CITY OF DANBURY

155 DEER HILL AVENUE
DANBURY, CONNECTICUT 06810

PLANNING COMMISSION
(203) 797-4525
(203) 797-4586 (FAX)

MINUTES
OCTOBER 18, 2006

^^^

Inspector Larry Miguel and they may not be required to have a handicapped parking space. Mr. Hiteshew said he would like to keep it. He added that the configuration of the building works out to fit his needs. Mr. Urice asked what the City would want there if it was not a parking space and Mrs. Emminger said less impervious surface and more green space. Mr. Hiteshew said he would like to keep it because it will allow him the maneuverability that he needs to turn his trucks around. Mrs. Emminger asked Mr. DiVesta why the fence was not extended past the building. He said it was strictly aesthetics, but they will do it if they need to. Mrs. Emminger said that is up to the Commission to determine exactly what fencing they would like to see there. She then said all we are waiting for is the City Traffic Engineer's report.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition and there was no one.

Mr. Keller made a motion to continue. Mr. Urice seconded the motion

^^^

considered getting a waiver to the parking requirements so they could increase the buffer. Mrs. Emminger explained that there is no waiver, they would have to apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance to the Regulations but they have no hardship. She then suggested they ask the A & P to have their employees park there. She also suggested that since a carnival is annually held in that area of the parking lot, they should make it a condition of approval that the carnival is not moved any closer to the adjacent residential parcel than it is now. Mr. Fagan then referred to the State DOT map, saying that all of the State improvements don't really have an impact on this site and therefore don't affect this application. He continued saying that what the State is proposing is not different than what their traffic engineers (Urbitran) proposed. He discussed the takings, lane widening and realignment, and the lane breakdown between traffic lights. Mr. Blaszka said it seems as though in the State's effort to alleviate the stacking, they are only moving it up the road. Mr. Urice said they also should consider what will happen when another restaurant goes into the former Burger King site. He said all of these changes don't really address the fact that the existing traffic is simply being moved across the street and then a similar use generating the same amount and kind of traffic could go into the former Burger King site. He said they have no control over what goes into the old site. Mr. Fagan said the State was proposing these changes before they knew that this Burger King was coming in for review. Attorney Jowdy said the existing Burger King site is not an easy site and will not be super desirable because it has access/egress issues and limitations on the physicality of it. He added that if the concern is that another fast food place will go in there, they should consider that the two biggest fast food chains are already located in this immediate vicinity.

Chairman Finaldi asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition and there was no one.

Mr. Keller made a motion to continue this until the next meeting. Mr. Blaszka seconded the motion and it was passed unanimously.

^^^

^^^