

Route 10 Steering Committee Meeting #14
Simsbury Town Hall, Main Meeting Room
Minutes of September 21, 2011 – 7:00 PM

ATTENDEES:	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company*</u>
	Mary Glassman	First Selectman – SC
	Alan Needham	Planning Commission - SC
	Emil Dahlquist	Design Review Board – SC
	Rick Wagner	Representing local business in corridor – SC
	Kirsten Griebel	Resident – SC
	Mark Deming	Economic Development Commission – SC
	Nancy Haase	Board of Selectmen – SC
	Jim Gallagher	Zoning Commission – SC
	Margery Winters	CC IW - SC
	Jennifer Carrier	CRCOG - PT
	Emily Moos	CRCOG – PT
	Hiram Peck	Town of Simsbury - PT
	Sue Bednarczyk	Member of the Public
	Tim Lescallet	Stakeholder, North Gateway
	Steven Antonio	Stakeholder, North Gateway
	Bob Hensley	Member of the Public

* SC = Steering Committee
 PT = Project Team

Welcome and Business

Mary Glassman welcomed everyone to the meeting. She asked Emily Moos to list the handouts that were distributed to the Steering Committee.

Adoption of Minutes

Margery Winters made a motion to adopt the June 9th, 2011 Minutes with corrections:

- On Page 1 change “Nancy Haase – Resident” to “Nancy Haase – BOS” under Attendees
- On Page 6 revisit to clarify language on 2nd and 3rd to last lines starting with, “Emily hopes...” and “She would caution against...”
- On Page 7: revisit to clarify language regarding matrix in 3rd paragraph from tom starting with, “A Committee member stated...”

Alan Needham Seconded the motion which passed unanimously.

MEETING NOTES**September 21, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #14****PAGE 2 OF 6**

Nancy Haase made a motion to adopt the June 27th, 2011 Minutes with corrections:

- On Page 1 change “Nancy Haase – Resident” to “Nancy Haase – BOS” under Attendees

Kirsten Griebel seconded the motion which passed unanimously

Alan Needham made a motion to adopt the July 6th, 2011 Minutes with corrections:

- On Page 1 clarify public comment made by Judy Rabinowitz regarding phasing for the South Gateway alternative. Committee member recalls that Ms. Rabinowitz opposes this alternative and did not say that she wished it to be phased, “As Opportunity Arises”

Nancy Haase seconded the motion which passed unanimously

The committee elected to table the September 8th, 2011 minutes.

Public Comment

Steve Antonio stated that he wanted to clarify that the minutes from the past meeting indicated that North Gateway property owners were in support of the roadway improvements in that area. Mr. Antonio clarified that as a North Gateway business owner he had agreed to disagree, especially on the parallel roadway concept. He also asked for clarification on who would pay for this roadway.

Hiram Peck stated that these concepts could be paid for in a number of different ways such as public private partnership or by private developers or a combination of funding sources, but that it would depend upon the individual project.

Tim Lescalleet stated that he appreciates the changes that were made to the map of the North Gateway improvements.

He offered the following rewording of the language on the last paragraph of page 61 of the report which talks about the parallel roadway:

“Integral to the North Gateway plan is the concept inter-parcel access between adjacent lands located on the westerly side of Route 10 (i.e. instituting vehicular connectivity between future developments that will not require use of Route 10). This may be achieved vis-à-vis established travel lane(s) running through parking areas and connecting with adjacent developments, or a service road running parallel to Route 10. Such interconnectivity would limit the number of curb cuts required to serve future developments, thereby reducing traffic flow entering and exiting Route 10.”

Mr. Lescalleet also stated that the language regarding setbacks and placing parking behind buildings is too strong. He suggested that the language should state that future developments

MEETING NOTES**September 21, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #14****PAGE 3 OF 6**

“should attempt to allocate parking in a manner that would minimize its being located between buildings and Route 10”

Mr. Lescalleet also stated that the paragraph about preserving the barn structures in the North Gateway is contradictory and should be reworded. He suggested taking out the second sentence of that paragraph and softening the language to state that the recommendation “encourages” the preservation of barns.

Mr. Lescalleet also offered a correction on page 62 of the draft report stating that the improvements at Route 10 and Hoskins Road are presently under construction, not under design.

Sue Benardczyk stated that she is concerned about the areas in the report which discuss density and stated that she would like to see more clarification as to what that term means and how it is used in the report.

Bob Hensley stated that he has an office on Simsbury-Avon town line and that he is concerned about the safety of the greenway crossing on RT 10 in this area. He mentioned several recent incidents that have reiterated his concerns over the safety of this crossing. He stated that moving crossing down to Latimer Lane is not a good idea because of the safety concerns at that location right before The Hartford driveway and on a curve. He stated that the current safety measures in place at the current crossing (push button and flashing light) are not being used. He stated that a tunnel or Bridge may be only safe solutions. He stated that the plan's recommendation to place a crossing at the Hartford driveway does seem better than the current location.

Discussion of Final Draft Report**Summary of Refinements****South Gateway**

- A committee member pointed out that the Graphic shows a segment of roadway aligning with Old Meadow Plain which may have been left in the image erroneously. The committee agreed that this segment should be eliminated and that the “Future Connectivity” designation should also be eliminated from the Key.
- The committee also agreed that the commuter parking lot designation should also come out of this graphic but transit connections should be addressed in the text.

Nod Road & RT 185

- A committee member had questions regarding the roundabout and why there needs to be an improvement here. CRCOG explained that there are safety issues at this

MEETING NOTES**September 21, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #14****PAGE 4 OF 6**

intersection and that the existing teardrop is an intersection solution that is no longer a widely used solution by traffic engineers.

- The committee agreed that they are comfortable with removing Alternative 2 – T-intersection as they would prefer to see the roundabout alternative implemented.
- Committee would like to copy the note that reads “Analyze alternative to this configuration to take out bypass road...” into body of text.

Historic Industry

- Committee members discussed the meaning of “service-style roadway” and they would like to see more consistency on how report classifies parallel roadway
- A committee member stated that the study could be followed up with roadway guidelines
- CRCOG will place a roadway cross section - potentially from the Town Center Charrette report into this section to show the scale of a two-lane service road.
- A committee member questioned the phrase “resiliency of the town center” Committee members agreed to rewording this phrase as “flexibility to market changes”
- The committee discussed whether the realignment of Drake Hill Road to West Street intersection should be included in the report or the appendix. The committee agreed it should be included in the main portion of the report.

North Gateway

- Addressing Tim Lescalleet’s comments –
 - The committee was comfortable leaving in mention of the parallel roadway concept because of its access management benefits and agrees that the wording of the report - the way it currently is written – is not overly prescriptive. Committee members do agree that the heading of the section regarding the parallel roadway should read, “North Gateway Access Management” rather than “North Gateway Parallel Roadway”
 - Committee members agree that the bullet point regarding preserving barns modified to take out sentence which begins, “Saving the barns (although desirable)...”
- The committee discussed the public comment regarding parallel roads encouraging density. Members agree that the last line of the opening paragraph that begins, “If developed in a synergistic fashion there is a potential to create a real node, with impressive density...” should be removed.
- A committee member pointed out that the label on the rendering on page 62 should read “Wolcott Road intersection” not “Hoskins Road intersection.”
- A committee member questioned whether the report should indicate North Gateway business owners concerns over regional roadways threatening multi-generational businesses in this area – it was suggested that concerns and issues that stem from

MEETING NOTES**September 21, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #14****PAGE 5 OF 6**

recommendations in the report could be addressed in a list or letter from the Steering Committee to the Board of Selectmen

Recommendations Matrix

- A committee member suggested adding a recommendation extending transit to the South Gateway so that there would be transit service between Route 185 to Route 44

General Comments

- A committee member raised concerns as to whether from legal standpoint, this report makes recommendations that could be challenged
- Ms. Glassman stated that there is no legal challenge to this document because it is a tool and a guide and there are no requirements made of private property owners or the town. She stated that she does have a legal opinion from the town's attorney that she can circulate to the Steering Committee. CRCOG has never had any issue with legality of corridor study documents or any question of the legality of these studies because they are planning studies and they do not make requirements of towns or property owners.
- Ms. Glassman asked that CRCOG provide a letter to the Simsbury Public Safety department about safety issues at the dangerous greenway crossing in the southern part of Route 10.
- A committee member suggested that there be a separate letter or list of outstanding issues that the committee would like to follow up on with regard to this study. Ms. Glassman stated and the committee agreed that they could present a list of issues to the Board of Selectmen regarding this report and that the committee member should send Emily a list issues to pursue.
- A committee member raised the issue of what the study recommends as the character of Route 10 as a 2-lane highway as future growth occurs inside and outside of town.

Steering Committee Vote on Final Report Endorsement

The Steering Committee elected not to vote on endorsement, but did pass a motion that the committee discussion of September 21, 2011 represents the final thoughts of the RT 10 Steering Committee on the Draft Route 10 Study Report which has now been fully vetted and that the project team will revise the report based upon these thoughts and comments heard.

Next Steps

Mary Glassman stated that the committee would convene again to seek an endorsement of this final draft report. She stated that regarding adoption of the report by the Board of Selectmen, the town could call a special meeting or meet at a regular meeting in October with BOS.

Ms. Glassman stated that committee members should forward Emily Moos a list of issues to follow up on to present to the Board of Selectmen

MEETING NOTES**September 21, 2011****ROUTE 10 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING #14****PAGE 6 OF 6****Adjourn**

Ms. Glassman asked for a motion to adjourn.

Kirsten Griebel made a motion and Alan Needham seconded. The motion passed unanimously.