was zoned  
21 for commercial use, not residential. So that  
22 means that you're going to have to go ahead  
23 and change the commercial to a residential  
24 zoning application.

25 Number two -- which was never

1 brought out -- I don't believe that anybody 144  
2 has understood that Patrissi had chemicals  
3 stored on his property for 40 years.

4 DDT was one of the most chemical  
5 chemicals that were stored on the property.  
6 Nobody realizes that there were other  
7 chemicals that were also there. And Richard,  
8 when he did go out for nursery, what he did  
9 was his trucks went on Gillette Street to  
10 avoid the traffic situation on Ringgold to  
11 Park Road.

12 What happens with these units now  
13 is we're going to have a traffic problem  
14 going from Ringgold to Park Road. At  
15 seven o'clock in the morning the traffic  
16 starts. And from 7 to 8:30, or quarter to 9  
17 is when the traffic subsides.

18 So the other situation is -- and  
19 I've talked to the policeman in the area,  
20 which a lot of people haven't taken under  
21 consideration -- is that when they do the  
22 Park Road extension, should there be a storm  
23 or a traffic delay, what happens is that you  
24 automatically get a heavy flow of traffic, so  
25 much so that going down Park Road -- and



1 you're going to add another 25 to 50 cars 145  
2 coming out of Ringgold to Park Road? It's  
3 going to be a mess.

4 The third thing is I've lived here  
5 for 70 years and I've had five generations of  
6 family who had lived in my house. So I know  
7 what I'm talking about.

8 The other thing is, under  
9 consideration is summertime -- which was not  
10 considered either. The kids coming across  
11 Park Road to Ringgold cross over and go into  
12 Kennedy Park. So that's another type of  
13 situation.

14 And the housing development that  
15 they're planning on building, why should I  
16 pay for their refuse? I believe that the  
17 condo association or the townhouse that  
18 they're trying to build should pay for their  
19 own garbage.

20 Why should I pay for it? My taxes  
21 are going up every day. I can't foresee  
22 this. I just can't live with it.

23 The lady before me mentioned that  
24 the situation is that parking on Park Road --  
25 I have 12 businesses near my area. They all

1 park to saturation on Park Road and Ringgold. 146

2 And my dear colleague, Mr. Effie's  
3 restaurant, his people park over there, too.

4 So what happens is now you got  
5 people parking on the convent property and  
6 not exactly on Park Road, or on -- directly  
7 onto Ringgold. They also park there from  
8 seven o'clock in the morning until 4:30,  
9 quarter to five in the afternoon and, you  
10 know, he's the one that's going to benefit,  
11 not me. I'm paying the taxes for it.

12 I think that's basically all I have  
13 to say. I just don't want my taxes going up  
14 because of this project.

15 And like I said, remember that DDT  
16 was stored on that property and there has not  
17 been an environmental study done, and it has  
18 to be done before this project can consider  
19 going on.

20 Thank you.

21 PRESIDENT CANTOR: The next person  
22 is Terri Haven. And after that, Cailene  
23 Brown and Steve Fisher.

24 TERRI HAVEN: Thank you, Madam  
25 Mayer and Council. I appreciate the fact --

1 I live at -- 41 Crescent Street is where we 147  
2 live. I appreciate the fact that you've  
3 asked us not to reiterate things that other  
4 people have said. At the same time, I think  
5 you need to continue to hear it over and over  
6 and over, because it is the same issues that  
7 we are all facing in being there.

8 One issue that I've not heard is  
9 that, on the one hand to say that it's great  
10 that the construction vehicles and traffic  
11 will go down Ringgold. The end result in  
12 that is the greater traffic that we're going  
13 to face on Crescent Street during the 18  
14 months to 2 years.

15 We just went through a  
16 construction. It's not going to be 18  
17 months. It's twice that, so we're going to  
18 be facing increased traffic flow on Crescent  
19 Street during the time that this is going on.

20 Every single person that's spoken  
21 has said to you the concerns about the  
22 density of this project. To have 500 feet of  
23 open space for 25 homes, that is not why I  
24 moved to West Hartford.

25 Thank you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you,

148

Ms. Haven. Again, Cailene Brown and Steve Fisher.

STEVE FISHER: Sorry I'm a little taller than most. My name is Steve Fisher. I'm actually not a resident there yet. My fiancée Cailene Brown lives at 67 Ringgold. I'll be moving there in a few months. She's been there for about a year, so we don't have quite the experience that a lot --

PRESIDENT CANTOR: We just have to make a motion to suspend the rules to allow you to speak.

I make a motion to suspend the rules to allow --

STEVE FISHER: I do live in West Hartford.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Oh, you do live in West Hartford?

STEVE FISHER: I do live in West Hartford.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: I'm sorry.

STEVE FISHER: So you know, I understand everything that you all have to consider. I certainly appreciate you all

1 listening to our concerns. My only comments 149  
2 would be that if the development is  
3 considering using Kennedy Park as a  
4 supplement to their open space, that the  
5 Council consider them making the improvements  
6 to get to Kennedy Park.

7 So we live on the south side of  
8 Gillette on that part of Ringgold, and some  
9 of the sidewalks there are in pretty rough  
10 shape. So if they're expecting their  
11 residents to use that sidewalk to get to  
12 Kennedy Park then they should probably make  
13 the appropriate improvements.

14 I also -- I don't know. This is  
15 probably more of a question for the Town. I  
16 heard comments about the Town repaving  
17 Ringgold. I don't know if that's going to  
18 extend south of Gillette, but that would be  
19 great if you're going to be doing it anyway.

20 And finally with respect to the  
21 traffic, I certainly understand the concerns  
22 of people who live on Gillette with the exit  
23 only on that part of the street, that part of  
24 the development.

25 And I noticed in the plans that it

1 seems that that driveway for building 150  
2 three -- I'm not sure which building it is --  
3 it seems to be one-way. And I don't know if  
4 there's a way to make that a two-way so that  
5 people who are trying to access Park Road  
6 toward prospect would be able to just access  
7 Ringgold Street.

8 Because right now it seems like  
9 that entire building which is one of the  
10 larger buildings which is forced to exit onto  
11 Gillette. So I just didn't know if that was  
12 a possibility.

13 Thank you.

14 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
15 Fisher. Sorry about that. And our next  
16 person is Victoria Caymona.

17 VICTORIA CAYMONA: No, thank you.

18 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay. No  
19 Victoria.

20 Douglas Hess?

21 DOUGLAS HESS: No, I was just  
22 signing it for attendance. Thank you.

23 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay.

24 John Paindiris signed up. We do  
25 have a letter, and Sarah Kieffer -- oh, I'm

1     sorry.  Hi, John.

151

2                     JOHN PAINDIRIS:  Good evening.  My  
3     name is John Paindiris.  I am a business  
4     owner and property owner at 91 Park Road.  I  
5     am here to speak in favor of this project.

6                     First of all, I would like to thank  
7     Mr. Lovely and Mr. Valenti for their  
8     proposal.  I also would like to thank Chuck  
9     for his outreach to the community.  We have  
10    spoken a few times.  I received a letter in  
11    the mail and I've actually been talking to  
12    some neighboring businesses.  They were  
13    telling me how Chuck has gone out to the  
14    businesses to conduct his outreach.

15                    They also came to our Park Road  
16    Association and presented the pictures, the  
17    drawings and discussed the proposal with  
18    neighbors and business owners in the area,  
19    and I thought that that was great.

20                    Let me go back to some of the notes  
21    I wrote.

22                    The drawings have been offered for  
23    review to most or all businesses and  
24    residents in the surrounding neighborhood.  
25    It's my opinion that they have designed a

1 nice residential area without pushing density 152

2 to its limit, which has already been  
3 discussed. Park Road has been in need of a  
4 new residential component to help keep up  
5 with development throughout the town.

6 One of the nice things about this,  
7 this project is there's a bus line. There's  
8 restaurants. There's spas. There's fitness  
9 locations. There's entertainment all within  
10 walking distance.

11 There's been a lot of conversation  
12 about the traffic, but think about all the  
13 walking possibilities that can happen in this  
14 part of the neighborhood. We are looking  
15 forward to foot traffic in our part of the  
16 street, and we're looking forward -- as a  
17 business owner and as a representative of the  
18 Park Road Association, we're looking forward  
19 to the residual improvements that happen with  
20 such a development.

21 There are some other properties in  
22 the area that could use some updating and so  
23 forth, and once you have some buildings come  
24 in and have a nice presence and raise  
25 property values it just trickles down to the



1 other properties as well. So it's nice to 153  
2 see.

3 And on a final note, Richard  
4 Patrissi was a longtime friend of mine and we  
5 had a lot of discussions over the years about  
6 the neighborhood. And while I'm not sure the  
7 trees that are proposed would meet his  
8 standards or not, I know that in  
9 conversations over the years he was looking  
10 forward to having that property developed  
11 either residentially or commercially because  
12 he knew that as a nursery it wouldn't sustain  
13 forever. I really do honestly think he would  
14 approve of what's going on.

15 So thank you very much and I hope  
16 this project gets approved.

17 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
18 Paindiris. The next person I have is Sarah  
19 Kieffer.

20 SARAH KIEFFER: Hi. I am Sarah  
21 Kieffer, and I've lived at 1115 Ringgold  
22 Street for 33 years.

23 And I am grateful for the  
24 gentleman -- and I'm sorry I don't know his  
25 name. He's the one who talked about the DDT,

1 but he mentioned something else that's very 154  
2 close to my heart and I'm glad that he  
3 brought it up because it is important I think  
4 for anybody living on Ringgold.

5 And I realize that maybe it's not  
6 something that's apparent to other people,  
7 but that intersection on Ringgold and Park,  
8 it's an issue. It's not even a straight  
9 shot, two perpendicular lines. I would be  
10 very interested to hear more at some other  
11 time what the traffic reports would be there.  
12 I can't believe that there isn't a higher  
13 incident of accidents.

14 I myself, I've gotten to the point  
15 now where I try not to use that intersection.  
16 I actually -- even though I live right behind  
17 the bank, Webster Bank, I actually go south  
18 on Ringgold and then West on Gillette in  
19 order to exit from my home, because I want to  
20 avoid that intersection. It's really hard to  
21 pull out.

22 It's also hard for the people on  
23 South Highland who are trying to come over on  
24 our side. That shouldn't really be so much  
25 of an issue except that we are going to have

1 a greater density. So I'm just bringing that 155  
2 up. It was stated in a different way and I  
3 apologize for bringing it up again, but it's  
4 that important to me.

5 Okay. Thank you.

6 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Ms.  
7 Kieffer. That's all I had on the sign-up.  
8 If there's anybody here that -- come on up  
9 and state your name.

10 RYAN TAGNEY: I'm Ryan Tagney. I'm  
11 this guy right here on the corner. So  
12 50 percent of my property abuts up to this  
13 situation. So I'm very interested in what's  
14 going on.

15 I was pretty happy, actually.  
16 Chuck and Tony came to my house and they  
17 talked through a bunch of stuff with me and  
18 everything was really good.

19 I've got to say there's one thing  
20 that came out of this meeting that I did not  
21 know about, and that's this guy here, this  
22 little recreational space. That's my  
23 backyard, and now you've concentrated 25  
24 townhomes into a singular regulation space  
25 that's my backyard basically. So there's no

1 amount of trees or bushes you could put up 156  
2 for 50 people being able to stare directly  
3 into my house.

4 Issues with traffic, I know  
5 everybody has brought that up. I would like  
6 to add one caveat to that. The police have  
7 been called many, many, many times. They  
8 just don't do anything about it. So you can  
9 put up signs and you can say that we're going  
10 to have more police involvement, but the  
11 reality is they're not doing anything now.  
12 So why would they do anything later?

13 Gosh, I had another one and I'm  
14 missing it at the moment.

15 Yeah, I'm blanking. So that's what  
16 I'm going to have to stick with. Cool.  
17 Thank you.

18 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Is there anybody  
19 else that would like to speak to this public  
20 hearing?

21  
22 (No response.)

23  
24 PRESIDENT CANTOR: All right.  
25 Attorney Pearson, do you want to address --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MS. PEARSON: I think the biggest concern is with traffic, and I think the biggest concern you've heard is a result of what people currently experience with traffic.

And I do believe there are, you know, the issue of people parking on the street, that's an enforcement issue. This particular development or any development that would be allowed as of right in the RM-1 zone is going to put more traffic onto that site, or generally from that site.

This, at 25 units is going to be a very minor generator of traffic. We said even at the busiest time we were talking about eleven cars in and out from this site. This is what our traffic consultant has determined. This is what the Town's Traffic Engineer has substantiated as being a valid analysis of traffic generation.

So I appreciate that there are concerns with existing conditions. A lot of this can be alleviated by additional enforcement, or maybe more no-parking signs, but the amount of traffic that's going to be

1 generated by this is significantly less than  
2 we had with the Patrissi locale for 70 years  
3 at this location.

158

4           And it's less than you would have  
5 with a larger development. So that begs the  
6 issue of, well, could you get a larger  
7 development on the site? And I have just  
8 talked with Mr. Lovely who confirmed with  
9 me -- I didn't participate in any of these  
10 conversations with staff, but they looked at  
11 all kinds of iterations of development on  
12 this site.

13           You could get a much more dense  
14 development onto this site if you put the  
15 units in one or two buildings and you had an  
16 apartment style layout on the site.

17           Would it require moving more  
18 utilities? Yes. Is this a more easier way  
19 of doing it because you don't have to move as  
20 many utilities? The answer is yes, but that  
21 doesn't mean that you couldn't get up to the  
22 maximum number of units onto this site as  
23 would be allowed by zoning.

24           The open space issue. The open  
25 space that -- people shouldn't be confused

1 and conflate open space with massing and lack  
2 of green space on a property. This  
3 development conforms to the standards for  
4 building coverage. There's not more building  
5 coverage on this site than would be allowed  
6 by zoning. There's not more massing or FAR  
7 issue, or violation with this. The amount of  
8 building in comparison to the size of the  
9 site conforms to the zoning.

10           The open space that we are looking  
11 to get relief from has to do with open space  
12 that is provided for the benefit of those who  
13 live on the premises. And we appreciate  
14 there's a lot of concern that the people who  
15 live there might not have the open space  
16 that's required by zoning, but they live next  
17 to a park. And it is -- if you look at  
18 Section 177-10, the open space is meant to be  
19 provided for the units and use by those who  
20 are living in the premises.

21           You can't count the open space  
22 that's in front of these buildings. If you  
23 look at a colored landscape plan you don't  
24 count the landscaping or any of the lawn in  
25 front, or anything on the sides or anything

1 along Crescent. That doesn't count towards  
2 usable open space.

160

3           So what's missing and what we've  
4 asked for some relief for is that  
5 recreational area or place where people in  
6 the buildings can come down and commune or be  
7 outside on their own property.

8           They have a park right down the  
9 street and we're building a sidewalk to walk  
10 to the park. So it's not -- again, the  
11 concern is not that this is going to read  
12 from the outside as being too dense. This  
13 has nothing to do with that. It has to do  
14 with the personal enjoyment and open air  
15 that's available for the residents that live  
16 in that structure.

17           You heard -- I think it was Brandon  
18 say that -- or maybe it was Mark who said,  
19 you know, they looked. They could have put  
20 vestibules on the back. You can have an  
21 outdoor porch in the back that could have  
22 created -- and I don't know if it would have  
23 met the total requirement for open space.  
24 You could do that.

25           Frankly, they did not think, nor



1 did staff, that it would be a better plan 161  
2 that way. And that it was a cleaner, neater,  
3 a more pleasing layout with the way that it's  
4 proposed. And there's a park that you can  
5 now walk to when they built the sidewalk to  
6 be able to go right down the street.

7 So that's the open space. I just  
8 want you to understand that's what is at  
9 issue here. It's not going to look different  
10 from the outside if you provided that open  
11 space, and it's not to make that development  
12 appear less dense. It meets all the density  
13 requirements for massing, FAR and building  
14 coverage within the zone as it exists.

15 Let's look at some of the other --  
16 and by right when you, you know, again there  
17 is development that's allowed by right on  
18 that site up to a density of 57 units for  
19 that particular site. If they were going in  
20 without this design -- and there are a lot of  
21 reasons they pursued this design. It  
22 required some of the design changes that  
23 don't quite meet the standards. You could do  
24 a single building and eliminate the issue of  
25 the 18 feet not being big enough between

1 them, but would that be a better design

162

2 overall for the development? We don't think  
3 so.

4 But as a right, you know, the  
5 traffic issues, you could not deny a  
6 development that didn't require these waivers  
7 or changes to the applicable standards. That  
8 it's presumed that when you approve that kind  
9 of density by your zoning regs that you  
10 acknowledge that the traffic that would be  
11 generated by it is appropriate and the zoning  
12 accommodates it. And it could not have been  
13 challenged if they weren't doing it without  
14 coming before you for the waivers, the design  
15 waivers.

16 There was concern about whether  
17 they could get the prices that they're  
18 proposing for the units. Frankly, that's  
19 their issue, but they have designed this.  
20 They have a great deal of experience.  
21 Mr. Lovely reached over to me while that was  
22 going on and he said we've done lots of  
23 comparables. There's a reason we want to be  
24 in West Hartford. We want to be in West  
25 Hartford because it's a strong market and

1 people want to buy here and people want to  
2 live in West Hartford.

163

3           They are extremely confident that  
4 this is a product that's going to be very  
5 desirable and will sell, and will be a great  
6 investment for the Town and for them.  
7 They're not spending all this time and effort  
8 if they don't think it's going to work.  
9 They're quite comfortable that it will.

10           Someone asked whether we needed  
11 another fire hydrant. We have reviewed  
12 everything with the fire department. We're  
13 all set on that.

14           What school would the children go  
15 to if they did -- if there were children in  
16 this development, and it would be Whiting  
17 Lane.

18           Again, we've talked about building  
19 the open space issue.

20           Traffic, again I'm not sure there's  
21 anything else I can say about traffic.  
22 There's going to be a de minimus amount of  
23 traffic generation. It's significantly less  
24 than what was experienced from that site for  
25 70 years, and even if -- an as-of-right

1 application could be able to go in there 164

2 without any questions about the traffic  
3 generation rates that you would expect from  
4 something in the RM-1 zone developed to the  
5 maximum density that would be allowed within  
6 the RM-1 zone.

7 Tree sizes, I'm told that the  
8 calibers are three inches. That's  
9 three inches for the trunk, the caliper.

10 You have something else you want to  
11 add?

12 MARK LOVELY: Yes. Mark lovely  
13 again. The caliper of the trees that are  
14 designed there, which is in your town  
15 standard is a three caliper, which is  
16 larger -- almost 3-inch, which is about a  
17 16-foot high tree.

18 MS. PEARSON: When it goes in, and  
19 it will be significantly higher.

20 MARK LOVELY: They're not saplings.  
21 Exactly.

22 MS. PEARSON: I think those were  
23 the questions and comments that I got. Was  
24 there something else you wanted to add?

25 MARK LOVELY: Mark Lovely again.

1 There's just a couple comments about the  
2 trees that I think you guys might have  
3 written down that was on the corner of  
4 Ringgold and Gillette. It's in our plans to  
5 take those down because that will improve  
6 sightline on there, and we do have a  
7 landscaping plan to replant that back on that  
8 side.

9 Construction access will only be to  
10 Ringgold. That's the only access to the  
11 property. We are actually going to make a  
12 staging area over here for everybody to park.  
13 During the construction we are going to keep  
14 up the chain link fence that is there, so  
15 that will stay up for security reasons and  
16 for during construction.

17 There's a question on the phase-one  
18 environmental. We have done a phase-one  
19 environmental, and the property did come back  
20 clean by DES Environmental Services out of  
21 Southington, Connecticut. We have to do that  
22 to be able to get financing on the site. We  
23 do not have a problem with giving that to the  
24 Town also, for your guys' records also.

25 Sidewalk, we are reconstructing,

1     like we say, working with the Town and giving     166  
2     funds for the sidewalk going along Ringgold.  
3     We are going to take in and extend it up  
4     Gillette to where it's stopped now. And with  
5     staff, they asked if we would look at  
6     doing the funds for that crosswalk, which we  
7     think it's going to be a great thing for this  
8     area for the businesses on Park Road.

9             People will not have to get in  
10    their cars to go out to eat to go to  
11    different places. They can walk there  
12    instead.

13            And then I think that's it -- and  
14    the fire pit, if it's a concern to the  
15    neighbors of having the fire pit there we  
16    don't have a problem taking the fire pit out  
17    also.

18            MS. PEARSON: Thank you, Mark.  
19            Do you recall anything we might  
20    have missed?

21            Oh, someone mentioned the height,  
22    but the height does conform.

23            PRESIDENT CANTOR: If it was  
24    as-of-right could you go higher?

25            MS. PEARSON: Are we at the

1 maximum? Or are we below the maximum that's 167  
2 allowed? Take out your glasses and double  
3 check.

4 BRANDON HANDFIELD: I don't  
5 believe -- height is a function of setback.

6 MS. PEARSON: Building height, 40  
7 is allowed, and am I reading that right,  
8 34.2?

9 MR. ALAIR: The maximum height in  
10 the RM-1 zone is 3 stories for 40 feet.

11 MS. PEARSON: And the maximum we've  
12 got here is 33.4 for one building, and it  
13 goes down to 30.7 for the least high. So  
14 it's a little less.

15 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Mr. Davidoff.

16 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Thank you,  
17 Madam Mayor. There was a lot of discussion  
18 from the public with respect to the egress  
19 onto Gillette Street, and I understand the  
20 requirement that it needs to be two ways, and  
21 now to the property.

22 With that said, was there any  
23 consideration given to reducing the number of  
24 units in building two or three so that an  
25 additional in-out could be placed there and

1 that there would be no access out onto  
2 Gillette Street?

168

3 MS. PEARSON: I'm going to have to  
4 ask the team that went through that to say  
5 whether or not there was ever consideration  
6 given.

7 But I can just offer this from my  
8 perspective, which is that the amount of  
9 traffic that's being generated by this really  
10 is not going to -- and you divide between two  
11 driveways. I think I said at the peak you've  
12 got 11 cars coming out during the peak hour.  
13 You divide that between two driveways.

14 You've got five and a half coming  
15 out between two driveways. Even at the peak  
16 time -- and that's a de minimus amount of  
17 traffic coming out --

18 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: The reason I  
19 raise it, currently you have 13 units that  
20 must exit onto Gillette Street. They don't  
21 have a choice.

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. You want to  
23 answer that?

24 MARK LOVELY: Mark Lovely again.  
25 With working within staff, Todd Dumais and



1 his staff we could make that a double access, 169  
2 but what happens is we wouldn't have the  
3 green space between the units. So what staff  
4 came back with is to make that a one-way.

5 We do have two-ways in here and  
6 then this being a one-way will make it so  
7 what happens is we get more green space up in  
8 here. This could have room to be able to  
9 come across and have both ways in it. Staff  
10 thought it would be better to have it as a  
11 one-way when we build with them.

12 Could we put two accesses off of  
13 Gillette? Yes, but fire apparatus and  
14 different things like that, to be able to get  
15 in around the building this makes better for  
16 fire apparatus.

17 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: I wasn't  
18 suggesting two accesses involving Gillette.  
19 I was saying no access from the project to  
20 Gillette.

21 MARK LOVELY: That was my fault.  
22 Two -- access off of Ringgold is what I  
23 meant.

24 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: What was the  
25 problem with two off of Ringgold?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MARK LOVELY: Well, then what

170

happens is this makes a better traffic flow for fire apparatus, for garbage pickup and everything like that.

PRESIDENT CANTOR:

Mr. Williams?

COUNCILOR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Mayor.

You know, as we sit here we have gone through this application, which is really interesting for a lot of different reasons. One of the things I'm thinking through is the fact that this issue -- what could be built there as of right keeps coming up.

And the problem I have with that is, for all the reasons we've gone through this is an attractive application, but the as-of-right to me is immaterial to this determination because you as successful businessmen, if you had an option to build something as of right that you wouldn't have to come before us and build it as it is, that it was economically viable you might be pursuing that option rather than that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

So to bring it back to the

application that's before us, which is what is at issue. So what I'd like to hear from the applicant is this, the concerns that I'm hearing from the people who have lived in the community for a long time have to do with parking and traffic.

And I've been in that area many, many times going to Effie's or the bank. And we have now a seasonal -- or now defunct parcel that was used seasonally. We're putting in 25 units that have 40 parking spaces, give or take, if you're going to put two small vehicles. I understand there's limitations, but those people are going to have guests. Those people are going to have visitors. We have already concerns of traffic in the area.

If you go on a Ringgold onto Park it's just a stop sign. It's not the sort of intersection or access point that anticipates heavy traffic like you would see on some other roads -- even some of the roads that kind of abut the Center, I'm thinking about that grid back there.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

So my question -- I believe

Attorney Pearson said at the conclusion of her presentation that this application is in harmony with the neighborhood. And I just want to hear -- I know we've gone through three hours now of her presentation, but how is that in harmony with this residential neighborhood where you have, you know, some multifamily, but just residential homes.

And so I'd would like to hear that specifically responded to by either the applicant or its counsel. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MS. PEARSON: I thought I did try and describe how it is in harmony with the residential neighborhood. It's a residential use where a commercial use that was there for 70 years -- that's a major change in terms of the use at this particular site. It immediately changes from commercial to residential. That in and of itself makes it more in harmony with the neighborhood than what existed there before.

Could another commercial nursery go in there? Absolutely. It's a prior existing

1 nonconforming use. It's a legally 173

2 established commercial use at that location.

3 So it can be used for commercial going

4 forward. This changes it to residential.

5 Again, that's the most -- that's

6 the key element of making it in harmony.

7 It's in harmony because the zoning, the use

8 is allowed by zoning by right, the use which

9 is a residential multifamily use.

10 The structures themselves are

11 residential in appearance. They are quite

12 attractive. They relate nicely to the other

13 homes in the area. There's a lot of

14 landscaping that's very residential in nature

15 and very attractive.

16 You'll have a new sidewalk going in

17 for pedestrian residential use connecting to

18 the park, connecting to the businesses.

19 You're improving the residential nature of

20 the street by, you know, contributing to

21 making, you know, fixing the drainage in the

22 street and helping to pay for that with a

23 better system. The height of the structures,

24 they relate well to the buildings that are

25 next to them.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

I mean, those are all things -- the  
type of traffic that is being generated is  
residential in its generational  
characteristics. So all those things are  
residential in nature as opposed to what's  
there now. And I think that's it. That's  
definitely in harmony with the area.

COUNCILOR WILLIAMS: All right.  
Well, thanks for that sort of executive  
summary of the presentation.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you.  
Anybody else?

(No response.)

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay. We -- oh,  
I'm sorry. We limit it to three minutes and  
one speaker. So I don't --

RYAN TAGNEY: Understood. Fair  
enough.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: All right. I  
think with that we are going to recess for  
two minutes.

Thank you.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

(Whereupon a recess was taken from  
9:57 p.m. to 10:07 p.m.)

PRESIDENT CANTOR: So Attorney  
Pearson gave her closing. I wanted to ask if  
anybody else had questions for her or the  
applicant.

Mr. Sweeney and Mr. Davidoff.

COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Just we have a  
question for the applicant.

So one of the things that we were  
looking at is -- the use of the park, I think  
was a discussion that we had today. Would it  
be something you guys would consider,  
potentially improving the entrance to Kennedy  
Park as part of your application?

MS. PEARSON: What entrance, and  
what are you contemplating?

COUNCILOR SWEENEY: At the end of  
Ringgold there's an entrance to Kennedy Park  
and it looks like you guys are using that as  
part of your application. That would be --

MARK LOVELY: Good evening. Mark  
Lovely again. If it's something where you  
would like to see us do some plantings there,

1 or do some stone pillars or brick pillars to 176  
2 fit with what we're doing to make an entrance  
3 to the park or something like that, we'd be  
4 willing to work with staff and do something  
5 there, or some signage and some landscaping  
6 or something like that, definitely. We feel  
7 it would be an improvement for that area too.

8 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Okay.  
9 Mr. Sweeney, are you all set?

10 COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Yes.

11 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Mr. Wenograd?

12 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Thank you for  
13 that. I'm trying to look online and trying  
14 to get the photos of it.

15 I mean, looks like -- so we've got  
16 the sidewalk that you talked about adding up,  
17 too. Right? So you've got a sidewalk  
18 through your property and then I think there  
19 was a comment made for the public that the  
20 remaining sidewalk wasn't in great shape. I  
21 haven't seen it. But again that planning,  
22 that you want to have access for your  
23 residents all the way to the park.

24 And then I have no idea whether  
25 this is something that the park is



1 interested in -- as a Town, I'm not sure how 177  
2 active that entrance is. There does seem to  
3 be a dirt path into the park proper.

4 I don't know whether or not our  
5 park department has ever wanted to make that  
6 a better access. I don't know whether a  
7 paved stone or something -- I'm not sure what  
8 is in their plan for the park, but something  
9 a little nicer than what looks -- from the  
10 photograph, just the path.

11 MARK LOVELY: We'd be willing to  
12 work with staff, if that's something that  
13 they wanted it to be concrete or paved, or  
14 stone dust, or something like that. It  
15 depends on how they want to maintain it, but  
16 we could work with the park staff and your  
17 town staff also.

18 COUNCILOR WENOGRAD: Okay. Thank  
19 you very much.

20 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you, Mr.  
21 Wenograd.

22 Mr. Davidoff.

23 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Thank you,  
24 Madam Mayor. During the public comment on  
25 the application, Attorney Pearson, one of the

1 abutters to the project brought to the

178

2 Council's attention the fire pit and how that  
3 was the passive recreation location for the  
4 community.

5 Is the applicant willing to  
6 consider alternative activities, or to remove  
7 the fire pit from this version.

8 MS. PEARSON: Mr. Lovely has  
9 already committed that if it were appropriate  
10 he would remove that. And so then it would  
11 be benches and a place for people to sit and  
12 talk without a fire pit.

13 COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: Thank you.

14 And I have a follow-up question.  
15 If people wanted to grill out in this complex  
16 where would they do that?

17 MARK LOVELY: What we're going to  
18 require them to do is have a grill that would  
19 be stored inside the garage and can be  
20 brought out at the time of cooking. It will  
21 be brought back in.

22 The grills would be inside of their  
23 garages where they could bring out just the  
24 grill. They would have to bring them back in  
25 right after they're done. Nothing permanent.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: They would grill in their driveway?

MARK LOVELY: Yes, in the back portion.

COUNCILOR DAVIDOFF: And then they would store the propane tank inside their garage.

MARK LOVELY: Yes, because that is fire rated, fire-rated sheetrock.

PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you.

Anything further?

Mr. Sweeney.

COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Sorry. Just to be clear, you guys have also committed to the corner of Gillette and Ringgold a crosswalk there as well, or just at the end of Park?

MARK LOVELY: We're doing one at the end of park and Ringgold and then what we're doing is we're actually taking and redoing the sidewalk from Ringgold up to our property line and redoing that also.

COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Okay. But the concern with traffic is at Gillette and Ringgold.

MARK LOVELY: Normally what you

1 would do -- there is a stop sign there. Like 180  
2 we said, if the town staff would like to see  
3 the other two stop signs we can work with  
4 town staff and put those in to slow down  
5 traffic there, and we can do a painted  
6 crosswalk across there -- is that's what  
7 they'd like.

8 COUNCILOR SWEENEY: Thank you.

9 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Thank you,  
10 Mr. Sweeney.

11 Anything else?

12

13 (No response.)

14

15 PRESIDENT CANTOR: All right. With  
16 that, anything else from Attorney Pearson?

17 MS. PEARSON: No. We are fine.  
18 Thank you very much.

19 PRESIDENT CANTOR: Then we will  
20 close the public hearing, and we're going to  
21 start the Council meeting right away.

22

23 (Whereupon, the above proceedings  
24 were concluded at 10:13 p.m.)

25

1  
2  
3 I hereby certify that the foregoing  
4 180 pages are a complete and accurate  
5 computer-aided transcription of my original  
6 verbatim notes taken of the Public Hearing in  
7 RE: APPLICATION ON BEHALF OF RINGGOLD  
8 CRESCENT PARTNERS, LLC, FOR SPECIAL  
9 DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT DESIGNATION FOR THE 1.33  
10 ACRE PATRISSI NURSERY SITE AT 35 RINGGOLD AND  
11 34 CRESCENT STREETS IN THE RM-1 ZONE, TO  
12 REMOVE THE EXISTING STRUCTURES AND CREATE THE  
13 TOWNHOMES AT RINGGOLD ESTATES, A COMMUNITY OF  
14 25 TOWNHOMES IN 5 BUILDINGS, MARK LOVELY AND  
15 ANTHONY M. VALENTI, MEMBERS, AND CO-TRUSTEES  
16 OF THE RICHARD F. PATRISSI TRUST, OWNER, Held  
17 before the West Hartford Town Council, at  
18 Town Hall, 50 South Main Street, Room 314,  
19 West Hartford, Connecticut, on February 27,  
20 2017.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25



---

Robert G. Dixon, CVR-M 857  
Notary Public  
BCT Reporting, LLC  
PO Box 1774  
Bristol, Connecticut 06011  
My Commission Expires: 6/30/2020