

# Capitol Region Council of Governments

241 Main St., Hartford, CT 06106

**Route 305 Advisory Committee Meeting  
Council Chambers, Windsor Town Hall  
Thursday, July 30, 2009  
7:00 PM**

**Draft until endorsed by  
Advisory Committee**

## **Committee Members**

Peter Souza  
Tom Lenehan  
Jim Martin  
Michael O'Brien

## **Organization**

Town of Windsor Town Manager  
Town of Windsor Town Engineer  
Windsor Economic Development  
Windsor Planning & Zoning

## **Others**

Melanie Zimyieski  
Jim Burke  
ConnDOT – Planning  
Windsor Economic Development

## **Project Team**

Jennifer Carrier  
Lia Huang  
Rod Bascom  
Jeff Parker  
Casey Hardin  
CRCOG  
CRCOG  
CHA  
CHA  
CHA

## **Public Attendees**

Terry Souza  
Allan Ferry  
Resident  
Resident

**Meeting Purpose:** Route 305 Corridor Study – Local Advisory Committee meeting to discuss feedback received at the public informational meetings, review refinements to the future improvement alternatives, and discuss potential access management strategies.

## **1. Welcome and Progress Update**

Jennifer Carrier led introductions and updated the Committee on progress since the April 16, 2009 Advisory Committee meeting. The following summarizes Ms. Carrier's update:

- Preliminary findings were presented to the CRCOG Transportation Committee.
- Public informational meetings were held in Bloomfield and Windsor.
- Bloomfield Town Council endorsed the study recommendations
- Project Team responded to public comments and conducted field investigations

## **2. Adoption of Minutes (Meeting on April 16, 2009)**

Jim Martin asked if there were any changes to the April 16, 2009 meeting minutes and none were identified. A motion was made by Mike O'Brien, seconded by Peter Souza, to accept the minutes of the April 16, 2009 meeting as written. The motion passed unanimously

## **3. Public Open House Briefing**

In Bloomfield, an Open House session was held prior to the Town Council Meeting on June 8, 2009. During the Open House period, attendees were able to review boards and maps summarizing the study findings and recommended alternatives. Study Team and Advisory Committee members were available to answer questions and to provide additional information. All attendees were invited to the subsequent Town Council meeting where the study process and findings were presented to the Town Council. During the public comment period attendees expressed concern over the potential

traffic issues with an at-grade crossing and also wanted to ensure that rail line opportunities are preserved. Bloomfield Town Council endorsed the study recommendations at the close of the discussion.

The Windsor Open House had a large turnout with about 30 members of the public present. The session allowed attendees to review boards and maps and to speak with Project Team and Advisory Committee members. The presentation included information on the study purpose, planning process, and draft recommendations. Comments received from the public were mainly focused on widening impacts and difficulties exiting driveways. In response, the project team reexamined the alternatives and will present its findings during this Advisory Committee meeting.

#### **4. Route 305 Alternative Concepts**

Jeff Parker reviewed the three original 4-lane concepts:

- Basic 4-lane section with no median, maintaining existing centerline
- 4-lane section with a narrow median, maintaining existing centerline
- 4-lane section with a wide median, asymmetrical alignment (widening on the south side only)

During the June public meeting, it was requested that a 4-lane section with a wide median maintaining the existing centerline also be reviewed. The Project Team did review this option; Mr. Parker noted that this concept would impact about 25 more properties, including 7 additional full acquisitions, than the asymmetrical alignment. Jim Burke commented that this option removes the possibility of constructing a multiuse path on the south side of Route 305 which is in the towns Plan of Conservation and Development. The Committee agreed that this concept would result in fewer residential properties, thus losing the residential feel along this section of the corridor. For these reasons, this concept will be described in the final report appendix as an option that was reviewed, but will not be included in the final recommendations.

Attendees of the June public meeting also expressed concern over difficulty turning out of driveways with the raised median options. The Project Team developed a “hybrid” option that includes a combination of raised medians, flush textured pavement medians, and opportunities for u-turns. This option incorporates benefits of medians in some areas while allowing for left turns out of most driveways during off-peak traffic hours. However, during peak hour traffic periods, residents will likely need to make a right turn out of their driveways and if needed, use a u-turn opportunity to reverse their direction. The following summarizes the discussion on this topic:

- A member of the public felt that the residents that live near a raised median would not want to make a u-turn every day. Mike O’Brien noted that he has lived on Windsor Avenue for 10 years with a similar raised median configuration. The u-turn sounds like a hassle, but in practice it really is not that bad. Another member of the public questioned the amount of motorists on Windsor Avenue. Mike O’Brien stated that the street does get very busy during the peak periods.
- Mike O’Brien asked whether there are any intersections that do not allow a safe left or u-turn due to limited sight lines. Jeff Parker noted that the crest at the intersection at Brookview does not allow for left or u-turns and the vertical crest between Brewster Road and Sheffield Drive prohibits westbound motorists from making a u-turn at Sheffield Drive (motorists will need to make a u-turn at Brewster Road if a direction change is needed).

Jeff Parker noted that all concepts now include the ConnDOT suggested 5-foot shoulders.

The Committee questioned whether any redevelopment was possible with the wide median, asymmetrical alignment option. An earlier discussion with Eric Barz indicated that the area south of Route 305 would likely remain green space. Jeff Parker presented a bird’s eye view rendering of the 4-lane section with wide median, asymmetrical alignment, multiuse path, and a frontage road just north of Route 305. The following summarizes comments regarding this concept:

- One Committee member noted that the frontage road was unattractive due to the increase in pavement.
- It was questioned whether the frontage road would tie into the perpendicular town roads; Jeff Parker answered that they would.
- Peter Souza noted that the multiuse path would meet a town objective.
- A resident that currently lives on the north side of Route 305 mentioned that he supports the frontage road since it adds a buffer to a 4-lane Route 305.
- Jim Martin suggested that the frontage road could be listed as an extension of the wide median, asymmetrical alignment concept.

Jeff Parker presented two new renderings for Windsor: the narrow median option near Sheffield Drive and the wide median with asymmetrical alignment from the same point of view.

## **5. Access Management**

Jeff Parker reviewed the access management memo regarding Route 305 in the vicinity of Selig Ford. The following summarizes the Committee's discussion:

- Peter Souza asked about the topography in the area of the proposed Addison Road extension. Jeff Parker replied that the topography is relatively flat, but there would be a lot of clearing and grubbing work with this extension.
- Peter Souza noted that there may be some confusion for westbound traffic over how to enter Selig Ford with the Addison Road extension configuration. Another committee member mentioned that signing would have to be installed in combination with any driveway closures. Jeff Parker added that the conceptual improvements were brought up by Selig Ford during the last public meeting.
- The Committee questioned the development potential with the Addison Road extension. Jeff Parker noted that the eastern section was damp and may not be developable. A Committee member mentioned that land unable to support a structure has been used to raise livestock in the past.
- Jim Burke asked whether there were any noted concerns with school buses turning left in this area. No issues were brought to the attention of the Project Team. The buses likely access the parking location outside of the peak traffic hour. A rear connection could be considered as an alternative.
- Jennifer Carrier stated that these concepts will be given to Selig Ford for their consideration and further advancement, if they so desire. Further advancement will require coordination with the State Traffic Commission. The concepts will be added to the Access Management Appendix of the Route 305 Final Report, but the lowering of the vertical crest will be included in the recommendation section of the Final Report.
- A member of the public inquired whether a similar access management investigation could be made for businesses north of this segment of Route 305. Jeff Parker replied that these access management improvements will need to be privately funded. This area will be noted in Appendix 2 of the Report.

## **6. Public Comments**

A member of the public felt that Route 305 is a residential area and wanted to know if traffic, trucks in particular, could be diverted to Day Hill Road instead. Jennifer Carrier noted that since Route 305 is a State road, trucks and other motorists must be provided access. Public comments have been received throughout the study process and it was expressed that alternatives include those that maintain the residential character. Although traffic is expected to increase 25-40% in the year 2030, improvements to the Day Hill Road Interstate-91 interchange may provide a little relief for Route 305.

A public attendee also felt that the recommended improvements will create more traffic on Route 305. Peter Souza commented that the study recommendations are not designed to add traffic but to better manage the increase in traffic that is expected in the future regardless whether these recommendations are implemented or not. Mike O'Brien suggested the resident to follow the Day Hill Road study since it has the potential to relieve some traffic on Route 305. Peter Souza added that the potential commuter line may also decrease traffic on Route 305.

A resident questioned why the Kennedy Road interchange was closed on Interstate-91. Peter Souza replied that when the Bradley Field Connector was built, the Kennedy Road interchange did not meet the safety guidelines for interchange spacing and needed to be closed.

## **7. Next Steps**

Jennifer Carrier reviewed the next steps which include meeting with ConnDOT to discuss the study recommendations, finalizing the Study Report, documentation of possible wildlife crossing accommodations and considerations for the culvert replacement just east of Addison Road, Advisory Committee review and comments on the Draft Executive Summary, meeting with P&Z in September, and meeting with the Windsor Town Council to consider study endorsement (preliminarily scheduled for Monday, September 21, 2009).

## **8. Other Business**

No other business was discussed.

## **9. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM.