
Town Staff Present: Temporary Town Planning Coordinator and Assistant Zoning and Wetlands Officer John Szczesny, and Town Engineer Dana Steele

Chairman Gannuscio called the meeting to order at 7:07 pm.

Commission roll call was taken.

Chairman Gannuscio seated Mr. Szepanski for Commissioner Scarfo for all of the evening’s proceedings.

MINUTES:

Chairman Gannuscio referred to the February 14, 2011 meeting minutes and asked the Commission members and staff for any comments or corrections. They had none. Mr. Gannuscio moved to approve the February 14, 2011 meeting minutes, as published. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 3 – 0 (Ms. Ramsay and Mr. Brown abstained), the motion was approved.

REVIEWS:

a. Continued review of the site plan application of Rollies Garage, LLC for the property located at 4 Lawnacre Road.

Steve Rolocut, owner of Rollies Garage, addressed the Commission and stated that his engineer had spoken with Town Engineer Steele and that they believed that they had resolved all of the issues raised by Mr. Steele.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Rolocut if he had received approval from the Inland Wetlands Commission. Mr. Rolocut replied that he had received approval from the Windsor Locks Inland Wetlands Commission and the Windsor Wetlands Commission. Mr. Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny if he had copies of those approvals. Mr. Szczesny stated that he did have copies.

Mr. Steele referred to his letter dated March 14, 2011 and stated that it had contained the following seven suggested conditions of approval:
1. There appears to be a conflict between the storm drainage and sanitary sewer. An alternate pipe configuration may be required.
2. Change PVC designation to C900 where less than 36 inches of cover is provided.
3. Final plans shall include a detail of the oil/water separator conforming to town standards.
4. Prior to start of construction, the applicant shall provide a cash E&S bond in the amount of $4,000.
5. Prior to commencing sanitary sewer work, the applicant shall submit flow calculations and proposed adjustments to the pump station's float levels to the WPCA for approval.
6. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit engineered shop drawings of all site retaining walls for approval.
7. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall provide a copy of the DEP registration for the new oil/water separator.

Mr. Steele referred to Item 1 and stated that there had been a miscommunication with emails and that he had received some information earlier that day that resolved the issue. He went on to say that all seven items should be included as conditions of any approval.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Rolocut if he had any questions. Mr. Rolocut asked what the $4,000 bond was for. Mr. Steele replied that it was for erosion control measures, silt fence, stabilization, and repair of any erosion that might occur. Mr. Rolocut then asked how long the bond would be held. Mr. Steele replied that it would be held until the grass was established and the site was stabilized.

Mr. Rolocut asked Mr. Steele if he wanted the C900 because it was thicker. Mr. Steele replied that C900 was the Town's specification. He went on to say that the C940 did not have the same designation for strength. Mr. Rolocut then stated that he was okay with using the C900 as well as the other suggested conditions.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny for any comments or questions. Mr. Szczesny had none.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any comments or questions. They had none.

Mr. Scarfo arrived at the meeting at 7:15 pm.

Chairman Gannuscio read the memorandum dated February 17, 2011 from Gary Kuczarski, Superintendent, Water Pollution Control Facility (WPCF), as follow:
- How many units? Subdivided
- Will each unit have a floor drain? If so, will all be tied into new oil/water/sand separator?
- Show details of oil/water separator on print.

Mr. Gannuscio asked Mr. Steele of those issues had been resolved. Mr. Steele noted that the memorandum was dated the same day as the plan revision and that Mr. Kuczarski probably
hadn’t had the revised plans that showed the new separator when he wrote that memorandum. Mr. Rolocut stated that Mr. Kuczarski had called him and that he had verified that everything would be going into the separator.

Chairman Gannuscio referred to the memorandum dated November 29, 2010 from Scott Lappen, Director of Public Works, and stated that he had had no comments other than noting that WPCF approval would be required.

Chairman Gannuscio read the memorandum dated March 8, 2011 from John Suchocki, Chief of Police, as follows:

“I have reviewed the above-identified site plan and have no concerns with the plans as submitted, provided all Planning and Zoning regulations are met.”

Chairman Gannuscio asked for a motion regarding the site plan applications of Rollies Garage, LLC. Mr. Zimnoch moved to approve the site plan application of Rollies Garage, LLC for the property located at 4 Lawnacre Road with the conditions listed as Items 1 through 7 in Mr. Steele’s March 14, 2011 letter. Ms. Ramsay seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5–0, the motion was approved.

Ms. Ramsay recommended that Mr. Szepanski be seated in her place since she was not present for the previous meeting and most of the items on the agenda had been continued from that meeting. Chairman Gannuscio agreed and seated Mr. Szepanski for Ms. Ramsay for the rest of the meeting.

b. Review of the site plan modification application of McDonald’s c/o Bohler Engineering for the property located at 195 Ella Grasso Turnpike.

Rhona McFarlane, Area Construction Manager for McDonald’s, addressed the Commission and stated that John Kucich of Bohler Engineering was also present that evening.

Mr. Kucich stated that they had been before the Commission three and a half years prior and had received site plan modification approval at that time. He went on to say that since that time the owner had made some modifications to that plan which included the architecture of the building and some additional parking spaces. He then noted that the proposed building architecture would be a 50s style building.

Mr. Kucich explained that the proposed modification included a 7,200 square foot reduction in impervious coverage on the site, the addition of ten parking spaces and a lighting plan modification. He then pointed out that they were still going to be removing the two reader boards from the pylon sign, installing sidewalks, and maintaining the landscape buffer as was shown on the original site plan modification.
Mr. Zimnoch asked if there was going to be a reduction in the size of the building. Mr. Kucich replied that the existing building was 5,500 square feet and that they were proposing a 4,400 square foot building. Mr. Zimnoch then asked what size the building had been on the original site plan modification approval. Mr. Kucich replied that that modification had been for a 5,300 square foot building.

Mr. Zimnoch referred to the architectural changes and asked Mr. Kucich to go over those changes. Mr. Kucich showed a photograph of the proposed retro 50's-style building and noted that there was a very similar McDonald's building in Newington, Connecticut.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if the play area was going to be eliminated. Mr. Kucich replied that the play area was going to be eliminated. He then explained that the previous modification approval had contained a play area in the front portion of the building. Ms. McFarlane noted that the demographics did not support a play area.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Steele for his concerns/comments. Mr. Steele stated that he had no concerns, but that he did have a few questions. He then referred to the grease trap and asked if the existing 2,000 gallon trap was going to be replaced. Mr. Kucich stated that their original modification approval had proposed that the grease trap be upgraded. He went on to say that although the owner had not proceeded with the approved modifications he had gone ahead and installed the upgraded grease trap about two or three years ago. Mr. Steele asked if replumbing would be required. Mr. Kucich replied that some new connections into the grease trap were required, but that the outlet and baffle would remain unchanged. Mr. Steele then asked if they were still going to install the sidewalks on Old County Road and Ella Grasso Turnpike. Mr. Kucich replied that they were going to be installed. Mr. Steele referred to the ramps at each driveway and the level landings prior to stepping out into the parking area. He then pointed out that for the previous modification approval they had agreed that those landings would be removed. Ms. McFarlane clarified that Mr. Steele wanted the landings removed. Mr. Steele stated that that was correct. Mr. Kucich stated that that would be no problem.

Chairman Gannuscio referred to Item 9 from Mr. O'Leary's memorandum dated March 7, 2011 regarding the patio and then asked what that patio feature was. Mr. Kucich replied that the front area of the building would be a stamped concrete patio with seating and a fence and landscaping around it.

Chairman Gannuscio asked, if approval was granted, were the plans ready to move forward at the start of the construction season. Ms. McFarlane replied that they were ready to move forward. Mr. Gannuscio then asked if there would be a shutdown, teardown of the existing building and a rebuild. Mr. Kucich replied that that was correct. He went on to say that it would take approximately 90 to 100 days to reopen the restaurant.
Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any questions. They had none.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Steele for any questions. Mr. Steele replied that he had no questions, but that there were a number of items listed in Mr. O'Leary's memorandum. He then referred to the impervious coverage and interior landscaped areas and noted that they had increased from the previous modification approval, but that they would still be less than what was currently on the site. Mr. Steele referred to Item 3 from Mr. O'Leary's memorandum in which he had suggested that, if they could not maintain the 25 foot buffer along Old County Road, perhaps an additional hedge row could be installed in that area. Both Ms. McFarlane and Mr. Kucich stated that they had no issue with doing so. Mr. Steele referred to Item 4 from Mr. O'Leary's memorandum which had stated that another street tree was required. Ms. McFarlane stated that they would be adding another street tree. Mr. Steele stated that Mr. O'Leary had referred to the lighting plan and had asked if the 14 building lights had been included in the photometric analysis. Mr. Kucich replied that they had not been included, because they were not angled out. Mr. Steele asked what the wattage of those building lights was. Mr. Kucich stated that he did not know, but that they were definitely lower than the parking lot lights.

Chairman Gannuscio referred to the last sentence of Item 7 from Mr. O'Leary's memorandum, "details of these building mounted fixtures should be provided" and asked if they had been provided. Mr. Kucich replied that a cut sheet had not been included in their submittal, but that they would provide it.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that they had received site plan modification approval from Gary Kuczarski, WPCA Superintendent, and Scott Lappen, Public Works Director. He then asked if they had received a letter from the Police. Mr. Szczesny stated that he had not received a letter from the Police. Mr. Gannuscio then asked if they had made any changes to the circulation on the site. Mr. Kucich replied that there were no changes in the circulation. Mr. Gannuscio asked if they had received anything from Fire. Mr. Szczesny stated that he had received a memorandum from the Fire Marshal and then submitted that memorandum to Mr. Gannuscio. Mr. Gannuscio then read the Fire Marshal's memorandum dated February 16, 2011 as follows:

"Please be advised that review of the submitted site plans and specifications did not disclose any issues affecting the fire department's access to the site or the ability to suppress a fire within the site."

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any questions. Mr. Szepanski referred to Item 6 from Mr. O'Leary's memorandum and asked how it had been addressed. Mr. Kucich stated that it was similar to the original modification approval which had also been noncompliant. He explained that they would have landscaping on the front and back of the building, but that on one side of the building was the drive thru and the other contained
the doors into the building which required that sidewalks be installed on that side. He then pointed out that it had been discussed at the previous site plan modification review and that it had been approved.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members for any further questions. They had none.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to approve the site plan modification application of McDonald’s c/o Bohler Engineering for the property located at 195 Ella Grasso Turnpike with the following conditions:
1. Staff be provided with details of the building light fixtures.
2. Item 3 from Mr. O’Leary’s March 7, 2011 memorandum; a hedge row along Old County Road.
3. Item 4 from Mr. O’Leary’s March 7, 2011 memorandum, an additional street tree.
4. Sidewalk ramps shall conform to Town standards.
Mr. Szepanski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

a. Continued public hearing on the application to amend Section 605 and add new Sections 607 and 602d to the Zoning Regulations.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to continue the public hearing on the application to amend Section 605 and add new Sections 607 and 602d to the Zoning Regulations to the April 11, 2011 meeting. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

b. Continued public hearing on the site plan review application of Jin Hospitality, LLC for the property located at 4 Loten Drive.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Brown to read the rules for conducting a public hearing. Mr. Brown then did so.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Recording Secretary to read the legal notice. The Recording Secretary then read the legal notice that was published in the Journal Inquirer on March 2 and 10, 2011.

Chairman Gannuscio noted that under Article 10, Section 3 the Commission had the privilege of speaking first during a public hearing. He then stated that Mr. O’Leary had brought to his attention that the number of employees on the site had increased. Attorney Milazzo
confirmed that the number of employees had gone from ten to sixteen. He then submitted six different packets of information to the Recording Secretary to include in the hearing file. Attorney Milazza stated that he had contacted the Margueritas’ Corporate Headquarters and had asked them to send him an estimate for the number of employees at the proposed restaurant. Mr. Johannesen explained that they had done a study based on the number of employees required for this type of restaurant per 100 seats. He then noted that they were proposing 20 employees and 165 seats. Mr. Gannuscio asked how that number of employees fit with the parking calculations. Mr. Johannesen stated that he had spent a lot of time since the previous meeting discussing the concerns regarding the Halfway House Road exit and traffic with Mr. Steele and Mr. O’Leary. He went on to say that he had submitted a preliminary lay-out without the Halfway House exit to Mr. Steele and Mr. O’Leary and that after they had discussed it amongst themselves and with Fire and Police it was agreed that the Halfway House Road exit should remain in place.

Mr. Johannesen stated that they were proposing to leave the access to Halfway House Road and to use twelve hotel parking spaces for Margueritas’ employee parking; the hotel had extra parking spaces. He then explained that the hotel owner also owned the site in question and that he was going to provide an easement to allow the twelve restaurant employees to park in the hotel parking spaces. Attorney Milazzo pointed out that it would be a permanent easement filed on the land records; if the property were sold the easement would remain in place.

Chairman Gannuscio commented that he did not see anywhere in the Regulations where it allowed for off-site parking. Attorney Milazzo stated that he had talked to the Windsor Locks Town Counsel who was looking into the issue. He went on to say that the parking would really not be off-site, because the easement would make those spaces part of the restaurant property. Attorney Milazzo noted that in February, 2009 the Commission had approved a similar easement for 52 South Elm Street. Mr. Gannuscio pointed out that that was for the Church and that they were talking about two quite different situations. Attorney Milazzo stated that it would be posted that the parking spaces in question were for restaurant employees only and that it would be enforced that way.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if they had a set of plans that showed the proposed easement parking. Mr. Johannesen replied that they did have a set of plans that showed it. He then proceeded to submit seven copies of those revised plans to the Commission, but noted that he had not printed out the architecturals.

Chairman Gannuscio noted that that evening was the end of the 65-day period. Attorney Milazzo stated that they would be happy to grant the Commission an extension, if needed.
Chairman Gannuscio commented that he saw it as a major change in the application to the extent where it might need to be withdrawn and resubmitted so that there would be ample time to consider the information. He then questioned whether the off-site parking would have to be done through a variance. Mr. Brown noted that the applicant had mentioned that they were going to hear something from the Town Counsel. Mr. Gannuscio pointed out that they would hear from the Town Counsel if he were to ask the Town Counsel, since the Counsel worked for the Commission and not the applicant. The discussion continued regarding how best to proceed and Mr. Johannesen stated that they would prefer to have the hearing continued as opposed to having to withdraw and resubmit.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if there was an executed easement. Attorney Milazzo replied that there was no easement, but it could be a condition of approval that he draft it up and run it by the Town Counsel. Mr. Johannesen reiterated that the hotel had enough parking to provide the easement and still meet the Planning and Zoning Commission’s requirements for their site. Attorney Milazzo pointed out that the employee parking would all be in one spot, within easy walking distance to the restaurant and clearly identified/marketed as restaurant employee parking only. Mr. Johannesen then noted that the remainder of the site would basically stay the same.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Commission members how they felt about granting an extension. Mr. Scarfo stated that he would be in favor of granting an extension. Mr. Zimnoch stated that he would prefer to start over. Ms. Ramsay stated that she would prefer to deny without prejudice and start over. Mr. Szepanski stated that he would prefer to grant an extension since everyone involved had already spent so much time working on it. Attorney Milazzo stated that they could also modify and reduce the number of seats in the restaurant, if they needed to.

Mr. Scarfo referred to the exit onto Halfway House Road and asked if there was any way that a tractor trailer could make a right turn onto Halfway House Road. Mr. Johannesen replied that a tractor trailer could not make a right turn onto Halfway House Road. Mr. Scarfo then asked if a car could make that right hand turn. Mr. Johannesen replied that a car could make the turn. He went on to say that they had also eliminated the ÊNo Left TurnÊ sign.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if there was a formal request for an extension. Attorney Milazzo then asked that the applicant be granted an extension of 65 days for the public hearing on their site plan application for the property located at 4 Loten Drive. Mr. Gannuscio asked for a motion regarding the extension request. Mr. Szepanski moved to accept the 65 day extension request for the public hearing on the site plan application of Jin Hospitality, LLC for the property located at 4 Loten Drive. Mr. Scarfo seconded the motion. The vote was 3 – 2 (Mr. Zimnoch and Mr. Gannuscio were opposed); the motion was approved.
c. Continued public hearing on the special use permit/liquor permit application of Jin Hospitality, LLC for the property located at 4 Loten Drive.

Chairman Gannuscio asked the Recording Secretary to read the legal notice. The Recording Secretary then read the legal notice that was published in the Journal Inquirer on March 2 and 10, 2011.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if there was a similar extension request for the special use/liquor permit application. Attorney Milazzo replied that they would also like a 65-day extension of the public hearing on the special use/liquor permit application. Mr. Szepanski moved to grant the 65-day extension of the public hearing on the special use/liquor permit application Jin Hospitality, LLC for the property located at 4 Loten Drive. Mr. Scarfo seconded the motion. The vote was 3 – 0 (Mr. Zimnoch and Mr. Gannuscio opposed), the motion was approved.

ACTION ON CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

There were none.

OLD BUSINESS:

a. Discussion with Commission and Staff

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS:

a. Public Input

There was none.

b. Receive New Applications

There were none.

Mr. Szczesny noted that he had been contacted regarding the redevelopment of 80 Ella Grasso Turnpike (the former Shell Station). He explained that they were looking to have a compressed natural gas refueling station for vehicles and that the existing store on the site would stay, the existing car wash would be demolished and the gasoline pumps would be replaced by the natural gas refueling units. Mr. Szczesny stated that he had received plans, but that no actual formal application had been submitted.
c. Informal discussion regarding the T&M and North Group, LLC request for acceptance of roads.

Mr. Steele stated that he had not gotten out to look at the site yet. Chairman Gannuscio asked the Recording Secretary to carry the item over to the April meeting agenda.

d. Election of Officers

Chairman Gannuscio stated that the Secretary, Vice Chairman, and Chairman positions were available.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Brown if he was interested in continuing as the Secretary. Mr. Brown replied that he was.

Chairman Gannuscio nominated Mr. Brown as Secretary. Ms. Ramsay seconded the nomination. Mr. Gannuscio then asked for any other nominations. There were none. All were in favor. The vote was 4 – 0 (Mr. Brown abstained), Mr. Brown was elected as Secretary.

Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Zimnoch if he was willing to continue as Vice Chairman. Mr. Zimnoch replied that he was. Mr. Gannuscio then asked if anyone else was interested in being Vice Chairman. No one was interested in the position.

Chairman Gannuscio nominated Mr. Zimnoch as Vice Chairman. Ms. Ramsay seconded the nomination. Mr. Gannuscio asked for any other nominations. There were none. The vote was 4 – 0 (Mr. Zimnoch abstained), Mr. Zimnoch was elected as Vice Chairman.

Chairman Gannuscio asked for nominations for Chairman. Mr. Zimnoch nominated Mr. Gannuscio. Mr. Scarfo seconded the motion. Mr. Gannuscio asked for any other nominations. There were none. The vote was 4 – 0 (Mr. Gannuscio abstained), Mr. Gannuscio was elected as Chairman.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received a telephone call from Harland Levy from the Journal Inquirer earlier that day while he was at work. He went on to say that he was a little upset that he had received a call from a reporter at work. Mr. Gannuscio noted that Mr. Levy’s question had been was there a meeting that evening and at what time. He then pointed out that both of those questions could have been answered by checking the Town’s website.
Chairman Gannuscio referred to the comment that had been made at the public hearing the previous month that the Commission was grossly negligent in considering the application before them. He went on to say that he was seriously considering some kind of notice to the Town where the individual resided, since that individual served on a Board in that town. Mr. Scarfo agreed with Mr. Gannuscio; sending some sort of notice was a good idea. He went on to say that the comment was really unprofessional, rude and totally uncalled for. Mr. Zimnoch agreed that the comment that had been made was very inappropriate. Ms. Ramsay asked Mr. Gannuscio if expressing it with his title in a Letter to the Editor would have more impact. Mr. Gannuscio replied that he felt that a letter to the Selectmen from Suffield along with copies of the pages from the Commission’s minutes would be better. Mr. Szepanski commented that he felt that the individual in question had gotten caught up in emotion, because she had a vested interest in not seeing Marguerita’s built on Route 75 since it could hurt the business that she worked for. He went on to say that he did not think that she really meant what she had said and that she had apologized. Mr. Szepanski also pointed out that if they were to pursue it with the Town of Suffield they did not know how it would be received and that the Commission might need Suffield’s cooperation in the future, but that pursuing the comments might detract from that future assistance/cooperation. The discussion continued briefly and Mr. Gannuscio stated that he would defer any action on the matter until the application was resolved.

Ms. Ramsay asked what was happening with Babylon. Chairman Gannuscio stated that he was expecting a report from the special counsel that they had hired, hopefully, within the week. He went on to say that the process that had started out as something that they could not touch had since turned into to something that they could come together on and work out. He then noted that the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) had found at least several violations at Babylon’s site in recent years in which they may have cited Babylon.

BILLS AND CORRESPONDENCE:

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received an invoice for their yearly dues to the Connecticut Federation of Planning and Zoning Agencies in the amount of $90. He then noted that they did have money in the budget for it.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to approve the Commission’s membership dues to the Connecticut Federation of Planning and Zoning Agencies through March 21, 2012 in the amount of $90. Mr. Szepanski seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received an invoice from Mr. O’Leary for his January/February, 2011 retainer in the amount of $3,333. He then moved to approve Mr. O’Leary’s invoice in the amount of $3,333. Mr. Scarfo seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the motion was approved.
Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received some correspondence from Gary Kuczarski, Superintendent of the Water Pollution Control Facility, with regard to the Dairy Cream alterations/addition. His comments were as follows: Òan adequate sized mechanical grease interceptor requiredÓ. Mr. Gannuscio then asked Mr. Steele if he had had any further discussion with Mr. Kuczarski about it. Mr. Steele replied that he had not spoken with Mr. Kuczarski about it. He then commented that Dairy Cream had not had a grease trap and had argued that they did not need one because they were not going to be cooking and that that was how he thought it had been left. Mr. Steele noted that Mr. Kuczarski's comment was pretty vague and that they might be able to come to an agreement for something internal. Mr. Scarfo stated that it had looked like the Dairy Cream had already started construction. Mr. Steele asked Mr. Szczesny to let Jim Plumridge, Town Building Inspector, know that Mr. Kuczarski wanted some type of interceptor installed. Mr. Gannuscio then gave Mr. Kuczarski's memorandum to Mr. Szczesny.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that the Commission's budget, as it had been presented to the Board of Finance had been signed-off on by the Board of Finance, except for the Legal Advertisement budget which had been cut by $500. He then noted that he felt that that was something that the Commission could live with. He went on to say that all of the other line items in the budget had been approved as they had been presented. Mr. Gannuscio commented that the Board of Finance's budget approval notification was dated February 15, 2011 and that it might have pre-dated the disclosure that the Town was going to receive $2.4 million less for the payment in lieu of taxes. He then noted that there might be notification to the various Boards to make further budget cuts. Mr. Scarfo asked if there was any way that the Commission could have the applicants pay for the legal advertisements. Mr. Steele stated that the application fees should be configured to cover the cost of the advertisements. The Recording Secretary pointed out that any application fees collected went into the Town's General Fund and did not go into the Commission's budget. A discussion of the legal notices and legal results took place and it was agreed that the Commission should continue to run both legal results and notices for any continued public hearings.

Chairman Gannuscio stated that he had received the following two emails:
- One notifying him that John Szczesny was going to be sitting in for Jennifer Rodriguez, because she had started her maternity leave.
- The other email had been sent to First Selectman Wawruck who had then forwarded it to Mr. Gannuscio. The email was from a town resident regarding the Oak Ridge Condominiums. The resident had wanted to know why every inch of Windsor Locks needed to be built upon.
Mr. Gannuscio stated that he had not replied to the email, because the time to raise that question should have been during the public hearing on the Oak Ridge Condominium application.
Chairman Gannuscio asked Mr. Szczesny if he had anything for discussion. Mr. Szczesny commented that the meeting agenda was posted on the Town’s website, but not posted in the calendar on the front page of that website. He suggested that the Commission’s meeting dates be posted on that calendar on the website. Mr. Gannuscio agreed. The Recording Secretary then stated that she would add the meeting dates to the town calendar on the website.

Mr. Steele stated that Mr. Lappen, Public Works Director, had asked him to bring up the Public Works Department’s roadway reconstruction project that was underway between Main Street and Suffield Street. He went on to say that the project had gone out to bid and that a contractor had been selected. They were ready to get underway and start work on Olive Street and Pleasant Street. He then noted that it was going to be funded through a federal grant program. Mr. Steele stated that the plan was to keep proceeding with that neighborhood each year and that Pearl Street and Fern Street were targeted for the following year. Chairman Gannuscio asked if the work included sidewalks. Mr. Steele stated that when there were sidewalks in place they would replace them. He then noted that there were no sidewalks on Fern and Pearl Streets. He went on to say that they could look into installing sidewalks on those two streets, but that the right-of-way was very narrow on those streets. Mr. Steele stated that he could discuss the installation of sidewalks with Mr. Lappen, but that Mr. Lappen might feel that it would be best to address them separately. He then noted that Olive and Pleasant Streets had sidewalks and that they would be replaced. The discussion on sidewalks continued further.

Chairman Gannuscio asked if there was anything else for discussion. Mr. Szepanski stated that the taxis were back on Route 75. Mr. Gannucio commented that he had heard that they were only going to be there until April and that then they were going to be gone again.

Chairman Gannuscio moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Zimnoch seconded the motion. All were in favor. The vote was 5 – 0, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Ferrari
Recording Secretary

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

THIS IS A DRAFT

Please check the following month’s meeting minutes for official approval of these minutes and any amendments or corrections that were made.