

PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING  
JANUARY 29, 2008 – 6:00 P.M.  
TOWN HALL ANNEX-COMMUNITY ROOM 1

I. ROLL CALL

Regular Members Present: Sherrard, Steinfeld, Munn, Roper, Pritchard (left at 6:30 p.m.)

Alternate Members Present: Fitzgerald, Kane (arrived at 6:20 p.m.)

Staff: Murphy, Oefinger, Schneider, Nichols, Moulding

II. ITEMS OF BUSINESS

1. 2009-2014 Capital Improvement Program – Review and Recommendations

Michael Murphy explained how the Planning and Development Office gathered information from Town Departments to create the draft CIP. He showed the Commission a new map showing locations of the principle projects.

Mark Oefinger, Town Manager, thanked the Commission for meeting to review the CIP. He stated that the total of \$3,389,000 will need to be substantially cut. He asked for the Commission's opinion on which projects should be considered the highest priorities. He stated that he had just received a bridge project in Groton Long Point to be added to the CIP. He also stated that this year more technology has been added to the CIP.

The Commission reviewed each project with staff, and had the following comments. Items are listed by project number and letter subsection referencing the draft CIP.

1. Roads, A) Pavement Management Program Implementation – Staff stated that paving Gungywamp Road is a priority. The city is also doing pavement management project, including evaluation and ranking, as well as Groton Long Point. The goal is to have the Town and the subdivisions utilizing the same system.

1. Roads, B) Major Road Traffic Circulation Implementation - Staff stated that the Kolnaski School and possibly another school would be using this area. Roper feels a sidewalk is important on this stretch of road near the school. Steinfeld commented that the main gate area outside of the Subase needs patching.

1. Roads, E) Bridge reconstruction – Mark Oefinger stated that a project would be added in Groton Long Point consisting of \$25,000 in 09 for planning and engineering and \$130,000 for permitting for the bridge on Beach Road. Munn asked if there is any thought to expanding the bridge or pulling back the abutments to improve tidal flow. Staff stated that this would be looked at as part of the design and planning phase.

1. Roads, H) Replacement of Defective Roadside Barrier System - Steinfeld suggested that the barriers in front of the Submarine Memorial could be improved with another project, the Thames Street Rehab study, because two cars have been able to get through the barriers. It was requested that the Town notify the city about the concern.

1. Roads, J) Thames Street Rehabilitation – Mark Oefinger stated that this project is a place holder because this may go to the voters. The Commission

felt that the Committee should look at phasing this project. Some members felt that portions of the project like the streetscape sections should be funded by the City.

2. Drainage & Watershed Protection, B) Local Drainage Improvements/New Installations – Staff stated that this would explore the potential for addressing some of the funding cuts in the Mystic Streetscape project necessitated by CONNDOT’s requirement for the hydrodynamic separator to catch road silt. Roper feels it would be shortsighted to cut back on the Streetscape project.

3. Sidewalks, A) Replacement Sidewalk Construction – Given the proximity to High Street Roper noted that future consideration should be given to extending the sidewalk to Cliff Street.

3. Sidewalks, B) New Sidewalk Construction-Route 215 – Staff stated that it would cost about \$45,000 to put in an asphalt sidewalk. The Commission felt this was important to completing this link near Esker Point for safety reasons.

3. Sidewalks, C) New Sidewalk Construction – Route 1 Downtown – The Commission stated that this is an important gateway to downtown where the right of way is narrow, ledge limits visibility, and pedestrian safety is a concern. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic in the area.

3. Sidewalks, E) New Sidewalk Construction – Drozdyk Drive - The Commission felt that this should be a high priority but would be willing to push it out a year if the developer for Ledges II is required to build part of the sidewalk. Staff would review the file to advise the Town Manager.

3. Sidewalks, G) Poquonnock Road Sidewalk Kolnaski School – Commission members suggested moving this project out. Oefinger suggested cutting the cost to \$40,000 and using asphalt to fill this open link along Poquonnock Road. The Commission felt this was a good compromise for public safety.

4. Parks and Recreation, B) Esker Point Beach Improvement Program – The Commission felt that this could be moved out another year.

4. Parks and Recreation, E) Open Space Acquisition and Development - The Commission supported this project. Steinford suggested the future option of using the money to buy the duplex property by the car wash on Drozdyk Drive to start a park, a concept furthered in the recent Strategic Economic Development Plan.

4. Parks and Recreation, F) Sutton Park Improvement Project – Commission verified with staff that there would be public involvement in the process for identifying improvements in this park.

4. Parks and Recreation, G) Golf Course Improvements – Pritchard and the Commission felt that the cost should be borne by users not the Town. The Commission suggested cutting back on the scope of the project if possible.

5. Education, B) West Side Middle School - The Commission suggested moving this project out another year to see what happens with Phase II.

5. Education, D) Claude Chester - The Commission felt this project should be a priority because of the present traffic conditions and that parking here also serves the Poquonnock Plains park.

5. Education, F) Educational Technologies – Oefinger stated that he cannot support this item as presented. The Commission felt this should be funded under the Board of Education’s operating budget unless broken down into specific justifiable capital projects.

The Commission reviewed and had no comments on projects under Public Buildings and Technology.

8. Economic Development, C) Economic Assistance Fund – The Commission supported the \$50,000.00 proposal and noted that it would like to see this increased to as much as a full \$100,000 to be put in this fund each year.

8. Economic Development, D) Crystal Lake Road – The Commission supports project and would like to see this area improved sooner. Staff stated that it has developed some concepts on paper for improvements at the Subase main gate but does not believe anything will be happening in this area in the next year, so it has moved the project out.

The Commission reviewed and had no comment on the projects under Water Pollution Control Facility and Miscellaneous.

III. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn at 9:08 p.m. by Roper, seconded by Sherrard, so voted unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Pritchard

Prepared by Robin Moulding,  
Office Assistant III